

ACADEMY REVALIDATION E-PORTFOLIO QUESTIONS

Following the Revalidation Steering Group meeting held on 16th February 2009, it was agreed that a number of questions would be circulated to the Colleges and Faculties for their feedback in relation to the development of e-portfolio. Responses were received from 14 of the Colleges and Faculties.

1. Does your College/Faculty support the notion of specialty e-portfolios for revalidation?

12 of the 14 Colleges who replied supported the development of specialty e-portfolio's for revalidation. The remaining 2 Colleges felt that the RST toolkit could be sufficient for revalidation, with the inclusion of specialty input from enhanced CPD and other assessment systems (e.g. MSF).

2. Does your College/Faculty support the idea of trying to develop a common e-portfolio across the specialties with specialty adaptations for revalidation?

Most of the responses indicated that there should be some common elements to an e-portfolio, but this may form a small part of the whole portfolio. Many Colleges and Faculties indicated that it may be possible to define some generic elements, but also felt that there would be significant specialty specific components to any e-portfolio for revalidation.

3. Is your College or Faculty a member of a cohort or working group looking at E-portfolio development in collaboration with other specialties?

4. If so, what cohort or working group is your College/Faculty associated with?

5. If not, would your College/Faculty be interested in joining a cohort or working group?

There appears to be only one cohort established at the moment, which is being facilitated by the RCP London. Membership of this cohort appears to be fluid but includes: RCPL; RCPSG; RCPE; RCOG; FOM; FPH; FPM; RCoA; RCPCH.

Those Colleges who responded but were not currently a member of a cohort indicated that they would be interested in becoming involved in a cohort if its aims and intentions were sufficiently aligned with those of the College.

6. If your College/Faculty would prefer to develop a specialty system alone, please explain the reasoning behind this decision.

Two of the Colleges indicated that they had already invested a lot of resources into developing systems for trainees and members. They felt that the best way forward for them was to build on these existing systems for revalidation.

7. How does your College/Faculty envisage a specialty e-portfolio will fit within the overall appraisal and revalidation process?

- Repository of information for inclusion in a doctor's portfolio of evidence for revalidation
- Central location of the collection of a range information and data – e.g. CPD; Clinical Audit; MSF; Appraisal etc
- It provides information for the recertification component of revalidation and could interrelate with the other information collected for appraisal and relicensing to inform the revalidation recommendation
- Provide a platform for outcome analysis and comparison of specialty specific standards
- Include reflection and self-analysis components for doctors without necessarily being included as evidence for revalidation
- Linking personal development plans with CPD

DOCUMENT 7

8. How much additional work would your College/Faculty estimate is required for you to develop a specialty system, including time and funding?

Many respondents felt they were unable to answer this question in any detail until the requirements and processes for revalidation became more definite. Estimates for initial work ranged from £50 000 - £100 000 per College or Faculty, although many of the responses did not include a figure at all.

9. Does your College/Faculty have a preferred provider for a specialty e-portfolio? If yes, who?

Only one College identified an external provider (Premier IT); two suggested they would want to build their systems in-house; and the others were unsure.

10. How does your College/Faculty intend to fund the maintenance and support for a specialty e-portfolio system if it is developed for revalidation?

The majority of the responses indicated that the ongoing costs of running an e-portfolio would need to be covered by the College or Faculty through subscriptions or other funds. Little mention was made of development costs and how these might be obtained. Some responses referred to possible development funding from within the College or from the DH.