EoE Public Health Training Programme

Policy – Assessment of KA10 competencies

Background

KA10 was a new addition to the 2015 Public Health Speciality Training Curriculum, designed to assess "integration and application of competencies for consultant practice" – i.e. the ability to work at senior level in complex and unpredictable environments.

FPH guidance states that summative assessment of KA10 should be no different from other key areas, that is through Activity Summary Sheets, WBPA and multi-source (360) feedback.

An optional, formative process described by FPH – the "KA10 panel" – is intended to help registrars in their progress towards consultant level working and should assist with preparation for AAC. This should happen near the end of ST4. The panel discussion is based on the registrar's work to date and does not require the identification of new projects; it is a matter of reflecting on work to date and the synthesis of actions, leading to a development plan to inform training in ST5.

Guidance notes describe the panel as comprising the TPD, an external TPD, and a further consultant member with educational training.

The registrar is expected to submit three reflective notes, each of up to 1000 words, on the theme of their development as "Public Health Expert", "Personal Impact and Effectiveness" and "Commitment to Public Health Values". Each reflective piece should cover at least two of the three pillars of public health – health protection, health improvement and healthcare public health. These are shared with the StR's ES in advance who provides a report. The StR's 360 (MSF) is also submitted to the panel.

Process

In Nov 2020, twelve senior registrars provided comments and suggestions for the local process. This, together with the views of the TPDs and HoS were discussed at STC in March 2021 and the following process was agreed:

1. StRs and ESs are responsible for ensuring that some form of preparation for consultant level working is undertaken. This need not be a KA10 panel as described here but an alternative will need to be described at ARCP if this KA10 process is not followed.
2. Responsibility for sign off of KA10 competences remains with the Educational Supervisor through the usual routes of competency sign off. This KA10 process is not required for KA10 competency sign off.
3. The KA10 process is not the same as interview practice nor preparation for AAC, but the process may be helpful in identifying good examples of work that can be used in an interview, for example
4. The KA10 process should be undertaken around the end of ST4; an earlier review is preferable to a late one.
5. StRs can choose the constitution and format of the process (e.g. informal conversation, more structured discussion, formal "panel" arrangement), subject to the following conditions agreed at STC:
   a. The conversation should be a single group meeting, not a series of 1:1s
   b. At least one member of the meeting should be a consultant who neither knows well nor has worked closely with the StR.
   c. The meeting should include two or more Consultants who have educational roles or who are trained and participate in consultant level appraisal, AAC panels, or similar

activities; the total number of consultants invited to the meeting is a decision for the registrar. It may be that several individuals able to provide perspectives on a variety of career options may be helpful, for example.

    d. The ES would not usually be involved in the meeting but if this is felt to be beneficial then it is not prohibited (a ES pre-meeting report may be provided and the registrar is expected to discuss review feedback with their ES).

6. The StR may identify other registrars who are also at the stage of requiring a KA10 review, in which case a single meeting of consultants, subject to the above conditions, may address several StRs' KA10 reviews. Registrars would not be present for other registrars' reviews and registrars are responsible for co-ordinating group reviews.

7. The StR can approach the Programme Administrator for an up to date list of names and contacts of Consultants who are willing to sit on a KA10 panel. The registrar will provide the TPD with the names of the KA10 review participants for approval at least one month before the agreed meeting date. The StR should already have approached those on the list and discussed the process, desired format and possible dates for the meeting. After approval, the registrar should send a copy of the KA10 pack to the panel members, which outlines their roles and expectations (appendix).

8. At least one week before the agreed meeting date, the registrar should send the following to the meeting attendees:
    a. 3 reflective pieces (mandatory – see note 9)
    b. 360 MSF report (mandatory)
    c. Optional documents:
        i. CV
        ii. ES report on reflections
        iii. Reflection on 360 / MSF

9. The reflective pieces of writing should cover three practice areas: Public health expertise, Personal effectiveness and impact, and Commitment to public health values. Guidance in the KA10 pack contains more information on these and the specific KA10 competencies to which they refer. FPH guidance recommends that each should be of around 1000 words; this should be taken as guidance only but registrars should take care to ensure that their pieces are of sufficient length and depth to provide adequate content for discussion at the meeting. The format is of the registrar's choosing.

10. The panel meeting should be approximately 1 hour per registrar in total. This should include panel discussion while the registrar is out of the room and feedback to the registrar (if that is the format the registrar has decided on) or panel agreement on the written summary after the end of the discussion including the registrar.

11. The Programme Administrator can support the meeting with access to teleconferencing / video calling if required. The meeting would be expected to last for around 60 minutes.

12. One consultant member of the meeting should take notes based on the feedback template in the KA10 pack, agree these notes with the other members of the meeting and commit to sending this feedback to the StR for discussion with the Educational Supervisor.

Document control	
Last reviewed: 16th April 2021	V1 - Author: Anne Swift, Also agreed by: Sara Godward & Kirsteen Watson, TPD; Jan Yates, HoS; STC & PHREE Chairs
Last reviewed & updated 28th May 2021	V2 – Kirsteen Watson, Hannah Gunn,
Last reviewed & updated 10th June 2021	V3 - Agreed by: Sara Godward & Kirsteen Watson, TPD; Jan Yates, HoS;
Next review due: April 2023	