

Paediatric and Child Health Advanced Clinical Practitioner Curricular Framework Consultation Phase 1 Feedback Report

Background

Health Education England (HEE) approached the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (RCPCH), the membership body for paediatrics, to develop and produce a modular, learning outcomes-based, curricular framework for advanced clinical practice in Paediatrics.

The result is the Paediatric and Child Health ACP Curricular Framework (PCHCF), a road map for the training and education of advanced clinical practitioners that is not defined (exclusively) by job role or title, professional group, or clinical setting.

There are eleven domains that form the PCHCF scaffolding and create a comprehensive underpinning for the clinical care of BCYP, while explicitly addressing the other three pillars of HEE-defined advanced clinical practice.

At the framework's very centre are the illustrations, which exemplify how the (shared) advanced practice learning outcomes and key capabilities can be demonstrated in an individual trainee's clinical area.

Consultation Phase 1

Between the 16th August and 10th September 2021, the writing group carried out a consultation with existing practitioners and employers to encourage feedback on;

- the framework structure,
- the key capabilities and learning outcomes,
- example illustrations **for Neonatology and Emergency Paediatrics only**

The survey received 220 responses with a 47% completion rate. The comments received have now been reviewed, considered and incorporated into the latest version of the document, which will be used in the next round of consultations with higher education institutions.

This document provides the results of the initial consultation, firstly quantitatively (table 1) and then grouped into collective themes where common issues arose. The common themes are summarised alongside the writing groups response as to how we plan to address the issues raised in the next version of the curricular framework.

The writing team would like to take this opportunity to thank all those that found the time to contribute to our phase one consultation and hope that you remain engaged with the project throughout its development.

Table 1 - Survey Response Results Summary

#	Question	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither or Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
5	The Curriculum introduction clearly outlines how ACPs can use the Curriculum.	1% (1)	5% (5)	6% (6)	70% (71)	19% (19)
6	I understand the terminology of the Learning Outcomes and Key Capabilities.	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	66% (67)	33% (34)
7	The Learning Outcomes and Key Capabilities clearly cover the purpose of the Curriculum.	1% (1)	2% (2)	6% (6)	69% (70)	23% (23)
8	The Learning Outcomes and Key Capabilities seemed relevant to the clinical work expected of an ACP.	1% (1)	5% (5)	9% (9)	64% (65)	22% (22)
9	The Learning Outcomes and Key Capabilities are clear and specific to avoid ambiguity while flexible enough to be applied to different areas of practice and geographies.	1% (1)	8% (8)	11% (11)	66% (67)	15% (15)
10	The Learning Outcomes and Key Capabilities are inclusive to the different ACP professionals and can be achieved in different workplace settings.	1% (1)	5% (5)	12% (12)	67% (68)	15% (15)
11	The Key Capabilities appropriately articulate the requirements needed to demonstrate the achievement of the Learning Outcomes.	0% (0)	3% (3)	6% (6)	74% (75)	18% (18)
12	The Illustrations appropriately articulate how the Learning Outcomes can be applied to clinical practice.	0% (0)	3% (3)	9% (9)	65% (66)	24% (24)
13	The Curriculum is inclusive to the different ACP professionals and the Learning Outcomes and Key Capabilities can be achieved in different workplace settings.	1% (1)	4% (4)	18% (18)	63% (64)	14% (14)
14	This Curriculum will meet the needs of the ACP paediatrics workforce.	0% (0)	7% (7)	14% (14)	64% (65)	15% (15)
15	The curriculum adequately addresses patient safety as a priority.	0% (0)	2% (2)	3% (3)	70% (71)	25% (25)
16	Are there any areas which you feel are under or overrepresented within the draft Curriculum?	No 65% (63)			Yes 35% (34)	
17	Can you identify any part of the Curriculum which may impact, whether positively or negatively on individuals or groups sharing any protected characteristics (including but not limited to age, disability, pregnancy and family-friendly leave, those working less than full time, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation)?	No 91% (92)			Yes 9% (9)	

Responses in full

Questions 1-4

These questions were concerned with respondents' details, where they worked, their current role, and whether they would be happy to be contacted.

Questions 5-20

These questions sought feedback on the curriculum, learning objectives and key capabilities as well as the illustrations for pathways 2a and 3.

The feedback has been grouped into thematic areas with the response from the writing team given below.

You Said	Content Specific: (41 comments) The comments in this section referred to areas that some felt were missing from the framework such as mental health, psychological development, or impact on climate change as well as specialisms such as prescribing medicine or oncology. Respondents also requested that the curriculum remains flexible and expressed concern that it seemed very medical based in its current form. Some felt the document felt more like a competency framework than a curriculum.
We Did	Writers Response: <i>"The illustrations are not intended to cover every single scenario or specialism. They are intended to give a high-level example of how the Key Capabilities might be applied in a variety of settings, remaining flexible enough to be interpreted by a range of differently situated ACPs. The medical aspects will hopefully be more balanced out once we have all the illustrations. We are also now describing the document as a 'curricular framework' rather than a curriculum."</i>

You Said	Document Format: (5 comments) These comments mostly related to the length of the document or were concerned that some elements were being lost due to the document's length.
We Did	Writers Response: <i>"We have reviewed the document length and decided to combine the illustrations for pathways 1 and 5-11. This should avoid repetition and keep the wordcount down. We have also coded the illustrative pathways so that it's easier to identify the relevant sections."</i>

You Said	Document Purpose and Usage: (42 comments) Many of the comments in this theme stemmed from confusion as to who the document was for and how it could be used in practice. Some felt they would struggle to demonstrate they had achieved the learning outcomes as well as show progression. People were unsure how the curriculum would be credentialed (with RCPCH/HEE?) and how existing practitioners were supposed to engage with the curriculum.
We Did	Writers Response: <i>"We have revised the document introduction and included frequently asked questions. These clearly outline who the document is for, how it should be used and how the curricular framework will be credentialed. We will also be adding a glossary in a future version so that there is a common understanding of the language and terminology used."</i>

You Said	Eportfolio: (5 comments) These comments related to the usability and ease of recording evidence and concern that people may have to recall historical examples or maintain multiple portfolios.
We Did	Writers Response: <i>"The recording of evidence within e-portfolio is outside of the scope of this project, however we are currently investigating a potential follow up project aimed at exploring this further."</i>

You Said	Higher Education: (5 comments) These comments were concerned that there may be duplication if the curriculum is not linked to HEI courses.
We Did	Writers Response: <i>"The second phase of the consultation is specifically targeted at HEIs where we hope to confirm that they support the concept and that the curricular framework is acceptable to deliver. "</i>

You Said	Pathway Specific: (13 comments) Comments related to the omission of certain pathways and settings such as the child with complex needs or community-based settings. Some also commented on how the pathways for Neonatology and Emergency medicine were presented quite differently and called for a consistent approach.
We Did	Writers Response: <i>"The final version of the curricular framework will include illustrative pathways for primary and urgent care, hospital paediatrics (both emergency and general), neonatology, paediatric critical care and community/child with complex needs. The illustrations will not all be in a similar format as they are specific to each of these patient settings."</i>

You Said	Role Specific: (70 comments) As suggested by the theme title, these comments were mainly concerned about specific roles and settings and why some specific settings, scenarios or specialisms had been omitted.
We Did	Writers Response: <i>"The illustrations are not intended to cover every single scenario or specialism. They are intended to give a high-level example of how the Key Capabilities might be applied in a variety of settings, remaining flexible enough to be interpreted by a range of differently situated ACPs. The final version of the curricular framework will include illustrative pathways for primary and urgent care, hospital paediatrics (both emergency and general), neonatology, paediatric critical care and community/child with complex needs."</i>

You Said	Support from Employer: (120 comments) Although there were many comments grouped into this theme they were mostly concerned with the same issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being given enough time and support from employers to fully understand the curriculum and complete the training. • Having exposure to the full range of domains illustrated in the relevant pathway • Access to mentors, knowledgeable supervisors, and better understanding from doctors • Competition with paediatric trainees • Training for the trainers
We Did	Writers Response: <i>"Most of these concerns are in relation to organisational readiness and, whilst this is outside the scope of the curricular framework, we are aware that it does need to be considered, so will be adding some content regarding it in the introduction in a future version. We will also be making some recommendations regarding assessment and supervision although this will most likely be in a separate document as we don't wish to add to much to an already long document."</i>

Paediatrics and Child Health ACP Curricular Framework - Writing Group

Stephen-Andrew Whyte	Professional lead for advanced clinical practice, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children.
Katie Barnes	Executive Director - Kids' Health Matters CIC and Advanced Paediatric Nurse Practitioner – Alder Hey
Dr Natalie Daniels	Consultant Neurodevelopmental Paediatrician, Trust Physician Associate Programme Lead, Professional Adviser; Alder Hey
Diane Keeling	Advanced Neonatal Nurse Practitioner - BAPM representative
Prof Colin Morgan	Chair , HEE National Lead for ACP
Claire Osborne	Paediatric Advanced Clinical Practitioner Senior Lecturer - Advanced Practice Programmes
Dr Sally Payne	Occupational Therapist; Professional Adviser, RCOT representative
Kirsti Soanes	Lead Consultant Advanced Clinical Practitioner - University Hospitals of Birmingham NHSFT
Colin Veal	Advanced transport nurse PCCS representative

RCPCH Staff

Lorraine Bullard	Quality and Standards Manager
Carolyn Charlton	Curriculum Project Coordinator
Robert Curd	Curriculum Project Administrator

HEE Staff

Sally Gosling	HEE, Credential lead
Dr Richard Collier	HEE, Centre for Advancing Practice
Danielle Upton	HEE, Project Manager