Nursing Views of 360-Degree Assessments for
Resident Evaluation in the PACU Setting

L Meng MD, MPH Assistant Professor Of Anesthesiology;
PACU Rotation Director; University Of Pittsburgh
David G. Metro, MD Assistant Professor Of Anesthesiology;
Associate Program Director Anesthesiology Residency Program; University Of Pittsburgh

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to seek PACU nurses' input and opinions on a new format for general competency assessment of resident physicians. The 360-degree assessment employs the use of raters from a variety of disciplinary groups interacting with trainees to evaluate professionalism and clinical performance. During their rotation, PACU residents work closely with PACU nurses. Therefore, the insight of PACU nurses into the 360-degree approach could provide the program with valuable information on which to judge the challenge of implementing such an assessment program.

Method

We developed a questionnaire that focused on the use of 360-degree assessments for PACU rotation. The nine questions selected dealt with familiarity of the 360-degree tool, willingness of the nurses to participate and thoughts on its usefulness and effectiveness. Each question was assigned a 5-point ordinal scale (1= very low, 5=very high). The PACU used for this study has 52 beds, 40 full time nurses and 10 part time nurses. The PACU rotation of the residency program is a mandatory 2-week rotation that occurs in this unit.

Results

A total of 27 PACU nurses responded to the survey. The mean scores regarding the degree of agreement with the statement of the respondents are shown in the table. In general, nurses felt that they should be involved in resident assessment and it would improve patient care and resident performance. Only 18.5% (5 out of 27) respondents had previously heard about 360-Degree evaluations.

Discussion

We feel that the 360-degree evaluation is a useful tool in the evaluation of residents, but realize that it is difficult to employ in many situations. The results of this study show that the PACU should be a good place to start using the 360-degree resident evaluation tool.

References

1.ACGME outcome project: Enhancing residency education through outcomes assessment. Chicago,

Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, 2000.

2.ACGME General Competencies: American Society of Anesthesiologist NEWSLETTER .Nov 2002:66; 22.
3. Assessing the General Competencies: ACGME Work in Progress.ACGME Bulletin Nov 2002.
4.Conducting effective performance appraisals. Clin Leadersh Manag Rev 2001; 15: 348-52.

Survey Questions	Results
Have you heard about 360-degree evaluations, which consist of measurement tools completed by multiple people in a person's sphere of influence such as superiors, peers, subordinates, and patients and families? **Y / N**	5/22
To what degree do you think 360-degree evaluations should be used for PACU rotating residents? **Very low=1, Low=2, Moderate=3, High=4, Very high=5.**	4.1
To what degree do you think PACU residents help with the patient care in PACU? **Very low=1, Low=2, Moderate=3, High=4, Very high=5.**	4.2
To what degree do you think the PACU nurses should get involved in the evaluation of the PACU residents? **Very low=1, Low=2, Moderate=3, High=4, Very high=5.**	3.9
If PACU nurses evaluate PACU residents, to what degree do you think it will improve the resident's performance? **Very low=1, Low=2, Moderate=3, High=4, Very high=5.**	4.1
If the PACU nurses evaluate the PACU residents, to what degree do you think it will improve the patient care in PACU? **Very low=1, Low=2, Moderate=3, High=4, Very high=5.**	3.9
When the PACU residents were present, to what degree do you think that they were involved in the patient care in PACU? **Very low=1, Low=2, Moderate=3, High=4, Very high=5.**	4.1
To what degree do you think you are willing to take part in the evaluation of the PACU residents? **Very low=1, Low=2, Moderate=3, High=4, Very high=5.**	3.9
To what degree do you think you have a good relationship with PACU residents? **Very low=1, Low=2, Moderate=3, High=4, Very high=5.**	4.4

The results were based on 27 respondents