

Evaluation of registration assessment training, 2 and 3 November 2013

Barbara Edwards, Quality Assurance agency

Introduction

1. The registration assessment training was carried out on 2 and 3 November 2013 at GOsC House by Sarah Wallace, independent osteopathic practitioner and Barbara Edwards, Assistant Director, QAA, with Marcus Dye, Professional Standards Manager, GOsC.
2. The training was divided into four separate sessions and the number of participants attending each session is provided in brackets:
 - Non UK (9)
 - Further evidence of practice (11)
 - Assessment of clinical performance (15)
 - Return to practice (9)
3. Participants were able to attend one or a combination of sessions which were arranged in series and a brief explanation of the overall process was provided at the beginning of each for those who had not attended the previous session(s).

Participant feedback

4. An evaluation form was circulated at the end of each session. Participants were invited to rate the general organisation of the training on a simple three point scale, but were asked to identify three learning points and also what they had found least useful in each session, and what follow-up activities they would most value.
5. 38 responses were received in total. The number for each session is given below.

Non UK (Forms returned: 8)

6. Participants identified three key learning points: the importance of the subject benchmark statement; the need to base their assessment on the evidence presented and not make assumptions; and the need to provide specific and detailed feedback to the osteopath.
7. There were few negative comments and three participants stated that it was 'all useful', but others would have appreciated more time to carry out the tasks and to have had the opportunity to interact with more experienced assessors.

8. Suggestions for follow-up activity included providing a flow chart of the process, and more case studies. Participants also felt that a contact list of assessors should be made available.

Further evidence of practice (Forms returned: 10)

9. The range of responses to what had been learned from this session were more diverse, but again included the need to provide clear, concise and specific feedback. Respondents recognised that comments have to be useful for the Assessment of Clinical Performance assessor and also noted the importance of clear referencing.
10. There were fewer negative comments and these again related to the lack of time to complete the exercise and the amount of 'paperwork to juggle'.
11. The suggestion that a flow chart of the process should be provided was reiterated. Participants also asked for more training on moderation, and for more discussion on good practice and how issues leading to appeals could be minimised in the writing of reports.

Assessment of clinical performance (Forms returned: 12)

12. This session prompted the most numerous and diverse range of learning points. Some respondents again noted the need for meaningful, contextualised feedback and a firm evidence base. The most frequent observation was about the importance of recognising personal bias and there were also a number of comments highlighting the need to use professional judgement in applying the criteria to the individual osteopath. The critical importance of the relationship between the assessor and moderator roles was also noted.
13. There were two main criticisms of the session: the exercise which asked participants to identify good and bad practice from a list of comments extracted from previous reports, and two respondents commented on the way in which certain experienced assessors had tended to dominate the session. One respondent also felt that the process was already sufficiently well-known to them.
14. Suggestions for improvement included the opportunity for new assessors to shadow more experienced assessors; for an opportunity to reflect annually with other assessors on the process; for peer appraisal; and for more examples of anonymised reports to be made available.

Return to practice (Forms returned: 8)

15. The most frequently cited learning points from this session were an understanding of the supportive tone and purpose of the interaction; the need for an empathetic approach; and how this could be demonstrated through an appropriately structured interview and well-formulated questioning techniques.

16. There were very few negative remarks and these referred to the lack of time for preparation for the session.
17. Suggestions for further activity included mentoring; more examples of completed documentation; opportunities for further discussion of points such as the merits of telephone as opposed to face-to face discussions with the osteopath; and the development of a network of assessors. One respondent asked for techniques on speed writing to help complete the 'numerous forms'.

Summary

18. Overall the sessions achieved their aims. The number of leaning points noted by the respondents exceeded the more negative comments by a considerable margin and reflected the key objectives. There were a number of useful suggestions for further activity, principally involving the provision of more 'worked' examples of the documentation and more regular opportunities to reflect on the process with colleagues and to discuss how to improve mentoring, interviewing and other key techniques through shadowing and assessor networking.

General organisation

19. All respondents felt that the venue was 'good'; 95% stated that the materials provided were 'good' with 5% rating them as 'satisfactory'; and 92% felt that the organisation on the day was 'good', with 8% rating it as 'satisfactory'.

	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
Organisation on the day	35	3	0
Suitability of the venue	38	0	0
The materials provided	36	2	0