Metacognitive Coaching Toolkit for Nurse Educators: Teaching Nurses to Think About Their Thinking

Practical Tools for Developing Clinical Reasoning Through Metacognitive Instruction

Developed by Daniel J Pesut PhD RN FAAN

Abstract

Clinical reasoning represents nursing's most essential yet challenging competency to teach. While educators can observe clinical performance, the visible actions students take—the cognitive processes underlying expert judgment remain invisible. Traditional nursing education focuses on what students should do (procedures, interventions, protocols) with insufficient attention to how they should think (reasoning processes, metacognitive awareness, self-regulation). This gap creates nurses who can follow procedures but struggle to adapt reasoning when patients do not fit textbook presentations or when novel situations demand creative problem-solving.

This toolkit addresses that fundamental pedagogical challenge by providing comprehensive frameworks and practical tools for teaching metacognition thinking about thinking. Grounded in five decades of research and practice teaching clinical reasoning through the Outcome-Present State-Test (OPT) Model, it transforms implicit expert reasoning into explicit teachable processes. The toolkit includes metacognitive questioning techniques that make thinking visible, debriefing frameworks that develop self-regulation capacity, assessment strategies that evaluate reasoning quality rather than just performance outcomes, and coaching methods that scaffold students' development from novice dependence to expert autonomy.

Unlike traditional clinical teaching that emphasizes task completion and psychomotor skills, metacognitive coaching treats thinking itself as the primary teaching target. It provides nurse educators with language, tools, and methods for making their own expert reasoning visible to students; asking powerful questions that surface students' thinking processes; facilitating reflection that transforms experience into learning; assessing cognitive development alongside clinical performance; and coaching self-regulation so students become independent learners capable of reasoning through novel situations long after formal education ends.

This approach fundamentally shifts the educator's role from information transmitter and skill demonstrator to thinking partner and metacognitive coach. The toolkit serves nursing faculty in all settings—academic classrooms, simulation labs, clinical practicum sites, residency programs, and continuing education—who recognize that producing safe,

effective, adaptive nurses requires teaching them not just what to do, but how to think about what they are doing and why.

Purpose and Use of This Toolkit

This toolkit serves multiple interconnected purposes for nurse educators committed to developing students' thinking capacity alongside their technical competence. It addresses a persistent gap in nursing education: we excel at teaching procedures and skills but struggle to teach the reasoning that determines when, how, and why to apply them.

Core Purposes

Making Expert Thinking Visible: Provides language and frameworks for articulating the invisible cognitive processes expert nurses use automatically, making implicit reasoning explicit so it becomes teachable and learnable.

Developing Metacognitive Capacity: Offers specific questioning techniques, reflection prompts, and coaching strategies that develop students' ability to think about their own thinking—monitoring, regulating, and improving their reasoning processes.

Teaching the OPT Model: Translates the Outcome-Present State-Test Model of clinical reasoning into practical teaching tools, showing educators how to help students construct reasoning webs, identify keystone issues, specify outcomes, and test systematically.

Scaffolding Developmental Progression: Provides tools for recognizing where students are developmentally (novice through expert) and scaffolding appropriate next-step growth rather than expecting expert reasoning from beginners.

Facilitating Powerful Debriefing: Transforms post-experience debriefing from information download to metacognitive development through structured frameworks that help students extract maximum learning from every clinical encounter.

Assessing Thinking Not Just Doing: Offers rubrics and assessment strategies for evaluating the quality of students' reasoning processes, not just the correctness of their actions or the favorability of patient outcomes.

Who Should Use This Toolkit

This toolkit is designed for nurse educators across diverse teaching contexts:

• Academic Faculty: Professors teaching clinical reasoning in classroom, simulation, and clinical practicum settings who want structured methods for developing students' thinking

capacity.

• Clinical Preceptors: Experienced nurses serving as preceptors who recognize that good nurses aren't just skilled but thoughtful, and want tools for coaching reasoning alongside procedures.

• Simulation Educators: Faculty designing and facilitating simulation experiences who understand debriefing quality determines learning outcomes and want evidence-based debriefing frameworks.

• New Nurse Residency Facilitators: Those supporting new graduates' transition to practice who need methods for accelerating clinical reasoning development during the critical first year.

• Staff Development Educators: Continuing education specialists helping practicing nurses advance their reasoning capacity, not just acquire new skills or procedures.

• Doctoral Students: Future nurse educators preparing for academic roles who want pedagogy grounded in cognitive science and learning theory rather than "teaching the way I was taught."

• Nurse Managers: Leaders who coach direct reports' clinical reasoning during rounding, huddles, and debriefs, recognizing that developing staff thinking capacity improves patient safety and care quality.

The toolkit is equally valuable for novice educators seeking structured teaching methods and experienced educators wanting to refine their practice or troubleshoot why traditional approaches aren't producing the thinking outcomes they desire.

How to Use This Toolkit

This toolkit can be used flexibly depending on your teaching context, student level, and learning objectives:

Comprehensive Implementation (Full Semester/Year): Use all frameworks sequentially across a clinical reasoning course—beginning with making thinking visible (Module 1), progressing through OPT Model instruction (Modules 2-3), teaching self-regulation (Module 4), mastering debriefing (Module 5), and culminating with assessment of reasoning (Module 6).

Targeted Skill Development (4-6 weeks): Focus on specific metacognitive coaching

competencies where you want to grow. For example, if you're comfortable with OPT Model basics but struggle with debriefing, dive deep into Module 5.

Just-in-Time Resources (Ongoing): Keep the questioning techniques, debriefing templates, and assessment rubrics readily accessible for immediate use during clinical teaching, simulation, or classroom discussions.

Faculty Development Programs (Workshops/Courses): Use as curriculum for training faculty in metacognitive teaching methods, dedicating 2-4 hours per module with practice, peer feedback, and application planning.

Peer Coaching Partnerships: Partner with a colleague to study and practice these methods together, observing each other's teaching, providing feedback on questioning techniques and debriefing quality.

Student Self-Regulation Tool: Some frameworks (especially the OPT Model worksheets and self-assessment tools) can be given directly to students to support their independent metacognitive development.

Key Success Factors:
- Start where students are developmentally, not where you wish they were
- Practice questioning techniques extensively—they feel awkward before they feel natural
- Record and review your own debriefings to identify patterns and improvement areas
- Use the assessment rubrics formatively first, summatively later
- Be patient—metacognitive development is slower than skill acquisition but creates deeper, more transferable learning
- Model your own metacognitive thinking aloud so students see expert reasoning in action

Remember: You're not just teaching students content or skills—you're teaching them how to teach themselves. That is metacognition.

The Metacognitive Coaching Framework: Six Essential Modules

The toolkit is organized into six modules that build progressively from foundational concepts to advanced coaching practices. While presented sequentially, they are iterative—you will cycle through these strategies repeatedly as students develop and as you refine your metacognitive teaching expertise.

Module 1: Making Thinking Visible - The Foundation of Metacognitive Teaching

Before you can teach students to think about their thinking, you must make thinking visible. Expert nurses reason automatically and implicitly, often unable to articulate the cognitive processes they use. This module provides strategies for externalizing internal reasoning so students can observe, analyze, and eventually internalize expert thinking patterns.

Why This Module Matters

The apprenticeship model of clinical education—"watch me, then you try "works well for visible psychomotor skills but fails for invisible cognitive processes. Students watch you check an IV site, listen to lung sounds, or administer medication, then replicate your actions. But when you walk into a patient's room, quickly scan the environment, integrate multiple data points, recognize a pattern, formulate a problem representation, prioritize competing issues, and make a clinical judgment—all within seconds—students observe none of this cognitive work. They see only your actions and decisions, not the reasoning that generated them.

Without seeing expert thinking, students develop their own idiosyncratic reasoning patterns through trial and error, often cementing ineffective or even dangerous reasoning habits. Making thinking visible accelerates learning, prevents development of faulty reasoning patterns, creates shared language for discussing thinking, enables students to self-assess their reasoning quality, and builds foundation for metacognitive self-regulation.

Core Strategies for Making Thinking Visible:

Think-Aloud Protocol: Narrate your reasoning process in real-time as you assess patients, review cases, or make clinical decisions. 'I am noticing her respiratory rate is 28—that is elevated. I am thinking about what could cause tachypnea: pain, anxiety, hypoxia, and metabolic acidosis. Let me check her oxygen saturation...'

Retrospective Reasoning Maps: After a clinical encounter, draw your reasoning pathway on a whiteboard: 'Here's what I noticed first. That made me think of three possibilities. I ruled out X because of Y. My priority concern became Z because...'

Parallel Case Analysis: Present a case and work through it alongside students, making your expert reasoning visible step-by-step: 'When I read this presenting complaint, my mind immediately generates a short list of differential diagnoses. Here is my list. What is yours?'

Metacognitive Questioning: Ask yourself (and answer) metacognitive questions aloud: 'What am I paying attention to? What might I be missing? What assumptions am I

making? How would I know if I am wrong? What other ways could I frame this situation?'

Error Analysis: When you or others make mistakes, analyze the reasoning breakdown: 'I missed the early signs of sepsis because I was anchored on the admission diagnosis. My thinking error was premature closure—I stopped looking for alternatives once I had one explanation.'

Practice Activities:

- **Think-Aloud Practice with Peer Feedback**: Record yourself doing a 10-minute think-aloud while working through a case. Have a colleague watch and note: When was thinking visible? When did you go silent? What questions would help make more thinking visible?
- **Expert vs. Novice Reasoning Comparison**: Present the same case to expert nurses and novice students. Compare their reasoning approaches. What patterns do experts use that novices do not? Make these expert patterns explicit for teaching.
- **Create Thinking Templates**: Develop templates that structure how you present cases—always include: What I noticed, what I was thinking, what concerned me most, what I considered, what I decided, why I decided that, and what I am watching for next.

Teaching Tips:

- Think-alouds feel awkward initially. Students may look confused. Persist—it gets easier and more natural.
- Slow down. Expert reasoning happens fast. You must deliberately slow your thinking to make it visible.
- Name your reasoning moves: 'I'm pattern-recognizing right now' or 'I'm ruling out competing hypotheses' or 'I'm testing my initial impression against new data.'
- Make errors visible too. 'I just caught myself assuming. Let me check if it is valid.'
- Invite students to observe when your thinking shifts: 'Did you notice my concern just changed? What new information made me reprioritize?'

Module 2: Teaching the OPT Model - Making Clinical Reasoning Explicit

The Outcome-Present State-Test (OPT) Model provides a structured framework for clinical reasoning that makes invisible cognitive processes explicit and teachable. This module provides step-by-step guidance for teaching students to use the OPT Model—constructing clinical reasoning webs, identifying keystone issues, specifying outcomes, and testing systematically.

Why the OPT Model for Teaching Clinical Reasoning

Traditional nursing process (assess, diagnose, plan, implement, evaluate) describes what nurses do but not how they think. Students can memorize nursing diagnoses and interventions yet still lack reasoning capacity because the process does not reveal the cognitive work of clinical reasoning—how to juggle competing priorities, identify leverage points, frame problems productively, or test hypotheses systematically.

The OPT Model fills this gap by making the structure of expert reasoning visible and reproducible. It shows students how expert nurses organize complex information (clinical reasoning web), identify where to focus energy (keystone issue), clarify desired endpoints (outcomes), and determine whether reasoning is working (testing). Unlike linear nursing process, OPT Model represents the dynamic, iterative, systems-focused nature of actual clinical thinking.

Teaching OPT Model enables students to organize complex patient situations, recognize relationships between problems rather than treating them as unrelated lists, identify high-leverage interventions that address root causes, think systematically about desired outcomes before intervening, and self-regulate their reasoning by testing whether their thinking is working.

Teaching OPT Model in Developmental Stages:

Do not teach the entire OPT Model at once. Break it into sequential mini lessons that build on each other:

Stage 1: Building the Clinical Reasoning Web (Weeks 1-3)

Learning Objective: Students can identify and map relationships between multiple patient problems.

Teaching Sequence:
1. Present a moderately complex patient case with 3-4 problems/diagnoses
2. Have students list all identified problems individually

3. Demonstrate web construction on whiteboard: place problems as nodes, draw connections showing relationships
4. Explain: 'This line means impaired mobility contributes to risk for skin breakdown. See the relationship?'
5. Have students add their own connections, explaining each relationship aloud
6. Debrief: 'How is this different from just listing problems? What do you see now that you did not see in a list?'

Common Student Challenges:
• Wanting to include too much—remind them this is about major issues, not every assessment finding
• Not seeing relationships—prompt: 'Does fixing Some help with B? Does A make B worse? Does B cause A?'
• Linear thinking—they want sequential steps, not interconnected systems

Practice Assignment: Construct webs for 3 different patients this week. Identify at least 5 relationship connections for each. Be prepared to explain why you drew each connection.

Stage 2: Identifying the Keystone Issue (Weeks 4-5)

Learning Objective: Students can identify which problem, if addressed, would create maximum positive impact on the patient system.

Teaching Sequence:
1. Review completed webs: 'You've mapped relationships. Now, which issue matters most?'
2. Introduce keystone criteria: Most central to web? Most connections? Addresses root cause not symptoms? Within nursing's scope? Has evidence-based interventions?
3. Model analysis: 'Pain has 6 connections. Mobility has 4. But look—address pain and mobility improves, which helps circulation, which reduces skin risk. Pain is keystone.'
4. Have students practice with multiple cases, defending their keystone selections
5. Introduce legitimate disagreement: 'There's often more than one valid keystone depending on timeframe and priorities. What matters is your reasoning.'

Common Student Challenges:
• Picking the most medically serious vs. most interconnected (teach: keystone ≠ most acute)
• Confusing presenting complaint with leverage point
• Inability to think systemically—they want to address everything equally

Practice Assignment: For your assigned patients, identify your keystone issue. Write 3-4 sentences defending your choice using the criteria. Be prepared for peers to challenge you, can you defend your reasoning?

Stage 3: Specifying Outcomes and Present State (Weeks 6-7)

Learning Objective: Students can articulate specific, measurable desired outcomes and accurately assess current state.

Teaching Sequence:
1. Review keystone identification: 'Now that you know where to focus, where are you trying to go?'
2. Introduce outcome specificity: Not 'patient will have less pain' but 'pain 3/10 or less, maintained for 4+ hours, enabling repositioning every 2 hours'
3. Demonstrate present state assessment: 'Pain currently 8/10, requiring repositioning q15min, crying out, refusing PT'
4. Emphasize gap: 'The distance between present state and outcome is what your interventions must bridge'
5. Practice with NOC (Nursing Outcomes Classification) for precision

Common Student Challenges:
• Vague outcomes ('patient will feel better')
• Unrealistic outcomes (expecting total resolution of chronic conditions)
• Not assessing present state accurately—they guess or assume

Practice Assignment: For your keystone issue, specify: desired outcome (measurable, timeframed), current present state (data-based), gap between them, and indicators you'll track to know if you're making progress.

Stage 4: Testing and Judgment (Weeks 8-10)

Learning Objective: Students can systematically evaluate whether their reasoning and interventions are moving patient toward desired outcome.

Teaching Sequence:
1. Review outcome and present state: 'You know where you are going. How do you know if you are getting there?'
2. Introduce testing: Not just 'did I do the intervention' but 'is it working? Is patient moving toward outcome?'
3. Model decision points: 'Pain still 8/10 after medication, my intervention is not working. What do I test next? Do I need different medication? Different dose? Is pain source what I thought?'

4. Teach course correction: 'Testing reveals need to adjust. That is not failure, that's clinical reasoning.'
5. Practice iterative testing: assess → intervene → test → adjust → test again

Common Student Challenges:
• Confusing task completion with outcome achievement ('I gave the medication' vs. 'did pain decrease?')
• Not testing soon enough—they wait hours when they should test in 30 minutes
• Treating failed interventions as personal failure rather than information

Practice Assignment: Track one patient over a shift. Document: Desired outcome, intervention implemented, when you tested (how soon after), what you found, whether you adjusted course, and final outcome. Reflect: Did your testing reveal needed adjustments? Did you test frequently enough?

Module 3: Metacognitive Questioning Techniques - Surfacing Student Thinking

Questions are the educator's most powerful tool for developing metacognitive capacity. The right question at the right moment can surface hidden assumptions, reveal reasoning gaps, encourage alternative perspectives, and help students become aware of their own thinking processes. This module provides a comprehensive toolkit of metacognitive questions organized by purpose and clinical context.

Why Metacognitive Questioning Matters

Traditional clinical questioning focuses on content: "What's the patient's blood pressure? What medications is she on? What nursing diagnosis applies?" These questions assess knowledge recall but do not develop thinking capacity. Students learn to regurgitate facts without understanding their own reasoning processes.

Metacognitive questions shift focus from content to process—from what students know to how they are thinking. Rather than "What's the diagnosis?" ask "What led you to consider that diagnosis? What other possibilities did you rule out? How confident are you, and why?" These questions make thinking visible, reveal reasoning quality, identify thinking errors before they become action errors, develop students' awareness of their own cognitive processes, and build capacity for self-regulation.

Without metacognitive questioning, educators remain in information-transmission mode, students practice answering but not thinking, reasoning errors go undetected until outcomes suffer, and learners remain dependent on external evaluation rather than developing internal monitoring.

The Metacognitive Question Bank: Questions Organized by Purpose

Below are 50+ metacognitive questions organized by what you are trying to accomplish. Practice these until they become natural in your teaching conversations.

1. Questions That Surface Thinking (Making the Invisible Visible)

- What are you thinking right now?
- Walk me through your reasoning, what led you to that conclusion?
- What is going on in your mind as you look at this patient?
- What are you noticing? What stands out to you?
- What questions are you asking yourself?
- What is your thinking process for deciding what to do next?
- If I could see inside your head right now, what would I observe?

2. Questions That Challenge Assumptions

- What are you taking for granted here?
- What assumptions are you making about this patient?
- How do you know that is true?
- What if your initial impression is wrong, what else could explain these findings?
- What evidence supports that assumption? What evidence challenges it?
- Are you assuming this patient fits a typical pattern? How might they be different?
- What would change your thinking?

3. Questions That Encourage Alternative Perspectives

- What other ways could you interpret this data?
- What is another explanation?
- How might a more experienced nurse approach this differently?
- What would you do if your first approach did not work?
- What are you not considering?
- What is the opposite perspective? Is there any validity to it?
- If you had to argue against your current thinking, what would you say?

4. Questions That Promote Metacognitive Awareness

- How confident are you in your reasoning? Why?
- What makes this situation challenging for you to think through?
- When did your thinking shift? What new information caused the shift?
- What is easy for you to see in this situation? What is harder?
- Are you thinking analytically or intuitively right now?
- What would help you think more clearly about this?
- How is your thinking now different from when you started in nursing?

5. Questions That Help Identify Reasoning Errors

- What data are you weighing most heavily? Could you be over-focusing on one piece of information?
- Did you jump to a conclusion before considering alternatives?
- Are you searching for information that confirms what you already think?
- Did you miss anything in your initial assessment?

- What would make you reconsider your current thinking?
- Are you being influenced by what you expected to find?
- Could your emotions or personal experiences be affecting your reasoning?

6. Questions That Connect Theory to Practice

- What theoretical knowledge are you applying here?
- How does what you learned in class show up in this patient?
- What pathophysiology explains what you are seeing?
- What evidence supports your intervention choice?
- How does this real patient differ from the textbook description?
- What nursing theory or model informs your approach?

7. Questions About Prioritizing and Decision-Making

- What is most important right now? Why?
- How did you decide what to focus on first?
- What would happen if you did nothing?
- What is the risk of your chosen approach?
- How are you balancing competing priorities?
- What is the downside of focusing on this problem?
- If you could only address one issue, which would you choose and why?

8. Questions About Testing and Self-Correction

- How will you know if your intervention is working?
- What will you monitor to test your hypothesis?
- When should you expect to see change?
- What would tell you that you need to adjust your approach?
- How are you evaluating whether your reasoning was sound?
- What feedback do you get that confirms or challenges your thinking?

Strategic Approaches to Metacognitive Questioning

The Socratic Method Adapted for Nursing

Use sequential questions to guide students to deeper understanding without telling them the answer:

1. Clarifying Thinking: "What do you mean by...?" "Can you give me an example?"
2. Challenging Assumptions: "What are you assuming?" "Is that always true?"
3. Examining Evidence: "How do you know?" "What evidence supports that?"
4. Exploring Alternatives: "What's another way to look at it?" "What if...?"
5. Examining Implications: "What follows from that thinking?" "What are the consequences?"
6. Meta-Questions: "Why do you think I asked that question?" "What was my purpose?"

Example Socratic Sequence:
Student: "The patient needs pain medication."
You: "What makes you think they're in pain?" (clarifying)
Student: "They're grimacing and restless."
You: "What else could cause grimacing and restlessness?" (exploring alternatives)
Student: "Maybe anxiety? Or withdrawal?"
You: "How would you determine which it is?" (examining implications)
Student: "I could ask about their pain level and anxiety..."
You: "And if they can't communicate reliably?" (challenging deeper)

The 'Five Whys' Technique

Ask "why" repeatedly to get beneath surface thinking to root reasoning:

Student: "I'm giving the patient oxygen."
Why? "Because their O2 sat is 88%."
Why does that matter? "Because hypoxia is dangerous."
Why might they be hypoxic? "Could be pneumonia, pulmonary edema, COPD exacerbation..."
Why do you think it is pneumonia? "They have fever and crackles."
Why are you giving oxygen before investigating further? "To prevent immediate harm while I assess."

This reveals the student's full reasoning chain and identifies where understanding breaks down.

Conditional Reasoning Questions (If-Then Thinking)

Develop students' ability to think through scenarios and consequences:

"If you give this medication and the patient's blood pressure drops, then what?"

"If your first intervention doesn't work, then what's your backup plan?"
"If the lab results come back showing X, then how would that change your thinking?"
"What if you're wrong about your keystone issue—then what?"
"If the patient refuses your intervention, then what will you do?"

These questions build contingency thinking and help students plan beyond their first idea.

Practice Activities for Module 3:

- Question Inventory: Record yourself teaching for 30 minutes. Count: How many content questions vs. metacognitive questions? Aim for at least 50% metacognitive.
- Question Substitution: Take 10 content questions you typically ask ('What's the blood pressure?'). Rewrite each as a metacognitive question ('What vital signs matter most here and why?').
- Socratic Sequence Practice: Plan a 5-question Socratic sequence for a common clinical scenario. Practice with a colleague playing student role.
- Question Journal: For one week, write down the best metacognitive question you asked each day and what it revealed about student thinking.

Teaching Tips for Metacognitive Questioning:

- Wait time matters: After asking a metacognitive question, wait 5-10 seconds. Students need processing time.
- Do not rescue too quickly: Tolerate silence and struggle, that's where learning happens.
- Follow up with 'Say more about that' when students give brief answers.
- Ask one question at a time. Multiple questions create confusion.
- Frame questions with genuine curiosity, not interrogation.
- When students answer, 'I don't know,' respond: 'If you did know, what might you think?'

Module 4: Powerful Debriefing Frameworks - Transforming Experience into Learning

Debriefing is where learning happens—not during the clinical experience itself, but in the structured reflection that follows. A 30-minute clinical experience with excellent debriefing creates more learning than 8 hours of clinical time with poor debriefing. Yet many educators treat debriefing as information download or performance critique rather than metacognitive development. This module provides evidence-based debriefing frameworks that maximize learning from every clinical encounter.

Why Debriefing Quality Determines Learning Outcomes

Research consistently shows that debriefing quality predicts learning outcomes more than simulation realism, case complexity, or student preparation. Yet debriefing is often the weakest link in clinical education—rushed, superficial, focused on what students did wrong rather than how they thought.

Poor debriefing looks like: educator talking 80% of the time, listing what students should have done differently, jumping immediately to teaching without exploring student thinking, focusing on task completion rather than reasoning quality, treating errors as failures rather than learning opportunities, and ending without clear takeaways or application planning.

Excellent debriefing surfaces student thinking before correcting it, uses experience as data for reflection, develops metacognitive awareness, addresses emotional responses constructively, creates psychological safety for honest reflection, generates student-owned insights rather than educator-delivered lessons, and results in students teaching themselves what they need to learn.

The frameworks in this module structure debriefing to maximize metacognitive development while maintaining psychological safety and ensuring learning transfers to future practice.

Framework 1: Three-Phase Debriefing Structure (Reaction → Analysis → Application)

<u>Phase 1: Reaction (5 minutes) - Emotional Defusing</u>

Purpose: Acknowledge emotions before moving to cognitive analysis. Students cannot think clearly while emotionally activated.

Key Questions:
• "How are you feeling right now?"

• "What surprised you?"
• "What was hardest about that experience?"
• "On a scale of 1-10, how intense was that for you?"

Educator Role: Normalize emotional responses. Validate without judgment. Create safety. Do not rush past this phase—if students are upset, anxious, or excited, they need to discharge emotion before they can reflect productively.

Common Pitfall: Skipping this phase and jumping to analysis while students are still emotionally activated. Result: Students shut down or become defensive.

Phase 2: Analysis (15-20 minutes) - Metacognitive Exploration

Purpose: Surface and examine thinking processes. This is where metacognitive development happens.

Key Questions (use metacognitive question bank from Module 3):
• "Walk me through your thinking—what was happening in your mind?"
• "What did you notice first? What made you prioritize that?"
• "When did your thinking shift? What changed?"
• "What were you most confident about? Least confident?"
• "What assumptions did you make?"
• "What would you do differently? Why?"

Educator Role: Facilitate, do not lecture. Use advocacy-inquiry (see next framework). Draw out multiple student perspectives. Connect thinking to outcomes. Identify reasoning patterns—both effective and problematic.

Structure:
1. Descriptive: "What happened?" (brief—do not dwell here)
2. Analytic: "What were you thinking? Why did you do that?" (spend most time here)
3. Evaluative: "What worked? What did not? How do you know?"

Common Pitfall: Educator doing most of the talking. If you talk more than 20% in this phase, you are lecturing, not debriefing.

Phase 3: Application (5-10 minutes) - Transfer Planning

Purpose: Ensure learning transfers to future practice. Without explicit application planning, insights evaporate.

Key Questions:

• "What are you taking away from this experience?"
• "How will you think differently next time?"
• "What specific changes will you make in your practice?"
• "When might you face a similar situation?"
• "What will you watch for or attend to differently?"
• "What do you still need to learn about this?"

Educator Role: Help students articulate specific, actionable takeaways. Resist the urge to provide a summary—let students generate their own. End with commitment: "So your goal for next clinical is...?"

Structure:
1. Key learnings (student-identified)
2. Specific applications ("Next time I will...")
3. Ongoing learning needs ("I still need to work on...")

Common Pitfall: Skipping this phase due to time constraints. Without application planning, debriefing is just interesting conversation that does not change practice.

Framework 2: Advocacy-Inquiry (Making Your Thinking Visible While Exploring Theirs)

Developed by Chris Argyris and adapted for healthcare by Jenny Rudolph and colleagues, advocacy-inquiry combines sharing your observations (advocacy) with genuine curiosity about student thinking (inquiry). It is particularly useful when students made problematic decisions, and you need to understand their reasoning without creating defensiveness.

The Advocacy-Inquiry Formula:

1. State your observation objectively (Advocacy)
2. Share your reasoning or concern (Advocacy)
3. Invite their perspective with genuine curiosity (Inquiry)
4. Listen without judgment
5. Explore reasoning gaps collaboratively

Example:
Instead of: "Why didn't you check the blood sugar? That was a serious oversight."
Use: "I noticed you didn't check blood glucose before giving insulin [observation]. I am concerned because blood sugar was 65, which makes insulin dangerous [reasoning]. Help me understand your thinking—what were you considering when you made that decision? [inquiry]"

The student then has space to explain: "I saw on the chart it was checked 2 hours ago and was 180, so I thought it was still high." Now you can explore: "That makes sense given that data. Let us talk about how quickly blood glucose can change..."

Without advocacy-inquiry, the student would have shut down defensively. With it, you have created a learning conversation.

More Advocacy-Inquiry Examples:

- I noticed you focused on completing the medication pass and did not respond when the patient said they felt dizzy. I am worried that important symptoms got missed. What was going on for you at that moment?
- I saw you choose pain management as your keystone issue, but the patient's respiratory rate was 10. I am thinking airway/breathing might need priority. Walk me through how you decided?
- I observed you did not verify the patient's identity before giving medication. That is a critical safety step. Help me understand what you were thinking?

Framework 3: PEARLS (Promoting Excellence And Reflective Learning in Simulation)

PEARLS is a structured debriefing framework specifically designed for simulation but applicable to any clinical learning experience. It integrates multiple techniques into a coherent approach.

P - Prebriefing: Set learning objectives, psychological safety, and expectations before the experience. Orient students to the environment and their roles.

E - Engagement: The clinical experience itself. Keep focused on learning objectives. Do not extend unnecessarily.

A - Advocacy-Inquiry: Use the technique described above to explore reasoning without creating defensiveness.

R - Reaction Phase: Allow emotional defusing (Phase 1 of Three-Phase model). Acknowledge feelings before analyzing.

L - Learning Discussion: Facilitated exploration of thinking (Phase 2). Use plus/delta or other structures to organize.

S - Summary: Learner-generated takeaways and application plans (Phase 3). NOT educator lecture.

Framework 4: Plus-Delta (Simple But Powerful Structure)

Plus-Delta is a straightforward framework that works for quick debriefs or when you have limited time. It is particularly useful for end-of-shift reflection or brief post-procedure discussions.

The Plus-Delta Structure:

PLUS (+): What went well? What are you proud of? What effective thinking or actions did you use?

Focus on: Reasoning quality, not just outcomes. Even if the patient outcome was not ideal, what thinking was sound? What would you do again?

DELTA (Δ): What would you change? What would you do differently? What do you need to work on?

Focus on: Growth areas without judgment. Frame as "what I'm learning" not "what I failed at."

Key: Spend equal time on Plus and Delta. Many students (and educators) focus on what went wrong. Identifying effective reasoning is equally important students need to know what to keep doing, not just what to change.

Quick Debrief Example (5 minutes):
"Take 2 minutes. Write down: 2-3 things that went well (your effective thinking or actions), and 1-2 things you would change next time. Then we will share."

[Students reflect individually, then share]

"I notice everyone identified communication as something to improve. What specifically about communication? Let us explore that..."

Framework 5: Debriefing with Good Judgment

This approach, developed by Jenny Rudolph, recognizes that educators form judgments about student performance—the question is whether we share those judgments

productively. Rather than hiding judgments (pure inquiry) or delivering them as criticism (pure advocacy), this framework makes judgments transparent while exploring reasoning collaboratively.

The Process:

1. Name your positive or negative judgment clearly
2. Explain the evidence/reasoning behind your judgment
3. Invite the learner to respond
4. Explore reasoning together
5. Close the loop with shared understanding

Example of Negative Judgment:
"I am concerned about the decision to not escalate care when the patient's condition deteriorated [judgment]. Here is what I saw: respiratory rate went to 28, O2 sat dropped to 89%, patient became confused. Those are signs of respiratory failure [evidence]. But you continued the current care plan for another hour [observation]. I am worried critical intervention was delayed [impact]. Help me understand your thinking during that hour [invitation]."

Example of Positive Judgment:
"I was really impressed with how you managed that conflict between the patient and family [judgment]. You stayed calm, listened to both perspectives, validated feelings, and helped them find common ground [evidence]. That is advanced communication skill [judgment]. How did you know how to handle it that way? [invitation]"

The key: Your judgment is data for exploration, not the final word. You might discover your judgment was based on incomplete information. Or the student might realize their reasoning had gaps. Either way, you are learning together.

Practice Activities for Module 4:

- Framework Selection: Choose 2 frameworks to practice. Use one for next 5 debriefs, then switch to the other. Reflect: Which feels more natural? Which generates more student insight?
- Debrief Recording and Analysis: Record (video or audio) a full debrief. Watch and analyze: What percentage of time did you talk vs. students? How many metacognitive questions did you ask? Did you move through all phases?
- Advocacy-Inquiry Scripts: Write 5 advocacy-inquiry stems for common student errors you see. Practice delivering them until they feel natural, not scripted.
- Peer Feedback: Co-debrief with a colleague. Take turns facilitating. Provide feedback using Plus-Delta structure.

- Debrief Planning Template: Before next simulation or clinical, write out: learning objectives, key questions for each phase, potential judgment points, and how you will close the loop.

Teaching Tips for Effective Debriefing:

- Protect time for debriefing—it is where learning happens. Do not sacrifice debrief time to extend the clinical experience.
- Debrief promptly (within 30 minutes if possible). Waiting reduces emotional salience and memory accuracy.
- Start every debrief with psychological safety reminder: 'This is a learning space. Mistakes are welcome.'
- Let silence work for you. Count to 7 after asking a question before speaking again.
- If only one student talks, use directed questions: 'Alex, what did you notice? Sam, different perspective?'
- Watch for groupthink—if everyone agrees, play devil's advocate: 'What if we are all wrong? What else could explain this?'
- End with commitment, not just discussion: 'So what specifically will you do differently next time?'
- Video review is powerful but use strategically—too much focus on video reduces reflection time.

Module 5: Assessing Clinical Reasoning Quality - Beyond Right Answers

Traditional nursing assessment focuses on outcomes: Did the patient improve? Did the student complete the task correctly? Was the answer, right? But outcome-based assessment misses the reasoning quality that generated those outcomes. A student can get lucky with good outcomes despite poor reasoning or use excellent reasoning that leads to poor outcomes due to factors beyond their control. This module provides rubrics and strategies for assessing the quality of students' thinking processes, not just the correctness of their actions.

Why Assessing Reasoning Quality Matters

Outcome-based assessment creates perverse incentives. Students learn to focus on "looking good" rather than thinking well. They hide uncertainty, avoid asking questions, and become risk averse. When only outcomes matter, students do not learn from near-misses (good reasoning that almost led to poor outcomes) or from lucky saves (poor reasoning that happened to work out).

Process-based assessment—evaluating reasoning quality—changes the game. It values: reasoning transparency over performance perfection, learning from errors over hiding mistakes, metacognitive awareness over confident ignorance, growth over current competence, and transfer potential over situation-specific success.

Students assessed on reasoning quality become better self-assessors, take more appropriate risks in learning, ask better questions, develop transferable thinking skills rather than memorized responses, and advance faster because they get feedback on the right targets.

The challenge: Reasoning is invisible, so it requires deliberate strategies to make it assessable. The rubrics in this module solve that problem.

Assessment Rubric 1: Clinical Reasoning Web Quality

This rubric assesses students' ability to identify relationships between patient problems and think systemically.

Comprehensiveness (1-4 points): 1=Missing major problems, 2=Identifies main problems but misses secondary, 3=Thorough problem identification, 4=Comprehensive including subtle issues

Relationship Accuracy (1-4 points): 1=No or incorrect relationships, 2=Some valid relationships, 3=Most relationships accurate, 4=All relationships evidence-based and clearly explained

Systems Thinking (1-4 points): 1=Lists problems linearly, 2=Recognizes some connections, 3=Shows interconnected thinking, 4=Demonstrates complex systems understanding with feedback loops

Prioritization Rationale (1-4 points): 1=No clear priority or rationale, 2=Identifies priority without strong justification, 3=Clear priority with good rationale, 4=Sophisticated prioritization considering multiple factors

Total Score: /16 points

Assessment Rubric 2: Keystone Issue Identification and Justification

This rubric evaluates students' ability to identify leverage points and justify their selections.

Selection Appropriateness (1-5 points): 1=Keystone is peripheral or irrelevant, 2=Keystone is important but not most central, 3=Appropriate keystone with some limitations, 4=Strong keystone selection, 5=Optimal keystone with sophisticated understanding

Justification Quality (1-5 points): 1=No justification, 2=Weak or circular reasoning, 3=Basic justification, 4=Strong evidence-based justification, 5=Compelling, multi-factorial justification considering alternatives

Systems Impact Understanding (1-5 points): 1=No awareness of ripple effects, 2=Limited understanding of impact, 3=Recognizes some downstream effects, 4=Clear understanding of cascading impacts, 5=Sophisticated analysis of system-wide consequences

Total Score: /15 points

Assessment Rubric 3: Outcome Specification Quality

This rubric assesses students' ability to specify clear, measurable, realistic outcomes.

Specificity (1-4 points): 1=Vague/general, 2=Specific, 3=Specific and measurable, 4=Highly specific with clear indicators

Measurability (1-4 points): 1=Cannot be measured, 2=Difficult to measure, 3=Measurable with clear metrics, 4=Precisely measurable with multiple indicators

Realism/Achievability (1-4 points): 1=Unrealistic given patient/time, 2=Ambitious but possible, 3=Realistic and appropriate, 4=Optimal considering context

Alignment with Keystone (1-4 points): 1=Unrelated to keystone, 2=Loosely related, 3=Aligned with keystone, 4=Perfect alignment demonstrating systems thinking

Total Score: /16 points

Assessment Rubric 4: Reflection Quality (Adapted from Hatton & Smith)

This rubric assesses depth of reflection from descriptive to transformative levels.

Level 1: Descriptive (1 point): Recounts events without analysis. 'I did X, then Y happened.' No evidence of deeper thinking.

Level 2: Descriptive with justification (2 points): Describes actions with simple rationale. 'I gave medication because it was ordered.' Basic cause-effect but not questioning.

Level 3: Dialogic reflection (3 points): Explores alternative interpretations. 'I chose A, but could have chosen B. Here is why I decided...' Weighs options, shows uncertainty appropriately.

Level 4: Critical reflection (4 points): Questions assumptions and considers broader context. 'My usual approach is X, but that assumes Y. What if that assumption is wrong? How do societal/systemic factors influence this?'

Level 5: Transformative reflection (5 points): Generates new understanding that changes practice. 'This experience revealed a blind spot in my thinking. Now I understand... which will change how I approach...' Evidence of consciousness shift.

Assessment Rubric 5: Metacognitive Awareness During Clinical Performance

This rubric is used during observation to assess students' real-time metacognitive monitoring.

Self-Monitoring: Checks own understanding, verifies assumptions, catches own errors, pauses to reconsider

Uncertainty Acknowledgment: Appropriately identifies limits of knowledge, asks clarifying questions, seeks help when needed

Strategy Adjustment: Recognizes when approach is not working, tries alternatives, adapts to new information

Thinking Transparency: Articulates reasoning aloud, explains decisions, shares thought process

Score each dimension: 0=Not observed, 1=Minimal evidence, 2=Some evidence, 3=Consistent evidence, 4=Exemplary

Assessment Strategies Beyond Rubrics

Think-Aloud Assessment

Ask students to verbalize their thinking while working through a case or caring for a patient. Listen for:
• Hypothesis generation (what they're considering)
• Information seeking patterns (what they look for and why)
• Assumption checking (do they test their thinking?)
• Alternative consideration (do they entertain multiple possibilities?)
• Error detection (do they catch their own mistakes?)

This reveals reasoning quality that outcomes-only assessment misses.

Reasoning Rationale Documentation

For key decisions, require students to document not just what they did but why:
• "I chose to address pain first because..."
• "I considered X and Y but selected X because..."
• "My keystone issue is Z for these reasons..."

Grade the quality of reasoning, not just the decision itself. A well-reasoned "wrong" answer can score higher than a lucky "right" answer.

Error Analysis Assignments

When students make errors, require written analysis:
• What was my reasoning?
• Where did my thinking break down?
• What led me to that error?
• What will I do differently to prevent this thinking error in future?

Assess the depth of analysis. Students who can identify their reasoning errors are developing metacognitive capacity.

Practice Activities for Module 5:

- Rubric Testing: Use the Clinical Reasoning Web rubric on 3 student submissions. Do scores align with your intuitive judgment? Revise rubric as needed.
- Dual Grading: Grade 10 student submissions twice—once on outcomes alone, once on reasoning quality. Compare. How different are the scores? What does this reveal?

- Calibration Exercise: With a colleague, independently score the same 5 student reflections using the Reflection Quality rubric. Compare scores. Discuss discrepancies to calibrate.
- Student Co-Development: Share rubrics with students before assessment. Ask: What is clear? What is confusing? Revise based on feedback. Students perform better when criteria are transparent.

Module 6: Coaching Self-Regulation and Independence - From External to Internal Regulation

The ultimate goal of metacognitive teaching is not to create students who think well when you are watching, but students who regulate their own thinking when you are not there. Self-regulation—the ability to monitor, evaluate, and adjust one's own reasoning—determines whether students become independent practitioners or remain perpetually dependent on external feedback. This module provides frameworks and tools for scaffolding the transition from educator-regulated to self-regulated learning.

Why Self-Regulation Is the Target Outcome

Most clinical education creates permanent dependence. Students learn to look to preceptors for validation: "Is this right? Did I do okay? What should I do next?" They develop external locus of control—their confidence depends on others' judgments rather than their own metacognitive monitoring.

This dependence becomes dangerous after graduation when there is no educator hovering. New nurses who can't self-regulate their thinking experience higher error rates, more anxiety, faster burnout, and difficulty adapting to novel situations because they never learned to trust and regulate their own reasoning.

Self-regulated learners demonstrate metacognitive awareness (they know when they're confused, confident, or uncertain), self-monitoring capacity (they catch their own errors before implementing), strategic thinking (they select appropriate approaches for different situations), and adaptive expertise (they transfer learning to novel contexts).

The shift from external to internal regulation doesn't happen automatically. It requires deliberate scaffolding—gradually reducing external support while building internal capacity. This module shows you how.

The Self-Regulation Scaffolding Framework

Move students through four levels, gradually transferring responsibility:

Level 1: Modeling (I do, you watch)

Educator explicitly models metacognitive self-regulation through think-alouds:

"I am noticing I feel uncertain about this diagnosis. Let me check: What am I basing it on? [self-monitoring] Just these symptoms? That is not enough data. [evaluation] I need to gather more history before I conclude anything. [strategy adjustment]"

Make visible: How you monitor your confidence, how you catch yourself making assumptions, when you recognize need for help, and how you self-correct before acting.

Student Role: Observe and begin to internalize the process.

Level 2: Guided Practice (We do together)

Work through cases together with you providing metacognitive prompts:

You: "Before you act, check your thinking. How confident are you?"
Student: "Maybe 70%?"
You: "What makes you 70% vs. 100%?"
Student: "I'm not sure if the medication dose is right for pediatric."
You: "Good catch. What could you do to increase your confidence?"
Student: "Check the pediatric dosing reference."
You: "Excellent self-regulation. You monitored your uncertainty and identified what you need. That is the skill."

Student Role: Begin using self-regulation with heavy prompting and support.

Level 3: Coached Practice (You do, I watch and coach)

Student performs independently but you observe and provide targeted coaching:

[Student completes assessment and begins medication preparation]
You: "Pause. Self-check: Have you considered all safety factors?"
Student: "I checked the five rights... wait, I did not verify allergies."
You: "Nice catch. You are getting better at monitoring your process. What helped you realize that?"
Student: "When you said, 'safety factors' I mentally reviewed my checklist and noticed the gap."
You: "That's metacognition—your thinking about your thinking caught an error before it happened."

Student Role: Perform with decreasing prompts. Begin internalizing the prompting questions.

Level 4: Independent Practice (You do, I am not there)

Student self-regulates without external prompting. Your role shifts to reviewing their self-assessment:

Student (in reflection journal): "During medication administration, I felt uncertain about

the dose. I paused, recognized my uncertainty, verified the order, and recalculated. My confidence increased to 95%, so I proceeded. I am getting better at catching my uncertainty early."

You (in feedback): "Excellent self-regulation cycle—you monitored, evaluated, adjusted, and then assessed your new confidence level. That is expert-level metacognition."

Student Role: Full self-regulation. You provide feedback on their self-regulatory process, not just clinical decisions.

Self-Regulation Tools for Students

Tool 1: Confidence Rating Scale

Teach students to regularly rate their confidence (0-100%) and justify the rating:

"Before you implement your plan, rate your confidence: 0-100%."
"What makes you [X]% confident? What would increase your confidence?"
"At what confidence level do you need to seek help?"

Over time, students internalize this: "I'm only 60% confident—I should verify before proceeding."

This simple tool develops crucial self-monitoring capacity.

Tool 2: Metacognitive Journaling Prompts

Provide structured prompts for weekly reflection:

1. What clinical situation challenged your thinking this week?
2. What was difficult about the thinking, not the doing?
3. What reasoning strategy did you use? Was it effective?
4. What did you learn about how you think?
5. What thinking pattern will you work on next week?

Grade based on depth of metacognitive analysis, not just content.
Example strong response: "I realized I jump to conclusions without considering alternatives. This week when I felt uncertain, I forced myself to generate at least 3 explanations before deciding. It felt slow and awkward, but my decisions were better."

Example weak response: "This week was busy. I took care of 5 patients and learned about wound care."

Teach students the difference.

Tool 3: Pre-Action Self-Assessment Checklist

Give students a metacognitive checklist to use before important decisions:

Before I act, have I:
□ Clearly identified the problem?
□ Considered alternative explanations?
□ Checked my assumptions?
□ Gathered sufficient data?
□ Thought through potential consequences?
□ Identified what I'm uncertain about?
□ Determined my confidence level?
□ Decided when I need help?

Eventually, students internalize this checklist and no longer need the external prompt.

Tool 4: Error Analysis Protocol

When students make errors, use this protocol to develop self-correcting capacity:

1. Describe what happened (without judgment)
2. Identify your reasoning at the time
3. Pinpoint where your thinking broke down
4. Classify the thinking error (assumption error, premature closure, confirmation bias, etc.)
5. Specify what you will monitor in future to catch this error early
6. Create a personal strategy to prevent this thinking error

The goal: Students become their own error detectors and correctors.

Common Obstacles to Developing Self-Regulation

Perfectionism: Students who need to be perfect are afraid to acknowledge uncertainty. Teach: 'Recognizing what you don't know is strength, not weakness.'

Imposter Syndrome: Students do not trust their own judgment. Build confidence gradually: 'Your reasoning was sound even though the outcome wasn't what you expected.'

External Locus of Control: Students constantly seek validation. Redirect: 'Before I answer, what do YOU think? How confident are you?'

Fear of Looking Incompetent: Students hide uncertainty. Create safety: 'I'm more concerned if you're uncertain and don't say so than if you're uncertain and do.'

Rushed Environment: Fast-paced clinical settings do not allow reflection time. Protect time: '5 minutes of reflection is not optional, it's where learning happens.'

Coaching Strategies That Build Self-Regulation

Strategy 1: Redirect Questions Back to Students

When students ask, "Is this right?" respond with:
• "What do you think?"
• "How confident are you?"
• "What makes you uncertain?"
• "How could you verify?"

Only after they've self-assessed do you provide feedback. This builds internal evaluation capacity.

Strategy 2: Praise the Process, Not Just the Outcome

Instead of: "Good job, which was correct."
Say: "I noticed you paused and double-checked before administering. That is excellent self-monitoring."

Instead of: "That diagnosis was right."
Say: "Your reasoning process was systematic—you considered alternatives and tested your hypotheses. That is what creates reliable clinical judgment."

This reinforces self-regulation behaviors regardless of whether the outcome was favorable.

Strategy 3: Make Uncertainty Normal and Expected

Regularly share your own uncertainty:
"I am not 100% certain about this. Here is what I am going to do to increase my confidence..."
"I felt uncertain whether to X or Y. I chose X because... but I am monitoring whether that was right."

Model that expert practitioners experience uncertainty regularly and have strategies for managing it. Students need permission to be uncertain and strategies for addressing uncertainty productively.

Strategy 4: Gradually Reduce Scaffolding

Track how much prompting each student needs. Deliberately reduce it over time:

Week 1-2: "Before you act, check your confidence level."
Week 3-4: "Anything you want to check before you proceed?"
Week 5-6: [Silent observation, see if they self-check]
Week 7+: If they consistently self-regulate, they're ready for independence.

If they regress (stop self-checking), resume prompting temporarily. Two steps forward, one step back is normal.

Practice Activities for Module 6:

- Scaffolding Plan: For one student, map out their current level (1-4) and create a 4-week plan for gradually increasing independence. Track progress weekly.
- Question Redirect Practice: For one day, do not answer ANY student questions directly. Redirect all back to them first. Reflect: How did they respond? What did you learn?
- Self-Regulation Journal Review: Read 10 student metacognitive journal entries. Score using Reflection Quality rubric (Module 5). Provide feedback that models metacognitive thinking.
- Confidence Calibration Study: Have students rate their confidence before making decisions, then evaluate accuracy. Help them identify if they are over-confident (Dunning-Kruger) or under-confident.
- Error Analysis Practice: When students make errors, use the Error Analysis Protocol. Grade the quality of their analysis, not just the error itself.

Teaching Tips for Developing Self-Regulation:

- Be patient. Self-regulation develops slowly—months to years, not weeks.
- Expect regression under stress. Students revert to external regulation when overwhelmed. That is normal.
- Celebrate small wins. 'I noticed you checked yourself before asking me—that's progress!'

- Do not rescue too quickly. Sit with students' uncertainty. They need to learn to tolerate it.
- Model your own metacognition constantly. Make your self-regulation visible.
- The goal is not perfect students, it is students who can detect and correct their own imperfections.
- Remember: You are successful when students no longer need you.

You Know Self-Regulation Is Developing When Students:

- Ask themselves questions before asking you
- Pause to check their thinking without prompting
- Catch their own errors before implementing
- Accurately assess their confidence level
- Identify their own learning needs
- Say 'I'm uncertain about...' rather than hiding uncertainty
- Seek resources independently before seeking you
- Reflect on their thinking process, not just outcomes
- Adjust their approach when initial strategy does not work
- Show appropriate help-seeking (not too soon, not too late)

References and Resources

The following references provide theoretical foundations, evidence-based frameworks, and practical guidance for metacognitive teaching in nursing education. Resources are organized thematically to support exploration of each module and integration across the framework.

Clinical Reasoning and the OPT Model

Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., & Kautz, D. (2009). Promoting the self-regulation of clinical reasoning skills in nursing students. Open Nursing Journal, 3, 76-85.

Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., & Arms, T. (2016). Clinical reasoning and care coordination in advanced practice nursing. Springer Publishing.

Kuiper, R., Pesut, D. J., & Kautz, D. (2017). The essentials of clinical reasoning for nurses: Using the outcome-present state test model for reflective practice. Sigma Theta Tau International.

Pesut, D. J., & Herman, J. (1999). Clinical reasoning: The art and science of critical and creative thinking. Delmar.

Pesut, D. J. (2008). Thoughts on thinking with complexity in mind. In C. Lindberg, S. Nash, & C. Lindberg (Eds.), On the edge: Nursing in the age of complexity (pp. 211-238). Plexus Press.

Metacognition and Self-Regulated Learning

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34(10), 906-911.

Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 19(4), 460-475.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory into Practice, 41(2), 64-70.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.). (2011). Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance. Routledge.

Debriefing and Reflective Practice

Cheng, A., Eppich, W., Grant, V., Sherbino, J., Zendejas, B., & Cook, D. A. (2014). Debriefing for technology-enhanced simulation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medical Education, 48(7), 657-666.

Eppich, W., & Cheng, A. (2015). Promoting excellence and reflective learning in simulation (PEARLS): Development and rationale for a blended approach to health care simulation debriefing. Simulation in Healthcare, 10(2), 106-115.

Rudolph, J. W., Simon, R., Dufresne, R. L., & Raemer, D. B. (2006). There is no such thing as 'nonjudgmental' debriefing: A theory and method for debriefing with good judgment. Simulation in Healthcare, 1(1), 49-55.

Rudolph, J. W., Simon, R., Raemer, D. B., & Eppich, W. J. (2008). Debriefing as formative assessment: Closing performance gaps in medical education. Academic Emergency Medicine, 15(11), 1010-1016.

Reflective Practice in Nursing Education

Brookfield, S. D. (2017). Becoming a critically reflective teacher (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 11(1), 33-49.

Horton-Deutsch, S., & Sherwood, G. (Eds.). (2017). Reflective practice: Transforming education and improving outcomes (2nd ed.). Sigma Theta Tau International.

Johns, C. (2017). Becoming a reflective practitioner (5th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

Socratic Questioning and Inquiry Methods

Elder, L., & Paul, R. (1998). The role of Socratic questioning in thinking, teaching, and learning. The Clearing House, 71(5), 297-301.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2006). The thinker's guide to the art of Socratic questioning. Foundation for Critical Thinking Press.

Yang, Y. T. C., Newby, T. J., & Bill, R. L. (2005). Using Socratic questioning to promote critical thinking skills through asynchronous discussion forums in distance learning environments. American Journal of Distance Education, 19(3), 163-181.

Assessment of Clinical Reasoning

Oermann, M. H., & Gaberson, K. B. (2021). Evaluation and testing in nursing education (6th ed.). Springer Publishing.

Tanner, C. A. (2006). Thinking like a nurse: A research-based model of clinical judgment in nursing. Journal of Nursing Education, 45(6), 204-211.

Yilmaz, K. (2007). Educational policy and assessment: Effects on teaching and learning. International Journal of Instruction, 1(1), 3-14.

Simulation-Based Learning

Jeffries, P. R., & Rizzolo, M. A. (2006). Designing and implementing models for the innovative use of simulation to teach nursing care of ill adults and children: A national, multi-site, multi-method study. National League for Nursing.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice Hall.

Motola, I., Devine, L. A., Chung, H. S., Sullivan, J. E., & Issenberg, S. B. (2013). Simulation in healthcare education: A best evidence practical guide. Medical Teacher, 35(10), e1511-e1530.

Cognitive Science and Learning Theory

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school (expanded ed.). National Academy Press.

Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257-285.

Expertise Development

Benner, P. (1984). From novice to expert: Excellence and power in clinical nursing practice. Addison-Wesley.

Benner, P., Sutphen, M., Leonard, V., & Day, L. (2010). Educating nurses: A call for radical transformation. Jossey-Bass.

Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. Psychological Review, 100(3), 363-406.

About This Toolkit

This Metacognitive Coaching Toolkit for Nurse Educators was developed by Daniel J Pesut PhD RN FAAN, Professor Emeritus at Indiana University School of Nursing and University of Minnesota School of Nursing. Throughout his 50-year nursing career, Dr. Pesut has pioneered approaches to clinical reasoning education and metacognitive development in nursing.

Dr. Pesut co-developed the Outcome-Present State-Test (OPT) Model of clinical reasoning with Dr. JoAnne Herman in the 1990s. The model and associated works have since garnered over 3,680 citations and been adopted by nursing programs globally. His subsequent work with Drs. Ruth Anne Kuiper and Donald Kautz and colleagues extended the OPT Model into tools for promoting self-regulation of clinical reasoning skills.

This toolkit represents Dr. Pesut's synthesis of five decades teaching nurses to think about their thinking. It translates the theoretical foundations of the OPT Model and metacognitive development into practical, immediately usable tools for nurse educators. The six modules provide comprehensive frameworks and evidence-based strategies for making thinking visible, teaching clinical reasoning, using powerful questions, facilitating transformative debriefing, assessing reasoning quality, and coaching self-regulation.

The toolkit serves nursing faculty in academic and clinical settings who recognize that producing excellent nurses requires teaching them not just what to do, but how to think about what they're doing and why. It reflects Dr. Pesut's conviction that metacognition—thinking about thinking—is nursing's most essential teachable competency.

Metacognitive Coaching Toolkit for Nurse Educators
First Edition
November 2025