

PROFESSION LED TRAINING: *EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW*

What are the Strengths

- The PLT Education Program sets out in more detail than has ever been visible or available what the AGPT program will look like. This provides the detail required to understand progress, and to inform a SWOT analysis to support progression towards implementation.
- It is really clear how supported registrars will be.
- It is really clear how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander placements will be supported.
- Teaching and learning is quite structured as outlined.
- Recognition and reward are reflected in the medical educator section.
- Supervisor acknowledgement is featured in the supervisor sections.
- Feedback is reflected throughout the program.
- Nationally consistent approaches are evident with regard to supervisor processes and professional development.
- Continuation of and commitment to SLOs.

What are the Weaknesses

Medical Educators

- Medical Educator Section refers to recognition and reward, but this is not equally reflected in other sections/ stakeholders.
- There is no reference to medical educators having experience as a supervisor. Having a program where medical educators and registrars liaise closely to determine accreditation and form views on supervisor and training practice efficacy without having an experienced being a supervisor significantly diminishes/ undermines the program. The intention may be implied but there have been instances where medical education staff have had no experience as a supervisor and this has been problematic.

In practice teaching

- In practice teaching appears semi structured and therefore not learner centred. Each learner is starting from a different base and needs different things emphasised. Structure is ok, but it should not undermine the ability for a supervisor and registrar to focus on what is needed rather than having to follow the formula.

Practice Managers

- Practice Managers are not adequately reflected in the document in articulating the responsibilities, rewards or professional development and networking that will be facilitated to this important group.

Progressive Assessment

- Progressive assessment remains unclear in the document in terms of time and number of assessments required.

Timelines

- The program is missing an implementation timeline. As things like supervisor curriculum and progressive assessment are brand new to AGPT it is important for stakeholders to understand when things will be phased in to allay fears and what supports will be put in place to support same. It has been mentioned there will be a grandfathering and a gradual move towards the new system, templates, but it is not evident from the document that this is the case.

Professional Development

- Self supported education is articulated in the document for supervisors. This would be a significant downgrade to the funded education opportunities available through AGPT to date. This can be in addition but should not be a replacement for face to face. Additionally each region will have peculiarities which will need to be navigated

One page summaries

- Because the document is so long it is somewhat difficult to ascertain everything a training practice and supervisor are being asked to do. This would best be articulated in a one page diagram/ summary, so stakeholders don't have to try and pick pepper from salt to get to the facts.

Supports for Registrars

- Wrap around supports for registrars diagram has no reference to supervisors at all despite the registrars spending 95% of their time in a practice and under the supervision of a supervisor.

Accreditation

- Accreditation references are not comprehensive enough – what are the quality markers the college will be looking for? Can anyone be an accredited practice or will this be restricted.
- Natural justice is not articulated as a principle of accreditation.
- Registrar opinions remain a feature of accreditation. Unless you are going to inform supervisors and training practices with a view to continuous improvement and provide them with the opportunity to fix anything that is not quite right and or give them the right of reply to reach an objective view on the circumstances then unqualified opinion should not be a KPI for accreditation.

Practice Liaison Officers

- It is not clear that the college will implement local practice support and coordination teams. These people will be essential to an effective transition. Practices want to be know and loved. The more distant a large and cold organisation is, the less satisfaction in dealing with said organisation. This is where large conferences and bringing people together improves morale. PLOs become a keen knowledge source for the college and a timely one stop answer shop for the practice.
- **SLOs are present** – but with no articulated role
While SLOs are present in the model it is still no clearer as to what their role will be? IT also doesn't articulate GPSA as the auspicing agency for this group. This has been an issue in the current AGPT as all SLOs are engaged differently and often not enabled. SLOs should be supported by the Practice and Supervisor Liaison and Medical Education Teams with contacts, referrals intelligence on who needs what.

Additional paperwork

- Multisource Feedback, learning plans (every 3 months) and 2 way feedback (every 3 months), in practice teaching plans and supervisor professional development plans is a lot more paperwork than some jurisdictions will be used to.

What are the Opportunities?

Recognition Reward and Acknowledgement – to the front!

- Pull recognition, reward and acknowledgement from all sections and articulate it in its own section together at the front of the document. Everyone (Medical Educator, Supervisor and Practice Manager groups) should be able to see that all parts of the system are going to be acknowledged, recognised and rewarded consistently. Promoting this to the front of the document would also articulate how recognition and reward will be prioritised/ implemented and its importance to the college.

Practice managers

- Create a section for practice managers articulating how they will access professional development, networking, resources and what their responsibilities will be.

Make it easy to find

- Create a one page summary pull-out for each craft group to describe what will be required on a page for each.

Progressive assessment

- Further define progressive assessment to articulate exactly what is going to be required of supervisors and training practices. It may be that practice managers/ practice nurses can be involved and share the load, but that will only be evident when it is articulated as to what will be required.

Refine registrar wrap around supports diagram

- Include supervisors in the diagram relating to registrar wrap around supports.

Define supervisor training practice supports in a diagram

- There are an awful lot of responsibilities articulated in the document associated to supervisors and training practices – we suggest there is as much need for a supervisor, practice managers and training practice supports diagram as there is a need for one for registrars. GPSA resources should be reflected here.

Provide realistic timelines acknowledging grandfathering and transition

- The program would be aided by the addition of a timeline – when things will be phased in. It has been mentioned there will be a grandfathering and a gradual move towards the new system, but it is not evident from the document that this is the case.

Accreditation – Its your opportunity to fix what ails it – please do

- Either put full accreditation details in or separate it out and articulate that this will be dealt with more comprehensively separately. Don't be 'half pregnant' about it.
- Ensure the KPIs of accreditation are articulated fully
- Ensure criteria for initial, ongoing and intervals of accreditation are articulated
- Formally state an orientation to natural justice with regard to accreditation or at least build it in.
- Unless you are going to give supervisors and training practices the opportunity to respond to registrar claims or articulate what needs to be addressed then there is no point in collecting registrar opinions about supervisors and training practices as these opinions are unqualified. Registrar opinions could be used to prompt a request for information to disprove the allegation, but they should not be used to establish 'form' if no one is willing to address the issues in real time with the training practice and supervisor.

Supervisor Liaison Officer role and supports articulated

- It would be a missed opportunity not to standardise this role nationally and to finally give the role some consistent supports, objectives, inputs, processes and outputs. You will need to articulate this groups independence

particularly as the college is a closed loop of accreditation, training, education, assessment, selection. SLOs become an important quality control, but not if they are

Make the in-practice teaching plans and learning plans a registrar responsibility with supervisor sign off. The learner is best placed with guidance to identify what they are confident/ competent in and what they need extra support with. In making it registrar led it also would make it learner centred. These documents can then be signed off and agreed to by the lead supervisor or adjusted. This could be signed off during the first week and their first in practice teaching session so both parties know exactly what is planned and going to happen.

What are the Threats?

Nationally Consistent Payment of Supervisors and Training Practice

- What underpins the achievement of this program is the Nationally Consistent Payment of Supervisors and Training Practice. While early indications are that this will be improved, it has not yet been formally announced.
- If the system is supported with less you will not be able to expect more.

Assumptions

- Assumptions – assuming that what is proposed is the same already nationally would be an error. So WA supervisors for example are not paid to attend professional development for example and they are simultaneously the poorest paid compared to supervisors nationally by a significant margin. The appetite to be expected to do more may be less for this group without the additional reward. OR it could see them more willing to do what is required for no recompense whereas others in other states who currently receive more won't do it without some form of reward.

Practice Managers overlooked

- If practice managers are not supported as they have been, this will significantly undermine the transition. In many respects it is the efficacy of the practice manager that sets the tone for the entire placement.

Fear of Change – Simplify it, break it down, make it clear

- Fear of change will be significant. People generally don't like change, so lean into it. Provide clear one page summaries for each craft group. Sifting through a 134 page document to find out what is different for them currently represents a risk to the colleges user acceptance.

Failing to fix accreditation with something credible

- Not seizing the opportunity to fix accreditation. Currently accreditation lacks credibility. The common denominator between high and low quality practices is that they are all accredited. When an accreditation visit occurs it is generally guaranteed that a practice will be accredited. There is very little depth and no KPIs a practice must work to and maintain, just a series of motherhood statements. Yet somehow accreditation is used as the weeding tool for getting rid of problematic practices without a natural justice approach.

Unrealistic timelines – or worse - no timelines

- Trying to implement too much too soon will be a threat to that which is outlined in the education program.
- Having no timelines also threatens to never reach the outcome sought or break relationships where it is not thoughtfully and systematically implemented.

Inconsistent recognition and reward

- Whereas MEs are paid employees. Supervisors are not. Supervisors are expected to do most of their work for free.
- It is therefore problematic to not ensure all parties are recognised and rewarded for their work especially those who will remain unpaid in the new model. Just be consistent. If you put it in for MEs put it in for everyone.