Quality Practice Criteria (QPC) Project
Registrar Placement feedback - 6 monthly

ECT visit feedback

Teaching data – in practice teaching log
- Curriculum coverage
- Teaching methodologies
- Who does the teaching

Administration data

Supervisor education activities
Identify quality practices
EIP project – QPC Phase 2

Phase 1
20 practices

- QPC criteria document
- Assessment tool
- Data

Phase 2

- Focus groups
- 105 practices
- Quality improvement tool
- Qualitative and quantitative analysis of data
  - Registrar satisfaction
  - RTP rating
- Streamlined computer data process
Results

• 105 current practices

• 91 practices with registrar and practice data 2007-2010
  – 80 are current practices
  – 509 registrar questionnaires from 214 individual registrars

• 31 (40%) practices completed QI tool

• 76 practices with data rated by RTP
Results

QPC criteria document
- 2 revisions by total of 39 Practices

Quality improvement tool
- 31 (40%) of practices responded
- Data provided understandable
- Tool effective quality improvement process
Quality improvement

- Areas for improvement
- One area you would highlight for QI – and how you would do it.

- Reporting to WAGPET: 16%
- Consultation review: 13%
- Structured teaching: 13%
- Assessment/appraisal: 12%
- Other teachers: 10%
- Orientation: 10%
- Curriculum coverage: 7%
- Practice meetings: 4%
- Supervisor education: 4%
- Registrar support: 3%
- Teaching techniques: 3%
- Registrar support: 3%
# Education log - Trainers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total teaching events – all trainers</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of supervisors</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor education attendance</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Education log – teaching techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct observation registrar</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse direct observation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video consultation debrief</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal feedback</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing home visit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most common >80%
- Chronic conditions
- Women’s health

Least common <10%
- Anaesthetics
- Rehabilitation
- Strategic skills
- Genetics
- Oral health
Registrar post placement survey

- Two thirds of registrars had completed multiple placements
- 50:50 split metro and rural
Registrar satisfaction

- Median practice satisfaction score was 8/10
- Score < 6.75 places practice in lowest 10%
## Registrar satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Univariate</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Multivariate</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total teaching events all trainers</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total events all teaching techniques</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trained supervisors</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with other professionals</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video consultation</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Univariate</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Multivariate</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct observation</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal feedback</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Registrar satisfaction

Four key domains:

- Supportive supervision
- Curriculum coverage
- Exposure to patients
- Working conditions/facilities
## Registrar satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registrar based questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive supervision</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions/facilities</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total teaching events</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice based report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trained supervisors</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with other health professionals</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct observation</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Registrar survey

Reliable and robust post placement survey:

- Supportive supervision – 21 questions (Cronbach alpha - 0.9423)
- Curriculum coverage – 10 questions (Cronbach alpha - 0.9017)
- Exposure to patients – 3 questions (Cronbach alpha - 0.8597)
- Working conditions/facilities – 9 questions (Cronbach alpha - 0.8701)
Qualitative analysis - descriptions

• Supervisor factors:
  – Traits
  – Behaviours
  – Skills
  – Attitudes

• Quality of in-practice teaching

• General practice factors
  – Infrastructure
  – Processes of care
  – Organisational
  – Workforce
Where to....

- Research
  - analysis of RTP rating of quality
  - direct observation consultation review
  - evidence-based teaching
- Implement regular quality improvement approaches
- Identify quality practices
- Reward practices that are excellent or exceptional