

Perceptions on Competence by Design in urology

Peter (Zhan Tao) Wang¹; Ernest Chan¹; Adam Forster²; Jennifer Vergel De Dios³; Alp Sener^{1,4}; Sumit Dave^{1,5}; Saad Chahine⁶

¹Department of Surgery, Division of Urology, Western University, London, ON, Canada; ²Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, London, ON, Canada; ³Department of Anesthesiology, Western University, London, ON, Canada; ⁴Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Western University, London, ON, Canada; ⁵Department of Pediatrics, Western University, London, ON, Canada; ⁶Department of Medicine, Faculty of Education, Western University, London, ON, Canada

Cite as: *Can Urol Assoc J* 2018 November 20; Epub ahead of print.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.5610>

Published online November 20, 2018

Abstract

Introduction: The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada has begun implementing Competence by Design (CBD). However, it is unclear how much urology trainees and faculty know about CBD, their attitudes towards this change, and their willingness to embrace and participate in this new model of training.

Methods: This cross-sectional study was conducted through an online survey, which was administered to all trainees and faculty at Canadian urology programs prior to the implementation of CBD. The final survey consisted of eight demographic questions, 17 five-point Likert items, one visual analog scale question, 11 multiple selection questions, and two open-ended questions.

Results: A total of 74 participants (38 faculty and 36 trainees) across 12 universities responded, with a completion rate of 82.4%. This corresponded to an overall response rate of 20.5%. Overall, there was a lack of resounding enthusiasm towards this shift to CBD in urology. Although both trainees and faculty had overall positive perceptions of CBD on assessment, teaching, and readiness, most agreed that this transition will be costly and associated with increased requirements for time, funding, and administrative support. Furthermore, there were significant concerns regarding the lack of valid assessment tools and evidence for the validity of entrustable professional activities.

Conclusions: While this survey has demonstrated an appreciation for the benefits of CBD, challenges are equally anticipated. CBD in urology will be a fertile research area; this study has identified several important educational questions regarding the model's effectiveness and consequences, thus, providing collaborative opportunities among all Canadian programs.

Introduction

Introducing competency-based medical education (CBME) without understanding readiness for program transition may be detrimental to its successful implementation. Globally, training programs are embarking on this major transformation by moving away from the “time-based” model of postgraduate medical education and instead focusing on the process of attaining competence on key expectations of the profession.^{1,2}

The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada (RCPSC) has begun implementing a customized version of this learner-centered, outcomes-based approach to training and assessment called Competence by Design (CBD). This approach to training fits within the Canadian context, and is proposed to be more flexible, accountable, and adaptable.^{3,4} Using a staged rollout, the process has already started in urology as of July 2018. However, it is unclear how much urology trainees and faculty know about CBD, their attitudes towards this change in medical pedagogy, and their willingness to embrace and participate in this new model of medical training.

Literature review

Little is known about the readiness of programs embarking on a CBD transformation.⁵ Interviews with Canadian program directors and residents in anesthesiology prior to the implementation of CBD indicated a variety of perceived challenges, including increased burden on program administration, implications for trainees, and ambiguity regarding “competence” and how evaluation will be performed.⁶ Similar findings were demonstrated by Mann et al. in a preliminary study of residents on their perceptions of CBD.⁷ In the United States, members of the Residency Review Committee for Urology⁸ highlighted the paucity of effective evaluation tools and lack of evidence that these changes will ultimately improve the training of residents. Despite these uncertainties, all urology residency training programs will be making the transition to CBD.

Competence by Design refines how educators and trainees interact and work together. Specifically, CBD involves generating a new approach to trainee evaluation through developing and implementing tools that focus on meeting milestones. There is also a focus on creating a learner-centered curriculum, with emphasis on objective trainee competency as a necessity for graduation.⁹ Competency is achieved by meeting proficiency in required entrustable professional activities (EPAs) prior to the conclusion of training. Entrustable professional activities are the fundamental units of training that are required for unsupervised practice in each program, developed by consensus agreements within specialty working groups for that program.

Some have challenged the comprehensiveness of EPAs to act as a representation of physician competency. Inconsistencies also exist in the decisions surrounding which EPAs should be assessed, how the milestones (subunits of EPAs) ought to be evaluated, and how many times a trainee needs to be evaluated on an EPA to be deemed competent. This lack of agreement coupled with unfamiliarity about CBD may result in “logistical chaos.”⁹

Furthermore, some authors have postulated that an EPA-centric curriculum would remove important clinical experiences deemed unnecessary to achieve competence, creating a utilitarian approach to the trainee.⁹ However, our current experience is unknown, and these uncertainties undocumented.

Objectives

In this study, we seek to compare the perceptions and attitudes of trainees (residents/fellows) and faculty towards CBD within urology, as well as identify perceived benefits and challenges of this transition.

Methods

Institutional ethical approval was obtained (IRB#111397). This cross-sectional study was conducted through an online survey (Qualtrics) comprising both qualitative and quantitatively-based items. The survey was administered to all trainees and faculty at Canadian urology programs in April 2018, with all data collected prior to the implementation of CBD in July 2018.

Survey design

The survey was designed to evaluate five constructs related to CBD: teaching, assessment, institutional readiness, influences on academic/clinical practice, and time commitment. An extensive list of survey items was developed by three educators using brainstorming sessions and literature review (PW, SC, and JV).

Survey items were then reviewed by five urology faculty at Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry. These experts rated items from 1-10 (10 = very important). Items that were rated 7 or higher were kept for the final survey, while items rated 4 or below were removed. Items rated 5-6 were modified, retained, or removed based on expert opinion.

The final survey consisted of eight demographic questions, seventeen 5-point Likert items (5=Strongly Agree, 1=Strongly Disagree), one visual analog scale (VAS) question, eleven multiple selection questions, and two open-ended questions (Appendix). All but the open-ended questions were required for the completion of the survey. The multiple selection questions elicited binary responses (agree/disagree) on benefits (26 items) and challenges (27 items) of CBD described by previous qualitative studies and the RCPSC.^{2,6,10}

Participant recruitment

Trainees and faculty from 12 Canadian urology programs were electronically solicited to participate in the study. Participants were provided with an anonymous link to the survey. Participation was voluntary with submission of the survey implying consent. All potential participants were invited to respond within 1 month with a reminder sent 4 weeks afterwards.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were performed on the demographic data. Prior to comparative analyses, Cronbach's alphas were computed to investigate the reliability of the constructs used to design the survey and to provide evidence supporting valid interpretations. The Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR-20) reliability index was used to estimate internal consistency within the perceived benefits and challenges.

Perceptions of the five constructs, as well as the perceived benefits and challenges between faculty and trainees were compared using independent samples t-tests with Bonferroni corrections applied. Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS (version 25, IBM) and IteMan (<http://www.assess.com/iteman/>).

Qualitative analysis

A general thematic analysis was used to determine patterns of responses to open-ended questions. Each response was reviewed and thematically coded by two research team members (AF and EC). The team met after the initial coding to refine the themes. Themes were then reviewed once more for final confirmation. The most common themes identified are presented in this paper with representative quotes.

Results

A total of 74 participants (38 faculty and 36 trainees) responded with a completion rate of 82.4%. This corresponds to a response rate of 20.2% among academic Urology faculty and 20.8% among Urology trainees (20.5% response rate overall). Of the faculty, 27 (71.1%) were Residency Training Committee (RTC) members. Tables 1A/B summarizes the distribution of the trainees by PGY year and faculty by years in practice.

Overall, there were no significant differences between trainees and faculty in terms of favorability of CBD (6.0 ± 2.1 versus 5.0 ± 2.5 , $p = 0.91$), such that both groups did not have overtly positive or negative favorability towards the implementation of CBD. Among faculty, 24 (64.9%) believed that their program was ready for CBD.

Perceptions

Four of the five constructs were made up of multiple items, while time commitment was summarized in one item. The four multi-item constructs analyzed are summarized in Supplementary Table 1. Overall, the four multi-item constructs had high internal consistency: teaching ($\alpha=0.87$), assessment ($\alpha=0.83$), readiness ($\alpha=0.81$), and influence ($\alpha=0.87$).

Table 2 summarizes the comparison of CBD perceptions between faculty and trainees. Specifically, there were no significant differences between faculty and trainees with regard to their perceptions of assessment, teaching, and readiness; both groups had overall positive perceptions towards these constructs. For example, both faculty and trainees perceived a benefit

on the assessment of trainees, which included improved quality of feedback and ability to identify specific areas of weakness (faculty 3.82 ± 0.90 versus trainees 3.83 ± 0.66 , $p = 0.865$).

While both groups agreed CBD would increase the time commitment required of faculty, there was a significant difference in the strength of agreement (4.57 ± 0.56 versus 4.00 ± 0.89 , $p = 0.002$). However, more faculty perceived a negative influence of CBD on their clinical or academic practice, whereas trainees demonstrated an overall neutral stance on this construct (2.57 ± 0.81 versus 3.15 ± 0.91 , $p = 0.006$).

Benefits and challenges

There was high internal consistency for the benefit (KR-20=0.94) and challenge (KR-20=0.94) items on the multiple selection questions. Overall, participants agreed on 46% of the 26 benefit items. Similarly, participants agreed on 46% of the challenges. The correlation was moderate ($r=0.52$), suggesting those who perceived more benefits also perceived more challenges.

The perceived benefits are summarized in Table 3. The most common benefit perceived by both groups was an improved ability to identify specific areas of weakness, although a significantly higher proportion of trainees perceived this to be a benefit compared to faculty (97.1% versus 74.2%, $p = 0.026$).

The most prevalent theme among the top benefits related to assessment and feedback (8/10). The last two items related to improved accountability and transparency in resident training. Surprisingly, the role of a competency committee was not globally perceived as a benefit. Similarly, most respondents did not view CBD as being beneficial to patient care, resident wellness, or the transitions between medical school, residency and independent practice.

Table 4 highlights the top challenges perceived by the participants. There were no statistical differences in the responses between the two groups. The top 6 challenges were related to increases in the resources required for the implementation of CBD (time, cost, and administrative support) and the subsequent impact on clinical practice.

The last 4 challenges described concerns regarding ‘process’ items of CBD including the lack of valid assessment tools, difficulties in achieving rare EPAs, unequal distribution of evaluations amongst faculty (‘gaming’ the system by trainees) and remediation in the form of individualized learning programs. Items relating to number of common cases, resident competition and scheduling, as well as impacts on future fellowship and employment were not viewed as significant challenges.

Qualitative analysis

The common themes identified from the qualitative analysis were similar to our quantitative results. Representative quotes are included in Supplementary Table 2 to exemplify the emotional tone of the responses.

When the respondents were asked to comment on their greatest concern regarding this transition into CBD, two common themes were identified: burden and lack of evidence. Overall, burden was the most prevalent theme and created the greatest degree of concordance between faculty and trainee. There is particular emphasis on time commitment required to complete EPAs meaningfully and a general paucity of preparedness at an administrative level. In addition, there was a collective concern regarding the unintended consequences of this increased burden on faculty, residents and patient care. The theme relating to the lack of evidence centered on EPAs as appropriate targets for resident competency, leading to a broader lack of confidence towards CBD as an effective way to structure a residency program.

This thematic analysis also identified two common benefits from the respondents: early identification and teaching/feedback. Unsurprisingly, the theme of identifying trainees with specific or global deficiency was common amongst the respondents. However, the general conviction and tone regarding this benefit were irresolute. Furthermore, there was a perception that CBD could foster consistent and continuous improvement among trainees through improved teaching resulting from regular feedback and well-defined targets.

Discussion

The RCPSC's CBD initiative branched from the recommendations by the Future of Medical Education in Canada Postgraduate Project (FMEC PG).¹ The rationale behind this shift towards CBD is that responsible medical education involves systematic deliberation (i.e., designing) of a learner's journey throughout their entire career.¹¹ Through CBD, this is achieved by training learners based on competencies that are required by an independently practicing healthcare professional. This is facilitated through discipline-specific assessment, increased emphasis on direct and indirect observation, and provision of timely, constructive, and specific feedback.^{4,12}

By focusing on the development of competence through EPAs, CBD shifts the focus of residency to learning as opposed to time spent in training. This is thought to ensure competence, support development of skills and abilities throughout practice, address gaps in training, increase accountability, and promote transparency in resident training.⁴ Such needs in urology have previously been described by Morrison and MacNeily¹³, who indicated that many specialized clinical areas of urology required increased emphasis, as well as a need for preparing residents in their transition to independent practice.

In this study, we found a general sense of uncertainty and neutral favorability toward CBD amongst urologists and urology trainees in Canada. The perceived benefits of CBD are self-evident. Both faculty and trainees agreed that improved assessment and feedback were the overarching hallmark of this training model, with a specific focus on the ability to identify specific areas of weakness. These findings correlate well with previous qualitative studies.^{6,7} However, when discussing this benefit, Boet et al. cautions us that one must also note and understand the ambiguity surrounding definitions of 'competence'.⁶

Competency, as defined by the RCPSC, is “an observable ability of a health professional to integrate multiple components such as knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes. Since competencies are observable, they can be measured and assessed to ensure their acquisition. Competencies can be assembled like building blocks to facilitate progressive development”.^{2,9,12} However, the competencies of surgeons also include technical skills, which do not have a predefined gold standard.

Furthermore, these benefits are grounded on the assumption that providing routine evaluation and feedback improves learning. However, this also assumes that we have valid and effective evaluation tools for our EPAs. This may not be the case, as lack of valid assessment tools was perceived to be a common challenge among urologists. This limitation is further compounded by the variability in the development of assessment tools across the different programs in Canada, as well as the pseudo-requirement of basing these tools on the O-score, which was validated on a population of orthopedic and general surgery residents.¹⁴

Similar concerns were found regarding the accuracy of EPAs in our qualitative analyses. Apramian et al. described how different surgeons had divergent views on whether or not certain procedural steps were principles versus preferences for the same surgery.^{15,16} If the success of CBD is predicated on the accurate measurement of competence and constructs of EPAs, then this discordance further muddies the potential benefit of CBD.

The challenges demonstrated in this study were similar to previous studies, citing increased resource allocation as a major deterrent to the implementation of CBD. This challenge includes both the increased financial and administrative burden placed on Canadian programs. Overall, 80% of participants perceive a detrimental effect on the day-to-day clinical practice of faculty due to CBD. In addition, there were concerns regarding ‘gaming’ or choosing ‘easy’ evaluators by trainees and whether this would unevenly distribute the burden of assessment.

These perceived challenges provide insight into important educational questions: What are the unintended consequences of this implementation moving forward? How will the increased frequency of assessment affect the emotional well-being of the trainees and faculty? How will trainee or faculty fatigue affect the accuracy of these assessments? Certain parallels may be drawn from the frequent high-stakes ‘testing’ of the “No Child Left Behind” initiative in the United States. A survey conducted by Jones et al. showed that 48.5% of teachers felt frequent high-stakes testing had a negative impact on students’ “love of learning” and 61% percent felt their students were more anxious because of it.¹⁷ Educator ‘burn-out’ due to this initiative has also been described.¹⁸

Limitations

The interpretation of this study is limited by the biases inherent to a relatively small response rate and study population. Furthermore, a French language version of this survey was not available, which may have reduced our response rates. In addition, given the ‘fait accompli’ of CBD implementation, the responses to this survey may be different if this study was performed prior

to the decision of implementing CBD. Lastly, the current trainees taking part in this survey are unaffected by the process, as CBD is only relevant and instituted for new PGY1s.

Although this is the first study to uniformly survey both faculty and trainees of a subspecialty surgical program, these findings may not be generalizable to non-surgical programs. However, the findings of this survey may provide important insight to other surgical programs due for CBD implementation in the coming years.

Conclusion

Overall, this study has shown a lack of resounding enthusiasm towards this shift to CBD in urology. Although both trainees and faculty had overall positive perceptions of CBD on assessment, teaching and readiness, most agreed that this transition will be costly and associated with increased requirements for time, funding, and administrative support. Furthermore, there were significant concerns regarding the lack of valid assessment tools and evidence for the validity of entrustable professional activities. Competence by Design in urology will be a fertile research area. This study has identified several important educational questions regarding the model's effectiveness and potential consequences, thus providing collaborative opportunities amongst all Canadian programs.

References

1. Busing N, Harris K, MacLellan A-M, et al. The future of postgraduate medical education in Canada. *Academic Medicine* 2015;90:1258-63.
2. Harris K, Frank J. Competence by design: Reshaping Canadian medical education. *Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada* 2014.
3. Iobst WF, Sherbino J, Cate OT, et al. Competency-based medical education in postgraduate medical education. *Medical teacher* 2010;32:651-6.
4. Competence By Design. The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, 2017. (Accessed November 26, 2017, 2017, at <http://www.royalcollege.ca/rcsite/cbd/competence-by-design-cbd-e.>)
5. Van Melle E, Frank J, Brzezniak S, et al. Competency by Design-Residency Education: A framework for program evaluation. Ottawa, ON: Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada; 2017.
6. Boet S, Pigford A-AE, Naik VN. Program director and resident perspectives of a competency-based medical education anesthesia residency program in Canada: a needs assessment. *Korean Journal of Medical Education* 2016;28:157-68.
7. Mann S, Hastings A, Egan R. Resident Perceptions of Competency-Based Medical Education 2016.
8. Kerfoot BP, Mitchell ME, Novick AC. Grappling with the evaluation of clinical competencies: a view from the Residency Review Committee for Urology. *Urology* 2002;60:223-4.
9. Frank JR, Snell LS, Cate OT, et al. Competency-based medical education: theory to practice. *Medical teacher* 2010;32:638-45.
10. Sonnadara RR, Mui C, McQueen S, et al. Reflections on Competency-Based Education and Training for Surgical Residents. *Journal of Surgical Education* 2014;71:151-8.
11. RCPSC. Competence by Design: What you need to know. A Resident's Guide. Ottawa, ON: Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada; 2017.
12. Holmboe ES, Sherbino J, Long DM, et al. The role of assessment in competency-based medical education. *Medical teacher* 2010;32:676-82.
13. Morrison KB, MacNeily AE. Core competencies in surgery: evaluating the goals of urology residency training in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Surgery* 2006;49:259-66.
14. Gofton WT, Dudek NL, Wood TJ, et al. The Ottawa surgical competency operating room evaluation (O-SCORE): a tool to assess surgical competence. *Academic Medicine* 2012;87:1401-7.
15. Apramian T, Cristancho S, Sener A, et al. How Do Thresholds of Principle and Preference Influence Surgeon Assessments of Learner Performance? *Ann Surg* 2018;268:385-90.
16. Apramian T, Cristancho S, Watling C, et al. Thresholds of Principle and Preference: Exploring Procedural Variation in Postgraduate Surgical Education. *Acad Med* 2015;90:S70-6.
17. Jones MG, Jones BD, Hardin B, et al. The impact of high-stakes testing on teachers and students in North Carolina. *The Phi Delta Kappan* 1999;81:199-203.

18. Berryhill J, Linney JA, Fromewick J. The Effects of Education Accountability on Teachers: Are Policies Too-Stress Provoking for Their Own Good? *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership* 2009;4:1-14.

DRAFT

Figures and Tables

Trainee	PGY level	Number (%)
	1	8 (22.2)
	2	3 (8.3)
	3	8 (22.2)
	4	3 (8.3)
	5	7 (19.4)
	Fellow	7 (19.4)

Faculty	Years in practice	Number (%)
	0–5 years	5 (13.2)
	6–10 years	11 (28.9)
	11–15 years	8 (21.1)
	16–20 years	8 (21.1)
	>20 years	6 (15.8)

Construct	Faculty (n=38)	Resident/fellow (n=36)	
	Mean \pm SD		p
Teaching	3.40 \pm 0.86	3.71 \pm 0.76	0.107
Assessment	3.82 \pm 0.90	3.83 \pm 0.66	0.865
Readiness	3.66 \pm 0.86	3.42 \pm 0.72	0.254
Influence	2.57 \pm 0.81	3.15 \pm 0.91	0.006
Time commitment	4.57 \pm 0.56	4.00 \pm 0.89	0.002

*Likert scale: 5 – Strongly agree and 1 – Strongly disagree.

Rank (%)	Perceived benefits	Trainee (%)	Faculty (%)	p
1 (86.2)	Improve ability to identify specific areas of weakness	97.1	74.2	0.026
2 (83.1)	Identification of residents who require extra assistance	91.2	74.2	0.141
3 (78.5)	More personalized feedback	85.3	71.0	0.243
4 (76.2)	Improve residents' knowledge of the competencies they are expected to achieve	75.8	76.7	0.959
5 (76.2)	Improve residents' awareness/clarity of competency level that residents are expected to attain	75.8	76.7	0.447
6 (75.4)	Facilitate feedback delivery	76.5	74.2	0.263
7 (75.4)	Increase frequency of structured feedback	79.4	71.0	0.084
8 (75.4)	Increase accountability of faculty for resident education	76.5	74.2	0.311
9 (64.6)	Improve faculty awareness/clarity of competency level that residents are expected to attain	64.7	64.5	0.175
10 (64.5)	Promote transparency in residency training	68.8	60.0	0.769

Rank is based on response from both faculty and trainee.

Rank (%)	Perceived challenge	Trainee (%)	Faculty (%)	p
1 (93.4)	Increased administrative burden for faculty	90.3	96.7	0.513
2 (90.2)	Increased administrative burden for coordinators	87.1	93.3	0.189
3 (88.5)	Increased faculty time commitment to teaching	83.9	93.3	0.499
4 (88.5)	Need for faculty commitment and participation	83.9	93.3	0.395
5 (80.3)	Increased burden on clinical practice	80.3	80.0	0.111
6 (77.0)	Increase expenses required for implementation and maintenance of CBD	71.0	86.7	0.119
7 (68.9)	Lack of valid and reliable tool to measure program-specific competencies	64.5	73.3	0.715
8 (67.2)	Difficulty achieving competence in entrustable professional activities (EPAs) that occur uncommonly	64.5	70.0	0.398
9 (67.2)	Promote selective evaluation by residents (residents choose "easy" evaluators)	64.5	70.0	0.31
10 (65.6)	Need for development of individualized learning programs	61.3	70.0	0.75

Rank is based on response from both faculty and trainee.

Supplementary Table 1. Constructs and included items used for validity and reliability testing				
Construct	Item	Mean	SD	n
Teaching		3.44	0.87	73
	CBD will improve my teaching of residents	3.45	0.91	73
	CBD will improve my role as a teacher	3.44	0.88	73
	CBD helps identify residents who require extra assistance	3.77	0.97	73
Assessment		3.83	0.78	73
	CBD will improve my feedback to residents	4.19	0.79	73
	CBD will improve my ability to identify specific areas in need of improvement for resident feedback	3.86	0.93	73
	CBD will improve my evaluation of residents	3.77	1.01	73
	CBD makes my institution more accountable for our graduates	3.47	1.09	72
Readiness		3.51	0.80	72
	I am comfortable with my current knowledge of CBD	3.64	0.98	72
	I received or will receive adequate training prior to the implementation of CBD	3.76	0.87	68
	I am comfortable with the implementation process of CBD	3.13	1.19	70
	My program is/was prepared for the transition into CBD	3.59	0.93	69
Influence		2.86	0.90	72
	CBD will have a positive influence on my academic practice	3.04	1.04	70
	CBD will have a positive influence on my clinical practice (output)	2.60	1.01	70
	CBD will have a positive influence on patient care	2.90	0.98	60
Time	CBD increases staff time commitment to residents	4.29	0.79	73

Likert scale: 5 – Strongly agree and 1 – Strongly disagree. SD: standard deviation.

Supplementary Table 2. Common themes and representative quotes from qualitative analysis	
Themes	Representative quotes
Burden	<p><i>“This is going to be a big burden on residents and staff for the frequent evaluations that have to be done for each EPA. I’m just not sure how receptive the staff will be with each evaluation.”</i></p> <p><i>“...the quality of evaluations will be meaningless. We don’t have time to do these many evaluations. We are first and foremost providing patient care, and this CBD structure will compromise patient care.”</i></p>
Lack of evidence	<p><i>“(The) specificity of the EPA model loses any value when the ITER/global assessment model may have had in determining whether the resident is ‘getting along well’, which is different from ‘meeting an academic milestone’.”</i></p> <p><i>“(There is a) lack of evidence first off to suggest it is any better (than the current model). Lack of validated competency endpoints.”</i></p> <p><i>“Validated assessment tools are lacking.”</i></p> <p><i>“There is no objective measure to indicate that this will create a more competent resident after five years.”</i></p> <p><i>“Inter-rater reliability creates further assessment challenges.”</i></p>
Early identification	<p><i>“(CBD will) hopefully be able to pick out people who are struggling earlier on.”</i></p> <p><i>“Timely constructive feedback will enhance early education.”</i></p>
Teaching/feedback	<p><i>“Increased...awareness of EPAs among attendings will foster better attention to the specifics of the task and attention to components of patient care that may be undersubscribed.”</i></p> <p><i>“The increased frequency in feedback will allow residents to improve more continuously.”</i></p>

Q1.1. What is your status?

- Resident/Fellow
- Faculty

Q1.2. How many years of practice have you been in?

- 0-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- > 20 years
- Not applicable

Q1.3. What is your PGY level?

- PGY-1
- PGY-2
- PGY-3
- PGY-4
- PGY-5
- PGY-6
- Postgraduate Fellow

Q33. Are you currently in a competency-based medical education stream, e.g. Competence by Design (CBD)?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

Q1.4. What is your gender?

Q1.5. What is your institutional name?

Western University ▼

Q1.6. Are you currently a member of the Competence Committee?

- Yes
- No

Q1.7. Are you currently a member of your department/division's Residency Program/Training Committee?

- Yes
- No

Perceptions of CBD

Q2.1. MEDICAL EDUCATION

Please choose the statement that most accurately describes your opinion:

"CBD improved or will improve..."

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
My teaching of residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My role as a teacher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My feedback to residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
My ability to identify specific areas in need of improvement for resident feedback	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My evaluation of residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q28. MEDICAL EDUCATION

Please choose the statement that most accurately describes your opinion:

"CBD improved or will improve..."

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
Staff teaching of residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff role as a teacher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff feedback to residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
Staff ability to identify specific areas in need of improvement for resident feedback	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff evaluation of residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2.2. MEDICAL EDUCATION

Please choose the statement that most accurately describes your opinion:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
I am comfortable with my current knowledge of CBD	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
CBD makes my institution more accountable for our graduates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
CBD helps identify residents who require extra assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
CBD increases staff time commitment to residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2.3. IMPLEMENTATION

Please choose the statement that most accurately describes your opinion:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
--	-------------------	----------	---------------------------	-------	----------------	----------------

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
I received or will receive adequate training prior to the implementation of CBD	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am comfortable with the implementation process of CBD	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My program is/was prepared for the transition into CBD	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2.4. INFLUENCE OF CBD

Please choose the statement that most accurately describes your opinion:

"CBD has or will have a positive influence on..."

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree or Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
My academic practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My clinical practice (output)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Patient care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Favorability of CBD

Q3.1.

How favourable are you towards Competence by Design (CBD) for postgraduate training in your program?



0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Favorability of CBD										
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



Perceived Benefits

Q32. For the next set of questions, please drag-and-drop the "Item" from the left to the most appropriate response category on the right ("Benefit", "Not a Benefit", or "Unsure") that represents your views.

Q4.1.
Identifying residents & skill acquisition

In your opinion, what benefits have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items	Benefit
Improve acquisition of non-technical skills	Not a Benefit
5 / 5	Unsure

Q4.2.
Faculty & feedback

In your opinion, what benefits have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items	Benefit
Increase accountability of faculty for resident education competency level that residents are expected to attain	

attain

5 / 5

Not a Benefit

Unsure

**Q4.4.
Residents**

In your opinion, what benefits have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items

Increased accountability of residents to achieve competency

€ attain

Benefit

4 / 4

Not a Benefit

Unsure

Q53.

Accuracy of evaluation & graduates

In your opinion, what benefits have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items

Residents graduate with fewer knowledge/training gaps
Committee

5 / 5


Benefit

Not a Benefit

Unsure

Q4.5.
Training program

In your opinion, what benefits have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items	Benefit
 <p>Promote transparency in residency training</p>	
3 / 3	Not a Benefit
	Unsure

Q4.6.
Miscellaneous

In your opinion, what benefits have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items	Benefit
 <p>Improved patient care</p>	

professionalism

4 / 4

Not a Benefit

Unsure

Perceived Challenges

Q5.1. Faculty

In your opinion, what challenges have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items

Increased **administrative** burden for program coordinators
traditional model

7 / 7

Challenge

Not a Challenge

Unsure

**Q5.2.
Assessment**

In your opinion, what challenges have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items

Results in increased competition amongst residents that occur uncommonly

6 / 6

Challenge

Not a Challenge

Unsure

Q5.3.
Training program

In your opinion, what challenges have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items

Lack of valid and reliable tool to measure program-specific competencies

5 / 5

Challenge

Not a Challenge

Unsure

Q5.4.
Residents

In your opinion, what challenges have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items

Residents graduating with greater knowledge/training gaps

7 / 7

Challenge

Not a Challenge

Unsure

Q5.5. Miscellaneous

In your opinion, what challenges have resulted or will result from CBD?

Items

Worsen patient care for implementation and maintenance of CBD

2 / 2

Challenge

Not a Challenge

Unsure

Open-ended Questions Regarding CBD

Q6.1.

What are you most concerned about regarding the transition to CBD?

Q6.2.

What benefits do you foresee (or have already seen) resulting from this transition and why (even if none)?