

CPD consultation questions

Paper Feb11 09

We are particularly interested in your views on the following points, although we welcome comments on any issues that you wish to raise in the relation to the draft CPD framework and rules

GPhC CPD Framework Comments

IPM is a non-profit making company established in 1964 and limited by guarantee with 300 members from across the spectrum of pharmacy practice in the UK and abroad. It has mainly educational and research objectives in the field of pharmacy business and management.

General Comment

It seems that the GPhC is in control of CPD record keeping which is not the case with the GMC. Looking to the issue of future revalidation we suggest the GPhC should support professional bodies in developing appropriate CPD along the lines that Medical Royal Colleges have undertaken.

*The recent review of the effectiveness of CPD undertaken by the GMC and Academy of Royal Colleges **The Effectiveness of Continuing Professional Development** should be incorporated into the thinking.*

Question 1: Do you agree that the recording format for CPD should continue to be structured according to the cycle of reflection, planning, action and evaluation?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please explain your answer

Whilst the principal of this is sound, experience indicates that sometimes the full cycle is unnecessary, over-burdensome and excessive for the recording purposes. Many CPD actions arise from peer meetings, customer or client questions which require decisions or quick answers based on literature searches, contacts with colleagues or advisers.

The new record form is more proportionate than the old one.

The GMC have adopted the Guly cycle for their activities which uses different terms of assess needs, planning, development activities and assess achievement. These are more meaningful headings and fit the new record quite well and are worth considering moving to a position where all health professions work to similar CPD standards.

Question 2: Do you agree that, for most registrants, CPD records should be reviewed every five years?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please explain your answer

This seems proportionate for the normal practising member, but could be reduced in the event of problems arising in someone's practise

Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed measures against which we will review CPD records?

- Yes
 No
 Unsure

Please explain your answer

Nine entries seems reasonable and three starting at reflection also.
Feedback will be most valuable as would be anonymous examples where problems arose and why.

Question 4: Do you have any other comments you wish to make about the content of the draft CPD framework?

- Yes
 No
 Unsure

Please explain your answer

Re 2.10 We wonder if there should also not be some requirement to keep up to date on matters affecting the profession outside ones area of specialisation or specialisations, given that being registered allows a person to work in other areas of practice and the growing trend for people to work in more than one area.

Recording of dates is sometimes difficult when a complex issue is being tackled and may take many on many different days

Question 5: Are there any other circumstances where a registrant would be considered to have failed to meet the CPD requirements that should be added to those listed in the draft rules?

- Yes
 No
 Unsure

Please explain your answer

These seem to cover most situations other than failing to keep up to date on professional issues generally which is not a current requirement, but may be suggested in 3.8 p 9 last bullet point

Question 6: Are there any other remedial measures that should be added to those listed in the draft rules?

- Yes
 No
 Unsure

Please explain your answer

Perhaps a requirement to work under supervision for a period of time?

Question 7: Do you agree with the procedure proposed for notifying registrants of the intention to remove them from the register or for removing an annotation relating to a specialisation and the subsequent stages prior to removal?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please explain your answer

Whilst 28 days is acceptable normally, someone going on a long holiday or seriously ill could be unaware of the notice of intention. Presumably GPhC could take a lenient view if evidence of absence or illness was provided. The rules do not seem to allow for this

Question 8: Do you have any other comments you wish to make about the content of the draft CPD Rules?

No

Just a comment that

The bottom half of the flowchart doesn't work for someone who is unsatisfactory and the top half has a typo etermine action