ACOT
ALBERTA COLLEGE *of*
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS

Effective Date:	April 2021
Policy:	The Registrar or Competence Committee must periodically select regulated members in accordance with criteria established by the Council for a review and evaluation of an aggregate sample of regulated members' continuing competence program submissions.
Purposes:	The purposes of this policy are: 1. To outline the processes for selecting, reviewing and evaluating aggregate registrants' Continuing Competence Program (CCP) submissions. 2. To identify CCP submission trends in order to target training and supports. 3. Determine whether the CCP is an accurate indicator for OT competence.
Applicable Regulation:	*Occupational Therapists Profession Regulation Section 14*
Procedures:	In order to review and evaluate aggregate registrants' CCP submissions, the following procedures will be implemented:

1. Sampling – the semi-randomized sample of 10% of registrants' prior year CCP submissions used for individual level review and evaluations will be combined for a second phase of review and evaluation in an aggregated and anonymized sample each one to five years.

2. Review and evaluation – ACOT's Director of Policy and Practice will perform an initial review of the aggregate data and provide a draft report including the following elements for the Competence Committee's review and evaluation:
   a. Sample demographics (age, gender, years of practice)
   b. % of sample who selected one, two or three areas of focus in the self-assessment tool
   c. % of sample who scored at levels A, B or C for the submission.
   d. In order to determine whether the CCP is an accurate indicator for OT competence, a survey will be provided to all registrants, re-looking at selected questions asked in the 2018 and 2019 Review and Evaluation (Audit) surveys.

3. Recommendations – the Competence Committee will develop recommendations for Council's consideration and approval, based on the findings from the program level review and evaluation.

4. Publication – the final aggregate anonymized review and evaluation report and recommendations will be provided to all registrants every one to five years, as approved by Council.

Outcomes:

1. Trends in CCP submissions and level of satisfaction with the new CCP will be identified.
2. Actions will be taken based on the trends and level of satisfaction identified (e.g., development of additional support resources, and/or updates to the CCP or review and evaluation practices).
3. ACOT will meet the requirements set out in the *Occupational Therapists Profession Regulation Section 14*.
4. The CCP will be validated as a good proxy of registrants' competence.

ALBERTA COLLEGE of
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS

CCP Component	Criteria for acceptable (**bolded**), conditional and unacceptable content to include in a CCP submission	✓
Area of Focus Selection (via Self-Assessment)	**A. The one to three Standard of Practice (SoP) /Code of Ethics (CoE) indicator(s) selected indicate consideration of how SoP/CoE are applicable to registrant's practice area/setting regardless of role (i.e., clinical, non-clinical or non-traditional)**	
	B. Generic/overarching indicator(s) selected when registrant is not: a new graduate, returning from leave of absence or new to the Province (e.g., "1.1 Be registered with ACOT in accordance with provincial regulatory legislation")	
	Reviewer Feedback:	
Learning Plan		
- Initial Reflection on Area of Focus Selected	**A. Reason for why indicator(s) selected as an area(s) of focus specifically stated and aligns with indicator selected**	
	B. Reason for why indicator(s) selected as an area(s) of focus generally stated	
	C. Reason for why indicator(s) selected as an area(s) of focus not relevant OR Placeholder content (e.g., random characters such as "XXXX")	
	Reviewer Feedback:	
- Learning Goal(s)	**A. Learning goal(s) clearly stated or at least indicates what the registrant is working towards and aiming to learn, enhance or change in their practice (for example – specific/tangible, achievable/realistic and measurable)**	
	B. Learning goal(s) not specific or future-focused	
	C. Learning goal(s) content not relevant OR Placeholder content	
	Reviewer Feedback:	

[1] The intent of this rubric is twofold 1. for registrants to use as a guide for what to include in their CCP Submission; 2. for CCP Submission Reviewers to objectively rate and offer feedback on the acceptability of a CCP Submission.

Competece Portfolio	- Learning Records	Number of Learning Records attached within Learning Plan (maximum 12):	Goal-related	
			Non-goal related	
		A. Learning Record(s) completed includes description of activity(ies) undertaken and a reflection on learning		
		B. Learning Record(s) only lists activity(ies) completed; does not include a reflection on learning		
		C. Learning Record(s) incomplete <u>OR</u> Placeholder content (e.g., summary and reflection on learning content is not related)		
		<u>Reviewer Feedback:</u>		
	- Supporting Documents (if applicable)	If supporting documents are uploaded (note: not always required as Learning Record itself can act as a portfolio document)		
		A. Documents uploaded are not required as content in Learning Record(s) is adequate <u>OR</u> documents offer additional information/evidence to support content in a Learning Record such as: a list of webinars/learning sessions attended, articles reviewed, etc. (along with key takeaways from each); examples of materials prepared or presented; sample forms created; <u>redacted</u> clinical case/chart notes; program development plans/proposals; briefing notes; other documents that show the general quality of work; etc.		
		B. Documents do not offer additional information/evidence to Learning Record* content <u>OR</u> Not related to the content in the Learning Record to which they are attached *Note: Do not upload copies of proof of course/workshop attendance (e.g., certificates) or slide decks from presentations attended. Do not upload copies of articles/manuals/textbooks or other resources reviewed. Instead, you may list the titles in the Learning Record text box, include a URL or attach a summary list with key takeaways as described above. Reviewers are most interested in the written reflection in the Learning Record.		
		C. No documents uploaded <u>AND</u> Learning Record content is an inadequate substitute		
		<u>Reviewer Feedback:</u>		

-Goal Status and Reflection on Practice Impact	A.	Appropriate selection of goal completion status option(s). Content in text box(es) ties together reflection content from the Learning Records added for each goal unless otherwise stated in the criteria below. Acceptable criteria for each status option include:	
		Completed: Content includes at least one example of how learning is/will be applied or how practice has/will be enhanced/changed OR indicates "refer to summary and reflection in Learning Record" if only one Learning Record was completed for a goal and reflection in Learning Record has the required level of detail	
		Discontinued: Content includes summary of learning activities completed up to the point of discontinuation AND/OR describes why goal has been discontinued	
		Ongoing/In Progress: Includes at least one example of how learning undertaken up to the point of renewal is/will be applied or how practice has/will be enhanced/changed (OR indicates "refer to summary and reflection in Learning Record" if only one Learning Record was completed for a goal) AND indicates which activities will be undertaken in the next registration year to achieve goal completion	
	B.	Improper selection of goal completion status options as reflected in text box/reflection content. Conditional criteria for each status option include:	
		Completed: Content duplicates or does not relate to content in the Learning Record(s) related to each goal AND/OR no example(s) provided of how learning is/will be applied or how practice has/will be enhanced/changed, etc.	
		Discontinued: Content offers no summary of learning activities completed up to point of goal discontinuation AND/OR no description of why goal has been discontinued	
		Ongoing/In Progress: Content offers no summary of learning completed up to the point of renewal AND/OR does not indicate activities to be undertaken in the next registration year to achieve goal completion	
	C.	Insufficient or placeholder content used in any of the status option text boxes	
		Reviewer Feedback:	

[1] The intent of this rubric is twofold a. for registrants to use as a guide for what to include in their CCP Submission; b. for CCP Submission Reviewers to objectively rate and offer feedback on the acceptability of a CCP Submission.

Overall Reviewer Feedback:

Overall rating of the CCP Submission*	✓	Action Required by Registrant	Notes to Registrant
A. <u>Acceptable</u>: The CCP Submission reviewed meets or exceeds ACOT's expectations for an acceptable submission.		If the reviewer has provided feedback for improvement in any of the sections, incorporate that feedback into next year's submission.	Your name will not be put back into the pool for randomization for 5 years unless requested or required.
B. <u>Conditional</u> – Revisions to be incorporated into next year's submission: The CCP Submission reviewed has minor content missing and does not meet ACOT's expectations for an acceptable submission.		Incorporate reviewer feedback into next year's submission.	**Your CCP Submission will be reviewed again next year** to verify that feedback has been incorporated. Refer to the various CCP Resources for guidance on how to complete your submission to an acceptable standard.
C. <u>Not Acceptable</u> – Revisions to be incorporated into this year's submission: The CCP Submission reviewed has major content missing and does not meet ACOT's expectations for an acceptable submission.		Your current CCP Submission is being sent back for immediate incorporation of reviewer feedback.	**You have 30 days to complete the required amendments to this year's submission.** Your CCP Submission will be reviewed again next year to verify that feedback has been incorporated. Refer to the various CCP Resources for guidance on how to complete your submission to an acceptable standard and reach out to the ACOT office to discuss next steps and supports available.

*The overall rating of a submission being A. Acceptable; B. Conditional; or C. Not Acceptable, is based on a Reviewer's overall impression of the quality of the submission even if there are variances in individual section ratings.

[1] The intent of this rubric is twofold a. for registrants to use as a guide for what to include in their CCP Submission; b. for CCP Submission Reviewers to objectively rate and offer feedback on the acceptability of a CCP Submission.