

## Just Culture SPEET Cue Card for Program Directors/Faculty working with Just Culture in Education Programs

1. Does the incident involve any of the “non-use misconduct” categories?  
**Academic cheating, confidentiality, inappropriate use of social media, fraud, theft, drug abuse, diversion, boundary issues, sexual misconduct, mental/physical impairment.**

**If Yes: STOP – don’t use SPEET. The SPEET is used only for evaluating student practice-related incidents in clinical settings.**

2. Is this the first practice incident with this student?      If yes, score 0 and proceed to next row.  
 If No:  
 How many prior incidents? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Was prior incident the same issue? \_\_\_\_\_ Related issue? \_\_\_\_\_ Non-related issue? \_\_\_\_\_  
 What counseling has occurred? \_\_\_\_\_ If so, is it documented? \_\_\_\_\_ Has there been improvement? \_\_\_\_\_

<b>G</b>	<b>General Nursing Practice</b>	No prior counseling for practice related issues	Prior counseling for single <b>non-related</b> practice issue	Prior counseling for single "related" issue	Prior counseling for "same" issue	Prior counseling for multiple related or non-related practice issues	Prior counseling for <u>same</u> or <u>related</u> issue with no or little evidence of improvement.	
----------	---------------------------------	---	---	---	-----------------------------------	--	---	--

3. Based on the level of student in the program, evaluate the expected level of understanding as it relates to incident:  
 Does the student have the Knowledge, Skills, and Ability needed for this activity? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Were available resources used? \_\_\_\_\_ Was this an appropriate assignment? \_\_\_\_\_

<b>U</b>	<b>Understanding expected based on program level, course objectives/ outcomes</b>	Has knowledge, skill and ability - <i>Incident was accidental, inadvertent, or an oversight</i>	Task driven/rote learning. OR <u>Wrong action for this circumstance.</u>	Failed to demonstrate appropriate understanding of options/resources. OR Aware of safety issues but in this instance <u>cut corners.</u>	Understands rationale but failed to recognize situations in terms of overall picture or to prioritize actions. OR In this instance, failed to obtain sufficient info or consult before acting.	Able to recognize potential problems. In this instance " <u>negligent</u> " OR <u>failed to act according to standards.</u> Risk to client outweighed benefits.	Knows or should have known correct action, role and limitations. In this instance action was " <u>gross negligence/ unsafe act</u> " and demonstrated no regard for patient safety.	
----------	---	---	--	--	--	---	---	--

4. Is there a policy, standard or order addressing the incident? \_\_\_\_\_ Was the student aware of policy/standard/order? \_\_\_\_\_ How is the policy or standard enforced? \_\_\_\_\_ Did the student cut corners? \_\_\_\_\_ Is there a pattern to these behaviors? \_\_\_\_\_ Was the student attempting to achieve expectations of others? \_\_\_\_\_ Did the student achieve personal gain? \_\_\_\_\_

I	<b>Internal Program or Agency Policies/standards/inter-disciplinary orders</b>	Unintentional breach OR No policy/standard/order available.	Policy not enforced. OR <u>Cultural norm</u> or common deviation of staff. OR Policy/order misinterpreted	Student cut corners or deviated in this instance from policy/standard/order as <u>time saver</u> .- No evidence or suggestion of a pattern of behavior.	Aware of policy/standard/order but <u>ignored or disregarded</u> to achieve <i>perceived expectations</i> of faculty, staff, patient or others. May indicate pattern or single event.	Disregarded policy/standard/order for <u>own personal gain</u> .	<u>Maliciously</u> disregarded policy/standard/order	
---	--	---	---	---	---	--	--	--

5. How was the decision/choice made? \_\_\_\_\_ Would a prudent student make this choice? \_\_\_\_\_ Was incident accidental/inadvertent? \_\_\_\_\_ Did advantages to patient outweighed risk? \_\_\_\_\_ Emergent situation required quick response? \_\_\_\_\_ Non emergent situation – used poor judgment? \_\_\_\_\_ Did the student put their interest ahead of pt/agency/public? \_\_\_\_\_

D	<b>Decision/choice</b>	Accidental/mistake/Inadvertent error	<u>Advantages</u> to patient <u>outweighed risk</u>	<u>Emergent situation</u> - quick response required.	<u>Non-emergent situation</u> . Chose to act/not to act without weighing options or utilizing resources. Used poor judgment	Clearly a prudent student would not have done. <u>Unacceptable risk to patient/agency/public</u> Disregard for patient safety.	Conscious choice. Put own interest above that of patient/agency/public. <u>Egregious choice</u> . <u>Neglected red flags</u>	
---	------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	--

6. How was the error identified? Student identified/Self reported \_\_\_\_\_ Other identified \_\_\_\_\_  
 Did the student: Accept accountability for error/incident? \_\_\_\_\_ Accept and identify ways to prevent in future? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Acknowledge role in error but attribute to others/circumstances to justify? \_\_\_\_\_ Deny responsibility until confronted with evidence? \_\_\_\_\_ Deny responsibility despite evidence? \_\_\_\_\_  
 What was the student's level of participation in investigation? Cooperative? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Identified opportunities to improve? \_\_\_\_\_ Demonstrated willingness to improve? \_\_\_\_\_ Made excuses? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Marginally cooperative? \_\_\_\_\_ Uncooperative and dishonest? \_\_\_\_\_ Actively attempted to conceal or failed to disclose known error? \_\_\_\_\_

<b>E</b>	<b>Ethics/ credibility/ accountability</b>	Identified own error and <u>self reported</u> . Identifies opportunities for improvement and develops action plan for ensuring incident will not be repeated.	Admitted to error and <u>accepts responsibility</u> . Identifies opportunities for improvement and develops action plan for ensuring incident will not be repeated.	Acknowledged role in error but <u>attributes to circumstances</u> and/or blames others to justify action/inaction. Cooperative during investigation. Demonstrates desire to improve practice.	Denies responsibility until confronted with evidence. Reluctantly accepts responsibility. <u>Made excuses</u> or <u>made light of occurrence</u> . Marginally cooperative during investigation.	Denied responsibility despite evidence. Indifferent to situation. <u>Uncooperative</u> and/or <u>dishonest</u> during investigation.	Took active steps to <u>conceal</u> error or <u>failed to disclose known error</u> .	
----------	--	---	---	---	---	--	--	--

7. Were mitigating circumstances involved? Subtract points as indicated for number of factors selected:

	<b>Communication breakdown (multiple handoffs, change of shift, language barriers)</b>
	<b>Unavailable resources (inadequate supplies/equipment )</b>
	<b>Interruptions/Chaotic environment/emergencies - (frequent interruptions/distractions)</b>
	<b>Inadequate supervision by faculty or receptor</b>
	<b>Inappropriate assignment by faculty or preceptor</b>
	<b>Policies/procedures unclear</b>
	<b>Client factors (combative/agitated, cognitively impaired, threatening)</b>
	<b>Non-supportive environment - interdepartmental/staff/student conflicts</b>
	<b>Lack of response by other departments/providers</b>
	<b>Other (identify)</b>

8. Were aggravating factors involved? Add one point for each identified factor.

	<b>Epecially heinous, cruel, and/or violent act</b>
	<b>Knowingly created risk for more than one client</b>
	<b>Threatening/bullying behaviors</b>
	<b>Prior student disciplinary record for practice issue(s)</b>
	<b>Other (Identify)</b>

9. **REMEMBER** to count number of items rated in each color category as well as the total score to determine final rating as Human Error, At-Risk Behavior, or Reckless Behavior.

10. **Collaboration** among two or more program representatives in completing the SPEET may be helpful in assuring fair, consistent application of Just Culture principles.

11. **Guidance from NCBON Education Consultants is available as needed:**

- Consultant will ask program representative to describe the event briefly BEFORE starting to review SPEET.
- Consultant will the ask program representative to talk through each SPEET row and provide rationale for score selected. Consultant may ask questions for greater clarity as needed.
- Consultant and program representative will then discuss the scoring and agree on score (or score range) for each SPEET row before moving to the next row. They will return to a previous row only if further information received might alter response in a significant manner.
- If consultant and program representative are unable to agree on scores, the Education Program’s rating ultimately takes precedence and the Program takes action as determined.