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The most fruitful lesson is the conquest of one’s own error. Whoever refuses to admit error may be a great scholar, but he is not a great learner.” - Goethe
#That’sSoMeta
Who is the author of the "meta" coffee table book about coffee tables?

- Murphy Brown: 5%
- Cosmo Kramer: 65%
- Kevin Spacey: 5%
- Stephen Colbert: 25%

When poll is active, respond at PollEv.com/kevinreaddea412
Text KEVINREADDEA412 to 22333 once to join
Learning Outcomes

Participants will be able to:

- Describe the essential steps in peer review assessments
- Develop peer review criteria based on expectations and goals of their behavioral intervention teams
- Implement a behavioral intervention team peer review system

How we will get there:

- Behavioral Intervention Teams (BIT)
- Peer review systems as an evaluation tool
- Application of BIT peer review system
  - Challenges and successes
  - Review mock case
What's in a name? What does your campus call it?

When poll is active, respond at PollEv.com/kevinreaddea412
Text KEVINREADDEA412 to 22333 once to join

- Intervention Team: 5%
- Behavioral Assessment Team: 21%
- Student Update & Intervention Team: 16%
- Behavioral Intervention Team: 16%
- Student of Concern Committee: 11%
- Threat Assessment Team: 0%
- None of the above: 11%
- We don't have a team: 32%
RPI Student Intervention Team (SIT)

- **Membership**
  - Chaired by AVP
  - Managing Deans
  - Deans on Duty – residential and class deans
  - Public Safety
  - Health and Counseling
  - Faculty
  - Legal/Risk Management

- **Weekly meeting**
- **Documentation – Maxient**
Similarities Across Teams

- Common mission
  - centralize/coordinate intervention process for students in need/at-risk
  - respond to and prevent crises

- Challenges
  - Formalized policies & intervention strategies
  - Serve as resource to campus community
  - Case Management
  - Document discussions and interventions (case managers)
  - Monitor student trends & evaluate team outcomes (leadership)
Case Management

- Collaborative process
  - Facilitate access to resources
  - Intervene to reduce the risk or threat posed
  - Develop a plan of action
  - Monitor progress toward the plan
Documentation

- Concise record of deliberations and actions
  - Summary of objective and subjective data
  - Clear rationale for referrals and interventions
- FERPA
- HIPAA
- Subject to disclosure in litigation
  - Fear should motivate not paralyze
Peer Case Review

- Medicine – review of clinical performance
  - Ishap bin Ali al-Rahawi, 9th century Syrian physician, *Ethics of the Physician*
  - Standards of care, review committee, medial audit, root cause analysis
  - Peers reviewing peers
- Data gathering quality improvement technique
  - Evaluate performance
  - Assessment of an individuals work
  - Implement retraining to improve practice
I like having people look over my shoulder and criticize my work.

When poll is active, respond at PollEv.com/kevinreaddea412
Text KEVINREADDEA412 to 22333 once to join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the potential issues with peers reviewing other peers?

Respond at PollEv.com/kevinreaddea412

Text KEVINREADDEA412 to 22333 once to join, then text your message.
Peer Case Review: Philosophy

- Conducting reviews and having one’s work the subject of a review can have a synergistic effect on performance improvement

- Key Elements
  - Not disciplinary – Learning and Feedback
  - Encourage a desire for self-improvement

- Quality of review
  - Structure
  - Relationships
  - Implementing change
Peer Case Review: Methodology

- Leadership
- Develop goals – educational exercise: improve documentation, improve care, share best practices, lower liability
- Develop structure – pairs, small group, review criteria, selection of cases (topics, number), reporting results, on-going schedule
- Communicate plan to group
  - Allow for input and discussion
  - Allow team to express concerns – individuality, evaluation, open criticism
- Introduce gradually – training and pilot test
- Assess the assessment of the assessment team (#thatswaytooometa)
  - Formative and summative
Chart Audit: Pilot 1

- Reviews conducted by teams of three
- 22 cases randomly selected from 2014-2015 cases
  - 2 cases for each of the 11 Deans who sit on SIT
- Reviewed: Incident Reports, Case Notes, Attachments
- Analysis: compliance with existing standards; recorded general comments
# Maxient Chart Audit Form

**Case Number:**

**Date of Review:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The notes include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronological timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facts only/no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correct spelling of name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correct RIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachments rather than cut and paste text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all involved parties are referenced in description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initials appear at end of note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
Implementation of Results

- Presented aggregate data
- Modified documentation standards
- Circulated ‘how to’ and ‘standards’ documents
- Expanded audit into true peer review system
  - All Deans participate in pairs
Mock Case Review

- Work in pairs
- Review mock incident report
- Complete chart audit form
Peer Case Review: Pilot 2

- Group developed criteria review form
  - Training
  - Buy-in
  - Reliability
- 26 cases randomly selected from Fall 2015 cases
  - 2 cases for each of the 13 Deans who sit on SIT
- Reviewed incident reports and case notes separately
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The notes include:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who is the incident about (student)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what happened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where the incident took place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why (underlying conditions that led to the incident)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when (date and time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description of initial intervention/response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronological timeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facts only/no opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correct spelling of all names</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correct RIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachments rather than cut/paste text or paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all parties affected by incident are referenced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall documentation is concise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abbreviations/acronyms are defined (as needed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Results: Pilot 2**

### Compliance with Documentation Standards - Incident Reports

- **Abbreviations/acronyms are defined (as needed):**
  - Yes: 62%
  - No: 23%
  - Partially: 15%

- **Overall documentation is concise:**
  - Yes: 91%
  - No: 9%

- **All parties affected by incident are referenced:**
  - Yes: 79%
  - No: 21%

- **Attachments rather than cut/paste text or paraphrase:**
  - Yes: 100%
  - No: 0%
  - Partially: 0%

- **3rd person narrative:**
  - Yes: 57%
  - No: 10%
  - Partially: 33%

- **Correct RIN:**
  - Yes: 91%
  - No: 9%

- **Correct spelling of all names:**
  - Yes: 91%
  - No: 9%

- **Facts only/no opinion:**
  - Yes: 100%
  - No: 0%

- **Chronological timeline:**
  - Yes: 86%
  - No: 14%

- **Description of initial intervention/response:**
  - Yes: 95%
  - No: 5%

- **When (date and time):**
  - Yes: 64%
  - No: 36%

- **Why (underlying conditions that led to the incident):**
  - Yes: 100%
  - No: 0%

- **Where the incident took place:**
  - Yes: 100%
  - No: 0%

- **What happened:**
  - Yes: 91%
  - No: 9%

- **Who is the incident about (student):**
  - Yes: 86%
  - No: 9%
  - Partially: 5%
Results: Pilot 2

Compliance with Documentation Standards - Case Notes

- Tags are appropriate to the case: 85% Yes, 15% No
- Closed case includes follow-up/closing note: 100% Yes, 0% No
- Abbreviations/acronyms are defined (as needed): 100% Yes, 0% No
- Documentation is concise: 95% Yes, 5% No
- All parties pertaining to the note are referenced: 100% Yes, 0% No
- Attachments rather than cut/paste text or paraphrase: 95% Yes, 5% No
- 3rd person narrative: 58% Yes, 5% No, 37% Partially
- Correct spelling of all names: 100% Yes, 0% No
- Facts only/no opinion: 85% Yes, 15% No
- Chronological timeline (details provided as needed): 100% Yes, 0% No
- What follow-up occurred: 90% Yes, 10% No

Legend:
- Yes
- No
- Partially
Next Steps

- Continue to Assess our Behavioral Assessment Team (#That’sSoMeta)
  - Regular peer review schedule
  - More cases at each review
- Training


