Welcome

Human Patient Simulation:
Bringing the Future into the
Classroom

Jennifer Rode, Brenda Barnes
Michael Callihan

INACSL CONFERENCE, 2016





ANCC

Continuing Nursing Education



INACSL is an accredited ANCC provider.





Disclosures

Conflict of Interest

- —All authors reports 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





Objectives

Upon completion of this presentation, participants will be able to:

- 1. Describe large-group HPS teaching strategy
- 2. Describe tools used to enhance learning for active participants and vicarious learners





Outline

- Background
- Specific Aims
- Intervention
- Measures
- Data Analysis
- Perceptions
- Limitations and Conclusions
- What's next?



Background





Background

Human Patient Simulation

Outcomes

Delivery

- Time



Background

Vicarious learning

Bandura

Does it work?



Specific Aims

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of integrated simulation in a didactic course

2. Describe students' perceptions of integration simulation in a didactic course.



Design

Intervention group

N = 29

12 hours of simulation

Control Group

N = 31

12 hours of traditional teaching





Intervention

- Small-group simulation experiences
- 8 simulation scenarios
- One classroom



Intervention

 HEROS- Helping Everyone Remember Our Skills



Time out

Ask a friend



Measures

Control variable

Simulation Pre-test

Intervention vs. control

Final exam simulation content Final exam non-sim content

Intervention group

HEROS Simulation scores
Vicarious learner simulation
scores

Intervention group

Simulation Effectiveness Tool



Data Analysis

MANCOVA:

Simulation pre-test (co-variate)

- Final exam simulation content (p = 0.01)
 - Intervention group performed better
- Final exam non-simulation content (p = 0.79)
 - No significant differences between groups



Data Analysis

- Paired Samples T-test
 - HEROS learning vs. Vicarious learning (p = .69)
 - No significant differences between active learning and vicarious learning outcomes



Perceptions

- Simulation Effectiveness Tool
 - Range 3.5 4.0/4.0

"Much more beneficial than lecture"

"The BEST learning experience EVER!!"



Limitations

- Small-sample
- Different instructors
- Internal validity





What's Next

- Resource effective strategies
 - Faculty time
- Need for evidence-based strategies which incorporate simulation
 - Delivery
 - Time
 - Outcomes





References

Cant, R.P. and Cooper, S.J. (2010). Simulation-based learning in nurse education: systematic review. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 66(1), 3-15.

Lapkin, S., Levett-Jones, T., Bellchambers, H., and Fernandez, R. (2010). Effectiveness of patient simulation manikins in teaching clinical reasoning skills to undergraduate nursing students: a systematic review. Clinical Simulation in Nursing, 6, e207-e222.

Ackermann, A.D. (2009). Investigation of learning outcomes for the acquisition and retention of CPR knowledge and skills learned with the use of high-fidelity simulation. Clinical Simulation in Nursing, 5, e213-e222.

Aqel, A.A. and Ahmad, M.M. (2014). High-fidelity simulation effects on CPR knowledge, skills, acquisition, and retention in nursing students. Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing, 11(6), 394-400.

Couto, T.B., Farhat, S.C.L., Geis, G.L., Olsen, O. and Schvartsman, C. (2015). High-fidelity simulation versus case-based discussion for teaching medical students in Brazil about pediatric emergencies. Clinics, 70(6), 393-399.

Adamson, K. (2010). Integrating human patient simulation into associate degree nursing curricula: faculty experiences, barriers, and facilitators. Clinical Simulation in Nursing, 6, e75-e81.





Contacts

Jennifer Rode
Associate Professor
Department of Nursing
rodejL@miamioh.edu



