

## **GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL**

### **CET Stakeholder Event**

**25 March 2010**

#### **Introduction**

The GOC organised and ran a CET Stakeholder event on the 25th March 2010 in London. The event was a facilitated event which included a presentation on risk profiling, how CET could be fed into the revalidation process and the vision of CET 2012. Stakeholders also had a large input into the day. The event also helped support the GOC's broader programme of stakeholder engagement.

For those registrants who were unable to attend the event the Education Department developed a questionnaire which had some very positive feedback with 991 responses.

#### **Purpose of the event**

The CET scheme has now reached the end of its second cycle and it was felt that there needed to be some form of consultation on how registrants feel the CET Scheme can be improved upon. As part of the Revalidation Scheme Stakeholder Events funding for this event was made available by the Department of Health.

The event sought input from the GOC Registrants, professional and regulatory bodies and the optical journalists on the following key issues:

- Specified Competency Areas – which competencies should require compulsory CET?
- Modality – How to encourage greater participation in peer review sessions and skills assessments/practical workshops.
- Annual or 3 yearly requirement?
- Is 36 points enough?

## **Event programme**

The event was based around two presentations, one by Linda Kennaugh, Director of Education on evaluation of the last CET 2007-09 Cycle and results of the registrants survey and the other presentation by Deborah Kelly, Europe Economics on profiling the risks in the Optical Profession. The interactive group sessions were led by an independent facilitator.

The event was publicised in the optical press and the GOC website. The event was attended by the Deputy Registrar, senior GOC staff members and other GOC staff.

The programme for the event was:

- Introduction from the GOC Deputy Registrar
- Profiling the risks in the Optical Profession, presentation by Deborah Kelly – Europe Economics
- Evaluation of the last CET 2007-09 Cycle and results of the registrant CET survey, presentation by Linda Kennaugh – Director of Education
- Break out sessions/discussion groups on specified competency areas
- Break out sessions/discussion groups on Modality
- Feedback from these groups
- Break out sessions/discussion groups on Annual or 3 yearly requirement
- Break out sessions/discussion groups on the 36 points
- Feedback from these groups
- Summary and next steps
- Close

## **Methodology**

The rooms were set up in cabaret style to help facilitate and encourage interaction between the attendees. The tables had a mix of attendees to enable a broad range of discussion and feedback.

At the group discussions, each table was given flip chart pads and different coloured post-it notes, one side of the room, half of the tables started with question 1 of the breakout sessions and the other side with question 2 so that both areas were covered in greater detail

## **Findings from the breakout sessions**

### **Specified Competency Areas**

Professional Conduct/Communication Skills/Record Keeping – Registrants identified this as a high risk area but they were open to the fact that it is not seen as a necessity. Communication came up frequently among the registrants as a key area that needs more emphasis and this was one of the areas that they felt was a potential risk.

Paediatric Optometry – Child protection was another area that was identified as high risk in the break out sessions. Registrants felt that there should be a general “childrens area” in terms of specified competency area.

Contact Lens – There was strong emphasis across the day by registrants in terms of contact lens. A number of registrants thought that this competency area crossed over for both Optoms and DO's. Contact lens related communication was also highlighted as an important factor along with practical fitting skills and product knowledge.

Ocular Abnormalities/Ocular Appliances – These competency areas were also highlighted as being key among registrants.

Overall it was felt that the core competency areas should be based on risk and all competencies are needed but some should have more “weight” than others for example the scope of each competency and the risk attached. The core competencies should also be reviewed with revalidation in mind instead of making the existing CET scheme fit around revalidation.

### **Modality**

Peer Review/Skills Workshops – It was felt that there should be more points awarded to these two areas of modality and there seemed to be a lack of providers of workshops and peer review. Registrants highlighted that there needs to be more awareness on what is actually available as it was felt that most Optoms and DO's were not aware of the peer review available to them. Registrants were also of the view that peer review should be made a compulsory participation.

It seemed that Distance Learning was a barrier to these two areas as there are more points awarded for Distance Learning and there should be a maximum of points for this.

CET Grants for DO's – There needs to be a fairer allocation of funding. Funding for Dispensers was an area that came up as a barrier to different types of modality.

Overall it was felt that there needs to be compulsory modalities and a formal structure needs to be put in place for peer review. In terms of grants, this should be allocated according to the type of modality. Registrants felt that there is too much focus on points achievement rather than knowledge.

### **Annual or 3 yearly requirement**

Registrants were in agreement that the current system of a 3 year cycle is sufficient with the possibility of having a rolling 3 years cycle with achieving 12 points as a minimum per year with a cap on the amount of points which can be achieved per day. Registrants were also of the view that the introduction of compulsory elements will naturally elongate the period it takes to complete the requirements.

Exceptional circumstances for not completing CET should be taken into account and 3 years is enough to allow for career break and maternity leave.

It was suggested that a portfolio system rather than a points system may be more beneficial and there were concerns whether the current system would stand up to investigation.

### **Is 36 points enough?**

It was undecided whether 36 points would be enough and this would depend on the competency areas and modality. There was a general consensus that 36 points is enough but with the possibility of an increase to 45-60, allocating more points for peer review which should be spread throughout the cycle.

### **Conclusions**

CET must be about what registrants need to do not what they want to do.

### Competencies

- Suggested areas for compulsory CET - Record keeping, Communication, decision making & non clinical skills (legal frameworks, conduct & paediatric) & contact lens for optoms & CLO's
- Should be about individual learning needs
- CET must address patient safety needs.
- The competencies should be reviewed with revalidation in mind rather than trying to make the new scheme fit the existing competencies.

### Modalities

- CET should be about learning outcomes rather than just getting points - is a points based system the best way of measuring?
- A range of modalities should be compulsory - it is not acceptable for everyone to get 100% their points through journals.
- Necessary to review requirements of CET approval process to enable more provision in key modalities such as peer review
- Barriers - CET approval requirements are too restrictive, could approval be retrospective rather than prior to an event / activity? Also geographical availability is an issue for some types of CET.
- Need to educate registrants about peer review
- Issues regarding CET funding - how CET grants are allocated - possibility of amount of grant being linked to type of CET activity undertaken
- DO's choose cheapest or free CET as they do not get grant & cannot afford to take time out of practice.
- Encourage innovation - greater use of technology in CET e.g. use of video conferencing
- Differentiate between CET which involves interactive learning compared to paper based CET and simple attendance at lectures with no participation.

### Cycle

- Significant support for continuing with a 3 year cycle

- Mixed views for having a minimum annual requirement within 3 year cycle, mainly support for the principle but could be complicated / costly to administer
- Support for discretionary powers for GOC to deal with cases of exceptional circumstances e.g. serious illness or maternity / career breaks.
- Suggestion of a portfolio approach instead of points
- Suggestion of a 3 year rolling cycle
- Support for limit number of points that can be obtained in one day
- Support for provision to carry over a capped number of points
- Provision for those on maternity, career break or serious illness.

#### Is 36 points the right amount?

- This cannot be decided until issues regarding compulsory modalities and competency areas have been determined.
- Different types of CET should carry differential weighting of points e.g. peer assessment should carry more points than distance learning articles
- Suggestion of 36 hours rather than points.