

Teaching Peer Review: Critique or Criticism?

Robin Arends, MS, CNP

Renaë Durfee, MS, CNP

South Dakota State University



Peer Review & Clinical Practice

- How Is Peer Review Used?
 - Random selection of charts
 - Retrospective chart review
 - Monthly basis
 - MD or APN review
 - Information related to HPI & ROS, physical exam, diagnosis, treatment, follow-up, health maintenance

Peer Review & Clinical Practice

- Why Is Peer Review Important?
 - Quality assurance issues
 - Improvement in patient care
 - Prevent adverse patient outcomes
 - Review of critical incidents
 - Improvement in clinical documentation
 - Reimbursement
 - Payment for performance



Peer Review & APN Students

- Transition to DNP
- Focus on pay-for-performance and evidence-based practice
- Knowledge, Skills, & Attitudes
 - Improving patient outcomes in the clinical setting
 - Identifying areas of improvement and gaps in practice
 - Role of continuous QA/QI in clinical practice

Peer Review Assignment

- The peer review assignment was initiated in the first practicum course.
- The assignment was then expanded as the students progressed into the second practicum course.
- This allowed for the progression in learning skills and concepts of the family nurse practitioner as well as enhancing the understanding of the peer review process



Peer Review Assignment

- In the first practicum, students individually selected a patient cared for in the clinical setting.
- Students posted the patient's H & P in the discussion forum.
 - All patient identifiers were removed prior to posting.
- Each student selected two H & Ps of their peers to review.
- Students provided constructive feedback of the H&P acting as if they were a colleague reviewing the chart.
- The student who posted the original H & P responded back to their peers answering any questions that were raised and clarifying aspects that were not clear.



Peer Review Assignment

- Students were provided questions to stimulate the peer review.
- These questions were based off chart review forms utilized by medical clinics in the community.
 - What additional questions would I have asked about the HPI?
 - Are there additional portions of the exam that may have been beneficial to formulating differentials/final diagnosis?
 - What other differentials could be considered?
 - What was the rationale behind selection of diagnostics?
 - Is there anything additional to add to the prescribed treatment plan?



Peer Review Assignment

- In the second practicum, the assignment was enhanced to demonstrate increased competence.
- Each student posted a H & P in the discussion forum for a patient cared for in the clinic setting.
 - The patient needed to have 2 or more chronic diseases or considered a complex patient.
- Each student responded to 2 of their peers' H & Ps.
- In this semester, the students needed to use a peer reviewed or evidence based research source to critique their peers' H&Ps.
- All students needed to respond to their peers postings.



Peer Review Assignment

- Some examples:
 - “JNC VII states that diabetic patients should be on a ACEI to help control hypertension as well as to protect the kidneys. This patient is not on an ACEI, and you did not start this medication. What was the rationale for this decision?”
 - “Your goal LDL for this patient is listed as 100. The patient has diabetes and hypertension. New research is stating that the LDL goal for these patients should be 70. Why did you select this goal LDL?”
 - “This patient was not compliant in their diabetic regimen. You chose to increase the metformin, but the patient was not taking this medication as prescribed. Did you assess why the patient was not taking the medication? Why did you decide to increase the Metformin dose?”



Grading Rubric

- This assignment was worth 10 points.
- The student could receive up to 2 points for posting a H & P that met the criteria for the course.
- The student could receive up to 2 points for responding to 2 of their peers.
- The student could receive up to 4 points for the feedback he or she provided for their peers.
 - The quality of the feedback determined the point distribution.
 - In the second semester, the use of a peer reviewed or evidence based source was included in the feedback points.
- The student could receive up to 2 points for the response back to each of the peers who peer reviewed their H & P.



Student Feedback

- Students were asked to provide feedback through the use of Survey Monkey.
 - 15 out of 25 students responded to the survey.
- 3 students rated the assignment as very beneficial.
- 9 students rated the assignment as beneficial.
- 2 students rated the assignment as neither beneficial or not beneficial.
- 1 student rated the assignment as not beneficial.
 - Stated it was not beneficial because NPs in her future setting do not perform chart reviews.



Student Feedback

- Positive feedback about the assignment
 - I liked getting feedback from my peers. Thank you for setting the limit of applying to only 2 case studies.
 - Gave me good practice in writing an H&P and also provided good feedback from my peers.
 - Different feedback from different points of view.
 - Interesting to hear about other unique clinical cases
 - Interesting cases and good to see how they are documented.
 - Opportunity to read about some uncommon diagnoses.



Student Feedback

- Positive feedback about the assignment
 - Reading everyone's cases and seeing how many different responses/suggestions there were.
 - Difficult cases were presented that stimulated critical thinking in classmates
 - Practicing H&Ps since a lot of sites use the EMR now
 - I like hearing about what everyone else did
 - Reading about interesting case studies from my classmates



Student Feedback

- Suggestions for Improvement
 - Decrease the number of responses required...gets overwhelming.
 - Instructors could give more feedback on how the cases presented are true to what would be on the boards.
 - Allow general comments of experience one may have had with this same type of patient.
 - Sometimes hard to find something to comment about.
 - A lot of reading...sometimes hard to follow.
 - I feel uncomfortable making corrections or criticizing other people's work.



Future Plans

- Faculty are creating several patient charts into Neehr Perfect.
- Some charts would have errors that lead to adverse outcomes.
- Students would need to go through a chart review process to determine where the error occurred and how the error could have been prevented.
- The student would not have the problem with responding to their peer group because the chart is made by the faculty.
- Faculty could provide more feedback without disagreeing with preceptor's treatment plans.
- Faculty are also including time during class to discuss the peer review process and how it is used in clinics.



Questions?

- Contact information
- Robin Arends, MS, CNP
 - Robin.Arends@sdstate.edu
- Renae Durfee, MS, CNP
 - Renae.Durfee@sdstate.edu