Radiology Resident Peer Learning Conference

Is there a role for peer learning in residency? If so, how best to implement it?
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Current State of Peer Learning

- Peer learning, an alternative to peer review, focuses on learning from the errors of one another rather than how often errors are occurring\textsuperscript{1,2}
- From 2014-2018, several early adopters have reported measurable successes\textsuperscript{1,3,4}
- Anonymous case submission, and centralized case collection and presentation were commonalities among these early adopters

\textsuperscript{1} Chetlen AL et al. Collaborative Learning in Radiology: From Peer Review to Peer Learning and Peer Coaching. Acad Radiol. 2019 Oct 18.
Historical Context

- Chief residents organized informal, impromptu noon-hour sessions in which cases rich with teaching points were presented in a hot-seat format.
- At the end of 2017, the residents were tasked to formalize peer learning.
- Our current resident peer learning conference format is based on this historic context.
Goals

- Share misses, good calls, and clinically pertinent cases
- Sharing “Interesting cases” or “zebras” is not the primary goal
- Create an open and safe environment to learn from each other

Format

- R1-R4 residents voluntarily collect and present own missed cases
- 1-2 resident facilitators; no attendings present
- 6 resident presenters per 2-hour session
- In 20 minutes, each resident presents 3 cases with 1-3 teaching points per case
- No set teaching format, but hot-seat format, supplemental slides, and companion cases are encouraged
RESIDENT FACILITATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

• Begin by sharing your own misses
• Ask directed questions to highlight teaching points
• Be the timekeeper and IT person
Pictures
SURVEY RESULTS

- 2 years of resident peer learning conference
- Voluntary completion of Qualtrics survey sent to 46 radiology residents to seek feedback for improvement
- Survey remained open for 3 weeks
Survey Responders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee Year</th>
<th># Responded</th>
<th>% Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGY2 (R1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY3 (R2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY4 (R3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGY5 (R4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 of 28 (100%) of survey responders have attended a peer learning conference.

12 of 28 (43%) of survey responders have never presented at peer learning conference.
What has prevented you from presenting at a radiology resident peer learning conference?

- Junior resident
- Sign up slots at capacity
- No cases yet to present
- Unsure how to present
- Ran out of time
- Time consuming to prepare cases

# of comments
Peer learning conference is a positive contribution to my education and development as a radiologist.
Comments

- Learning from others: Valuable time spent
- Open and casual environment
- Engaging and practical

Number of comments: 2
We should have a faculty facilitator (attending) participate during peer learning
Comments

- Open environment without faculty: 5 comments
- Detrimental with attending presence: 2 comments
- Prefer to learn from faculty instead and share cases elsewhere: 2 comments
- Alternate sessions with and without attending: 1 comment
- Attending present to correct black pearls: 1 comment
- No attending first then join session later: 1 comment
Residents should be required to present cases in peer learning

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither A nor D
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Comments

- Should be voluntary not forced
- Too many requirements
- Not efficient for the purpose of studying
- Anonymous case submission with one presenter
What is one thing about peer learning that should be fixed?

- Create a shared database of cases: 4
- Session attendance should be mandatory: 2
- Maintain culture of accepting mistakes: 2
- Presenting should be kept voluntary: 2
- Scheduled regularly: 1
- Hot seat format: 1
- Keep the variety of teaching styles: 1
- Have a faculty coordinator: 1
- Presenters should better prepare beforehand: 1
- Ensure equal talk time among presenters: 1
- More focus on missed cases: 1
- Peer learning should be replaced by faculty lecture: 1
What is one thing about peer learning that you like?

- Open environment to share mistakes: 12
- Resident pertinent learning: 3
- Engaging and practical: 2
- Get to see many cases: 1
- Variety of presentation styles and themes: 1
- Prefer faculty lectures: 1
Summary and Discussion

- Residents at our institution find peer learning to be valuable, particularly having an open and safe environment to learn from each other.
- Much of the challenges involving inconsistent resident-presenter participation and concerns about faculty presence likely related to the format of our non-anonymized, decentralized peer learning conference.
- Attendings provide written feedback and are potential references for residents who seek fellowship training and jobs, which is a setup for potential conflict of interest.
- Is an anonymized, centralized peer learning process the optimal way to learn from each others’ mistakes?
Future Endeavors

- How are the experiences of other institutions’ resident peer learning conferences (e.g. Thomas Jefferson University Program requiring R4 residents to present own missed cases)?
- How best to involve faculty attending?
- Trial idea of anonymous case submission with centralized case gathering and presentation