

THE SHORT SCALE

Date and time of debriefing:

Date of assessment:

Case ID / debriefer's initials:

Rater's initials:

SCORE (see holistic rating below)	1/5	2/5	3/5	4/5	5/5
DESCRIPTION	Harmful	Neutral	Must improve	Could improve	Expert

Item 1: DEBRIEFING ENVIRONMENT (fosters a safe and effective debriefing environment with a positive tone)

1	2	3	4	5
Shows no respect for the learners and their emotional security	Shows little respect for the learners OR little concern for their emotional safety	Shows respect for the learners AND concern for their emotional safety	Shows respect for the learners AND concern for their emotional safety	Shows respect for the learners AND concern for their emotional safety
Does NOT help in reducing the learners' tension and stress	Helps slightly in reducing the learners' tension and stress	Helps slightly in reducing the learners' tension and stress	Helps moderately in reducing the learners' tension and stress	Helps effectively in reducing the learners' tension and stress

COMMENTS:

Item 2: DEBRIEFING STRUCTURE (organized structure)

1	2	3	4	5
Does NOT allow for an emotional phase	Facilitates a short AND incomplete emotional phase	Facilitates a short AND incomplete emotional phase	Facilitates a fair emotional phase	Facilitates an excellent emotional phase
Does NOT facilitate a summary at the end of the session	Does NOT facilitate a summary at the end of the session	Does NOT facilitate a summary at the end of the session	Facilitates an adequate summary at the end of the session	Facilitates an effective summary at the end of the session
Does NOT ensure that the debriefing meets the case objectives	Does NOT ensure that the debriefing meets the case objectives	Ensures that the debriefing meets the case objectives	Ensures that the debriefing meets the case objectives	Ensures that the debriefing meets the case objectives

COMMENTS:

Item 3: DEBRIEFING FACILITATION (efficiency and fluidity)

1	2	3	4	5
Prevents group discussion through continuous interventions	Does NOT encourage group discussion by intervening excessively	Slightly encourages group discussion despite some excessive interventions	Regularly encourages group discussion without excessive interventions	Effectively encourages group discussion without excessive interventions
Does NOT reorient discussions that digress from the objectives	Reorients only slightly the discussions that digress from the objectives	Consistently tries to reorient the discussions that digress from the objectives	Reorient correctly the discussions that digress from the objectives	Reorients effectively the discussions that digress from the objectives
Does NOT manage at all the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)	Avoids managing the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)	Tries to manage the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)	Correctly manages the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)	Effectively manages the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)

COMMENTS:

Item 4: ANALYSIS (facilitates an analysis of learner performance: « Identify the gap » - contextualizing)

1	2	3	4	5
Does NOT discuss the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience	Does NOT encourage discussion about the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience	Encourages discussion about the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience	Encourages discussion about the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience	Encourages discussion about the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience
Does NOT explore the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance	Does NOT explore the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance	Does NOT explore the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance	Explores the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance	Explores effectively the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance

COMMENTS:

Item 5: TRANSFER (encourages learning transfer: « *close the gap* » - decontextualizing and recontextualizing)

1	2	3	4	5
Brings out inaccurate overarching principles	Does NOT bring out the overarching principles related to the case (knowledge and/or management strategies)	Tries to bring out the overarching principles related to the case (knowledge and/or management strategies)	Brings out the overarching principles related to the case (knowledge and/or management strategies)	Brings out the overarching principles related to the case (knowledge and/or management strategies)
Debriefs only based on abstract concepts	Debriefs mostly based on abstract concepts	Debriefs mostly based on abstract concepts	Causes the emergence of concrete strategies for management (rather than debriefing based on abstract principles)	Causes the emergence of concrete strategies for management (rather than debriefing based on abstract principles)
Does NOT project the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)	Does NOT project the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)	Does NOT project the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)	Does NOT project the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)	Projects the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)

COMMENTS:

EXPERT GLOBAL SCORE: holistic assessment; NOT the average score

SCORE	1/5	2/5	3/5	4/5	5/5
DESCRIPTION	Harmful <i>Undoes learning OR harms the credibility of the training or of the simulation modality</i>	Neutral <i>No benefit from the debriefing OR does not make the simulation modality relevant</i>	Must improve <i>Encourages learning, BUT does not allow the simulation modality to be used at its optimal capacity</i>	Could improve <i>Encourages learning significantly AND allows the simulation modality to be used at its optimal capacity</i>	Expert <i>Encourages learning significantly. Could be cited as an example OR the debriefers could train other debriefers</i>

NUMBER OF OBJECTIVES REACHED DURING THE CASE : ____ / ____

Overall comments:

Authors : Etienne Rivière MD, PhD, MA(Ed), Samuel-Lessard Tremblay, MD, Gilles Lortie, MD, PhD, & Gilles Chiniara, MD, MA(Ed).

Adapted from « Évaluation du débriefage au centre Apprentiss » by Gilles Chiniara, and debriefing evaluation by M Jaffrelot & G Savoldelli, 2010, inspired from the DASH© evaluation scale (Brett-Fleegler M. et al, Simulation in Healthcare, 2009).

RATER'S GUIDE TO USE THE SHORT SCALE

The SHORT instrument includes a global rating scale composed of 5 items and a holistic expert evaluation.

Each of the 5 items is scored on a scale from 1 (harmful) to 5 (expert), using specific **cues** provided to guide scoring. The cues for each item are placed on separate lines based on their topic or theme. For each item, rate each line individually, then rate the item. If the lines of a single item give different scores, the highest score should be adopted for the item. However, for some items, specific lines should weigh more in the final item score; such weighing is described in the rating guide.

The holistic evaluation is rated on a scale from 1 to 5 as follows. Please note that the **holistic evaluation should not be based on the mean score of the five preceding items**.

- "1 = harmful", *i.e.* undoes learning, or harms the credibility of the training or of the simulation modality;
- "2 = neutral", *i.e.* learners gain no benefit from the debriefing, or the debriefer does not make the simulation modality relevant;
- "3 = must improve", *i.e.* the debriefer encourages learning, but does not allow the simulation modality to be used at its optimal capacity;
- "4 = could improve", *i.e.* the debriefer encourages learning significantly and allows the simulation modality to be used at its optimal capacity;
- "5 = expert", *i.e.* the debriefer encourages learning significantly and could be cited as an example, or the debriefer could train other debriefers.

EXAMPLE:

The cue lines help the rater to score the debriefer as accurately as possible. Each cue line should be rated independently, then the item should be scored based on the full lines that delineate successive cues:

Item 1 : ENVIRONMENT (create a convivial environment with a positive tone encouraging effective debriefing)

1	2	3	4	5
Demonstrate no respect of the learners and for their emotional security	Demonstrate little respect of the learners OR little concern for their emotional security	Demonstrate respect of the learners AND concern for their emotional security	Demonstrate respect of the learners AND concern for their emotional security	Demonstrate respect of the learners AND concern for their emotional security
Do NOT contribute to reduce tension and stress of the learners	Contribute slightly to reduce tension and stress of the learners	Contribute slightly to reduce tension and stress of the learners	Contribute moderately to reduce tension and stress of the learners	Contribute effectively to reduce tension and stress of the learners

Global rating for the item = 3/5

In case of large discrepancies between different cue line scores for an item, a mean score should be averaged, except in items where the cue lines are weighed differently, as specified in the individual item descriptions below.

A score of 3 or less on any item or on the holistic evaluation should prompt consideration of providing additional training on relevant aspects of the debriefer's performance.

How to rate each of the 5 items

D = DEBRIEFER

• ITEM 1: ENVIRONMENT

GOAL: To foster a safe and effective debriefing environment with a positive tone that encourages effective debriefing

1.1. Respect and emotional security

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Shows no respect for the learners and their emotional security	Shows little respect for the learners OR little concern for their emotional safety	Shows respect for the learners AND concern for their emotional safety	Shows respect for the learners AND concern for their emotional safety	Shows respect for the learners AND concern for their emotional safety
EXAMPLES	- Undue arguing with learners - Overt learner bashing - Shaming	- No active efforts to ensure emotional security - Neutral attitude - Speech interruption	- Active efforts to ensure emotional security - Watchful supervision - No or few speech interruption(s) - Supportive attitude		

1.2. Tension and stress management

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT help in reducing the learners' tension and stress	Helps slightly in reducing the learners' tension and stress	Helps slightly in reducing the learners' tension and stress	Helps moderately in reducing the learners' tension and stress	Helps effectively in reducing the learners' tension and stress
EXAMPLES	- Anger - Accusations - Making the learners feel guilty	- Passive / neutral attitude - Absence of normalisation of tension and stress	- Passive efforts to reduce tension (only by learners, but respected by D) - Aborted or incomplete normalisation of tension and stress	- Active efforts to reduce tension - Appropriate and complete normalisation of tension and stress	

• **ITEM 2: STRUCTURE**

GOAL: To structure the debriefing to allow for discussion of central concepts relative to the case

2.1. Quality of the emotional phase

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT allow for an emotional phase	Facilitates a short AND incomplete emotional phase	Facilitates a short AND incomplete emotional phase	Facilitates a fair emotional phase	Facilitates an excellent emotional phase
EXAMPLES	Omission of the phase which allows learners to verbalize their emotions	Emotional phase interrupted by D Or interruption by learners not controlled		Passive control over the emotional phase (by learners, but respected by D without interruption)	Active control over the emotional phase, with eventual redirection or focus of learners' emotions on a concept planned for discussion

2.2. Summary of concepts discussed during debriefing

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT facilitate a summary at the end of the session	Does NOT facilitate a summary at the end of the session	Does NOT facilitate a summary at the end of the session	Facilitates an adequate summary at the end of the session	Facilitates an effective summary at the end of the session
EXAMPLES	Omission of a summary of concepts discussed in the debriefing			Summary too brief, or interrupted, or incomplete	Efficient summary of concepts discussed during debriefing, with verbalization of transfer of these concepts to a future case, either simulated or not

2.3. Targeting learning outcomes defined for the case

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT ensure that the debriefing meets the case objectives	Does NOT ensure that the debriefing meets the case objectives	Ensures that the debriefing meets the case objectives	Ensures that the debriefing meets the case objectives	Ensures that the debriefing meets the case objectives
EXAMPLES	D has obviously not reviewed specific learning outcomes for the case in order to target them during debriefing		D has obviously reviewed specific learning outcomes for the case and targets all or most of them during debriefing		

2.4. Weighing

In case of a rating contradiction between the three lines, the presence of a summary should be a priority, then the presence of an efficient emotional phase and then targeted learning outcomes. The presence of an effective summary that allows learning transfer to occur is a hallmark of debriefing expertise.

• **ITEM 3: ANIMATION**

GOAL: To ensure efficiency and fluidity of the debriefing

3.1. Guiding group discussion

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Prevents group discussion through continuous interventions	Does NOT encourage group discussion by intervening excessively	Slightly encourages group discussion despite some excessive interventions	Regularly encourages group discussion without excessive interventions	Effectively encourages group discussion without excessive interventions
EXAMPLES	- D talks exclusively - No or inadequate answers to learners' questions	- D talks most of the time with only little time for learners - Few answers are given to learner's questions, some questions remaining unanswered	- Passive encouragement of discussion through a positive tone and environment with or without excessive interventions - Active encouragement of discussion (with verbal or non-verbal actions), but with excessive interventions	- Active encouragement of discussion (with verbal or non-verbal actions), without excessive interventions	- Active encouragement of discussion (with verbal or non-verbal actions) - D lead the discussion efficiently, targeting all learning outcomes

3.2. Redirection of digressive objectives

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT reorient discussions that digress from the objectives	Reorients only slightly the discussions that digress from the objectives	Consistently tries to reorient the discussions that digress from the objectives	Reorient correctly the discussions that digress from the objectives	Reorients effectively the discussions that digress from the objectives
EXAMPLES	- D talks exclusively, leaving no time for learners' discussion	- D initiates a reorientation of digressing discussions, but fail to do so and gives up	- D initiates a reorientation of digressing discussions and fails to do so, but continues to try	- D partly succeeds in reorienting digressing discussions	- D fully succeeds in reorienting digressing discussions

3.3. Managing the resistant or disruptive learner

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT manage at all the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)	Avoids managing the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)	Tries to manage the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)	Correctly manages the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)	Effectively manages the resistant or disruptive learner (when applicable)
EXAMPLES	- D refuses to manage the resistant or disruptive learner - D does not recognize a resistant or disruptive learner	- D recognizes a resistant or disruptive learner, but avoids tackling this issue	- D initiates efforts to manage a resistant or disruptive learner, but fails to do so	- D partially manages a resistant or disruptive learner and dedicates minimal time to that end	- D makes adequate efforts to manage a resistant or disruptive learner and allows adequate time to that end

3.4. Weighing

Most of the time, if the first line is scored 1 or 2, the other lines are not applicable and should not be rated. Thus, the final score for the item is that of the first line.

• **ITEM 4: ANALYSIS**

GOAL: To animate the analysis of learners' performance and « *identify the knowledge gap* » - contextualizing

4.1. Ability to discuss the learners' performance

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT discuss the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience	Does NOT encourage discussion about the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience	Encourages discussion about the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience	Encourages discussion about the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience	Encourages discussion about the learners' performance in the context of their lived experience
EXAMPLES	- D completely and/or deliberately omits to rely on learners' performance during the simulated case - D dedicates all the debriefing time to a lecture	- D relies partially on learner's performance during the simulated case	- D fully relies on learner's performance during the simulated case - D encourages learners to explain what happened during the simulated case through their own eyes - D encourages all participants to verbalize their feelings and cognitive frames		

4.2. Exploration of learner's cognitive frames

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT explore the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance	Does NOT explore the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance	Does NOT explore the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance	Explores the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance	Explores effectively the cognitive frames underlying the learners' performance
EXAMPLES	- D omits or avoids exploring cognitive frames - Passive exposure of cognitive frames by learners - Absence of confrontation of learners' cognitive frames with D's own			- Incomplete or inadequate (judgmental or Socratic) exploration of cognitive frames - Confrontation of learner's cognitive frames with D's own	- Complete and non-judgmental exploration of cognitive frames - Confrontation of learner's cognitive frames with D's own

• **ITEM 5: TRANSFER**

GOAL: To encourage learning transfer and « *close the knowledge gap* » - decontextualizing and recontextualizing

5.1. Ability to bring out overarching principles related to the learners' knowledge gap (decontextualizing)

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Brings out inaccurate overarching principles	Does NOT bring out the overarching principles related to the case (knowledge and/or management strategies)	Tries to bring out the overarching principles related to the case (knowledge and/or management strategies)	Brings out the overarching principles related to the case (knowledge and/or management strategies)	Brings out the overarching principles related to the case (knowledge and/or management strategies)
EXAMPLES	- Wrong general principles - Outdated principles	- No mention of overarching principles adapted to learners' performance	- Overarching principles partially adapted to learners' performance - D allows learners to partially close their knowledge gap	- Overarching principles fully adapted to learners' performance - D allows learners to fully close their knowledge gap - Learners are now equipped with general principles that could be mobilized in new situations, either similar or prototypal	

5.2. Ability to bring out concrete strategies relative to learner's knowledge gap (decontextualizing)

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Debriefs only based on abstract concepts	Debriefs mostly based on abstract concepts	Debriefs mostly based on abstract concepts	Causes the emergence of concrete strategies for management (rather than debriefing based on abstract principles)	Causes the emergence of concrete strategies for management (rather than debriefing based on abstract principles)
EXAMPLES	- D dedicates all the debriefing time to a lecture, without any concrete strategies	- D dedicates some time to a lecture - Few or very few concrete strategies and/or not adapted to the lived experience		- D facilitates the discussion of concrete strategies appropriate to management of a similar case in clinical practice and adapted to the lived experience	

5.3. Ability to project learners in a new situation either prototypal or similar (recontextualizing)

RATING	1	2	3	4	5
CUE(S)	Does NOT project the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)	Does NOT project the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)	Does NOT project the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)	Does NOT project the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)	Projects the learner in the context of a new situation (prototypal, similar)
EXAMPLES	- D does not project learners into a new situation during debriefing - D does not make the prototypical aspects of the case explicit or does not ask learners about the prototypical aspect of the case				- D makes explicit the prototypical aspect of the case or asks learners about them, then guides learners in applying their knowledge to a new similar situation (or a prototypal situation if this was not the case) discussed during debriefing

5.4. Weighing

If scoring highlights discordance between the lines, then recontextualizing (line 3) should weigh more heavily for the item score, followed by concrete strategies (line 2), and finally overarching principles (line 1).