



A Quality Assurance Framework for Dental workforce Development







Jonathan Cowpe 1, Linda Prescott-Clements 2, Helen Falcon 3, Tony Anderson 4

School of Dentistry, Cardiff University, UK¹, National Clinical Assessment Service, NCAS (part of NHS Litigation Authority), London UK², Committee of Postgraduate Dental Deans & Directors (COPDEND), Manchester UK³, NHS Education for Scotland, UK⁴.

Education & Training of the UK dental workforce, should promote sharing of best practice for dentists and the allied professions: Delivery of Life-Long Learning through the provision of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) underpins this philosophy, however:

- Concerns, expressed by stakeholders, regarding the quality of dental CPD
- Need for a robust system of Quality Assurance

European DentCPD project - www.DentCPD.org - identified need to explore issue of 'Quality Assurance' to promote a consistent approach to ensure dental continuing education is 'fit for purpose'

Aim

- Describe evidence-base for, and content of, the "QA Framework for Dental Workforce Development (2016)"
- Report how "QA Framework" is being promoted for use by dental registrants ('Users') and CPD 'Providers'

Materials & Methods UK, Committee of Postgraduate Dental Deans & Directors (COPDEND) project

- 1. Evidence-base to develop a draft 'QA Framework' suitable for different types of CPD (face-to-face, online, journal, conference CPD etc.).
 - a. systematic review of CPD quality literature
 - b. audit of QA processes in place from >50 CPD 'Providers'
- 2. Draft 'QA Framework'
 - a. national consultation
 - b. review by Life-Long Learning SIG at ADEE (Riga 2014)
 - c. Expert Advisory Group
 - d. publication of COPDEND 'QA Framework (2014)'
- 3. Further consultation (including at ADEE SIG 2015)
 - a. resulted in revised/updated 'QA Framework'
 - b. published in 2016 reported below

Results

'QA Framework (2016)' includes a range of Quality Criteria in Four Sections:

1. Planning & Development

- i. Educational Aims & Learning Objectives
- ii. Educational Design & Development

2. CPD Delivery

- i. Teachers & Trainers
- ii. Delivery Methods
- iii. Assessment of Participants' Learning
- 3. CPD Evaluation
- 4. Administration

Two 'Standards' - for each Quality Criterion:

'Expected Standard' (ExSt) 'Enhanced CPD' (EnSt)

Minimum quality criteria appropriate to ensure effective educational impact

Enhanced provision encompasses processes that demonstrate improvements in the quality of provision beyond the 'expected standard'

Developed/delivered by experts; Evidence-informed; Effective & engaging delivery methods; Evaluation - high levels of participants' satisfaction;

Demonstrable positive impact on practice & patient outcomes

Conclusions

- "QA Framework for Dental Workforce Development (2016)":
 - provides a suitable measure of what one should expect of educational activities (CPD)
 - Strengthens continuing education of the dental workforce
- CPD 'Providers' can use to strengthen their portfolio of CPD educational activities
- *** CPD 'Users' can measure value of their CPD activities when reflecting on impact on their practice
- Aspiration will promote mobility of dental professionals with appropriately quality assured records of their continuing education and development

 (Expected' and

'Enhanced' Standards
=
Impact on Clinical and
Professional Practice

Main messages

Patient care improved through maintenance of high professional standards

High quality education & training relies on robust & structured quality assurance

'QA Framework for Dental Workforce Development (2016)' supports *'Users'* and *'Providers'* to demonstrate evidence of good practice

Exerts from the QA Framework

		F 04	E . 01	METO	
1.	CPD PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	ExSt	EnSt	MET? Yes/No	Potential supporting evidence
1.1.1	Educational Aims & Objectives Clear & concise educational aims, objectives &	Yes	Yes		- Written documents, such as course programme, CPD certificate, flyer
	learning outcomes are available for the CPD				- Online programme
	activity				- Other documents e.g. speaker agreement for activity, lesson plans, or within
110		Mari	Mari		conference delegate pack
1.1.3	Educational objectives & learning outcomes are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and		Yes		 CPD supporting docs, (programme/certificates/slides) Website / online info & conference delegate pack
	Time-bound (SMART)				- Speakers contracts
1.	CPD PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	ExSt	EnSt	MET?	Potential supporting evidence
1.2	Educational Design & Development			Yes/No	
1.2.1	Content is developed by recognised experts	Yes	Yes		- Speaker agreement / contract.
1.2.2	Qualifications, experience, expertise of the	Yes	Yes		- Credentials of developer - Evidence of review
	individual responsible reviewed by the provider				- Details published in course documents
1.2.3	Content is explicitly evidence-based	No	Yes		- Declaration by course developer
1.2.4		Mo	Yes		- Sources of evidence
1.2.4	Content is reviewed to check - it is current, accurate and appropriate by an independent		163		- Document signed by third party - Record of review meeting(s)
/	third party				- Schedule of review dates
1.2.5	Instructional design of the activity uses evidence-	No	Yes		- Programme highlights strategies used
	based educational strategies to maximise				- Participant feedback on effectiveness of engagement strategies
	participant engagement				
2. 2.1	CPD DELIVERY Teachers & Trainers	ExSt	EnSt	MET? Yes/No	Potential supporting evidence
2.1.1	Individuals responsible for delivery of the CPD	Yes	Yes		- Recruitment policy & process recorded
	identified through robust and transparent		100		- Speaker(s) (or online developer) CVs, qualifications, prior experience etc.
	processes				- Previous feedback regarding speaker, or peer review
2.1.2	Individual responsible for delivering the CPD has	Yes	Yes		- Qualifications (evidence checked - certificates), record of relevant experience (CV,
	the necessary qualifications				Biography)
					- Signed record the qualification/experience reviewed
2.1.3	Qualifications, experience, expertise of the		Yes		- Record of review by 3rd party & provider
	individual responsible for delivering the CPD reviewed by the provider, checked by an				 Trainer database or register of expertise Online information or within conference packs
	independent third party with appropriate expertise				Orimic information of within conference packs
2.1.5	CPD activity has been checked for conflicts of	Yes	Yes		- Documentation, e.g. course program, website info, conference pack
	interest				- Evidence within CPD content e.g. slides, online
2.	CPD DELIVERY	ExSt	EnSt	MET? Yes/No	Potential supporting evidence
2.2	Single point of contact for participants	Yes	Yes		- Contact details recorded on marketing documentation -
					CPD programme, online, conference pack etc.
2.2.2	Delivery reatherds are appropriate for the learning	Yes	Yes		
2.2.2	Delivery methods are appropriate for the learning objectives, anticipated outcomes, and target		163		 Participant feedback on delivery methods, relevance etc. Record of review
	audience				- CPD activity plan
2.	CPD DELIVERY	ExSt	EnSt	MET?	Potential supporting evidence
2.3	Assessment of Participants' Learning			Yes/No	
2.3.1	CPD activity includes an assessment of	Yes	Yes		- Assessment documentation, including areas targeted and method used, e.g.
	participants' learning				knowledge test, observation, simulation etc.
2.3.2	Design of assessment content / questions, and	No	Yes		- Signed record of review
	marking criteria, are reviewed by an individual with				- Reviewers qualifications / experience
	educational expertise				
2.3.3	Feedback is provided to participants following the	No	Yes		- Feedback documentation (example), discussion record (if verbal)
	assessment of their learning				
3	CPD EVALUATION	ExSt	EnSt	MET? Yes/No	Potential supporting evidence
3.1	Structured feedback is obtained from individual	Yes	Yes		- Feedback form (paper / online)
	participants following each CPD activity				- Collated feedback report
3.2	Participants are able to provide feedback	Yes	Yes		- Documented process for anonymisation
	anonymously				
3.5	Ctrustured to adhead, from a particle and a least	l No.	Yes		Example of atrustured feedback relation to person and improve
0.5	Structured feedback from participants is requested regarding the perceived impact of the CPD activity,		163		- Example of structured feedback relating to perceived impact
	on future practice and / or patient care and				
3.7	outcomes The longer term impact of CDD activities on the	Mo	Yes		Deport or evaluation data even languitudi ed tier (1977)
3.1	The longer term impact of CPD activities on the participant and / or patients is investigated through		Tes		- Report or evaluation data over longitudinal timeframe, e.g. database, follow-up emails, follow-up surveys or Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
	follow up evaluation				such ap carroys at they remained indicators (10 10)
A	CDD ADMINISTRATION	ExSt	EnSt	MET?	Potential supporting evidence
4	CPD ADMINISTRATION	LAGI	Linot	Yes/No	
4.1	Details of the CPD activity are published in	Yes	Yes		- CPD activity details on e.g. website, flyer, marketing documents, CPD programme,
	advance and available to participants				conference pack
4.4	Documentant evidence (a.e. ODD es ('C. t.)	No	Yes		CDD Cortificate with prompt
7.4	Documentary evidence (e.g. CPD certificates) include a prompt for the CPD user to reflect on		162		 CPD Certificate with prompt Other documentary evidence of prompt, e.g. email, online system
	their learning and link this to their professional				,
4.5	development plan	Voc	Yes		Ouglity accurance policy
4.0	The provider has a quality assurance policy for CPD activities, including transparent processes for		ies		 Quality assurance policy Quality improvement strategy and evidence of implementation e.g. database,
	quality improvement.				records, audit, review meetings