

Preparing for revalidation

Self-review of practice for clinical radiologists undertaking interventional procedures

Tools for improving professional practice in
clinical radiology

This tool is designed by The Royal College of Radiologists (RCR) to help clinical radiologists to collect the supporting information required for revalidation.

The RCR would also recommend using these methods to help improve professional practice, irrespective of when the first round of revalidation is implemented.

A series of further tools and pro formas is currently in development and will be added in the future.

As the revalidation process develops and changes with implementation, the RCR will review its tools and would expect the portfolio to evolve. Any feedback to assist with this process would be most welcome.

Relevant background RCR guidance related to professional performance

1. *Standards for Self-Assessment of Performance* – includes a range of methods for monitoring personal professional performance
2. *Standards for Radiology Discrepancy Meetings* – including recommendations for attendance rates and documentation of cases discussed
3. *Cancer Multidisciplinary Team Meetings – Standards for Clinical Radiologists* – includes recommendations for attendance and dealing with discrepancies
4. *Standards for patient confidentiality and PACS* – guidance on professional standards for confidentiality related to radiologists' routine work, teaching and research
5. *Standards for the communication of critical, urgent and unexpected significant radiological findings* – includes professional guidance on compliance with NPSA safer practice notice 16 and recording of action taken
6. AuditLive – a selection of recommended audits <http://www.rcr.ac.uk/CRAuditLive>

List of radiology-specific tools published

- *Multisource feedback: recommended specialty-specific questions, generic questions related to performance and guidance for use*
- *Peer review: guidance on the use of double reporting*
- *Personal reflection on discrepancies and adverse events*
- *Self-review of practice for diagnostic radiologists*
- *Recording attendance at radiology discrepancy meetings*
- *Case-based discussion for diagnostic radiologists*

List of generic tools published

- *Reflection on complaints: a tool for clinical oncologists and clinical radiologists*
- *Reflection on compliments: a tool for clinical oncologists and clinical radiologists*
- *Reflection on serious untoward incidents (SUIs): a tool for clinical oncologists and clinical radiologists*
- *Revalidation audit tool*
- *Revalidation continuing professional development (CPD) summary tool*
- *Reflection on 'near miss' incidents: a tool for clinical oncologists and clinical radiologists*
- *Attendance at mandatory training: a tool for clinical oncologists and clinical radiologists*
- *Supporting information for health for use in appraisal and revalidation*
- *Supporting information for probity for use in appraisal and revalidation*

Introduction

The Royal College of Radiologists (RCR) considers it important to provide tools which Fellows and members could use to produce the supporting information that they will require to achieve revalidation, and to support them in improving their professional practice.

The RCR has developed this tool to allow clinical radiologists undertaking interventional procedures to review their practice, record the outcome and reflect on the results. This could be used as a form of supporting information for revalidation.

The RCR has published its specialist standards framework¹ which details the types of supporting information clinical radiologists and clinical oncologists will need to produce to support their revalidation.

Please anonymise any patient information/data used during this exercise.

As revalidation processes develop and change with implementation, the RCR will review its revalidation tools and would expect them to evolve over time. We would welcome any feedback from those who use this tool to assist with this process.

Aim

The aim is to critically appraise your own work, in order to discover strengths and weaknesses and assess the consistency of your practice.

Method

Review 10–20 (depending on complexity) previous procedures which you have carried out. These should either be consecutive or chosen at random. The review should take place with the relevant clinical information or patients' notes available.

The following questions should be answered for each case.

- On review, was the chosen procedure appropriate?
- On reflection, would you have carried out the procedure any differently? If yes, how?
- How do you rate your performance in this procedure:
 - Suboptimal?
 - Fair?
 - Good?
- Any further comments?

The table in **Appendix A** is provided as a means of recording the outcome of the review.

Reflection on the outcome of the review is as important as the results and that reflection should include what you learnt from the exercise, if you identified any particular strengths or weaknesses and whether you will be carrying out any further actions as a result. The template in **Appendix B** is provided as a means of recording your reflections.

References

1. The Royal College of Radiologists. *Specialty standards and supporting information for revalidation*. London: The Royal College of Radiologists, 2010.

Appendix A. Table to record outcome of self-review of practice

Case Number	On review, was the chosen procedure appropriate?	On reflection, would you have carried out the procedure any differently? If yes, how?	How do you rate your performance in this procedure?	Any comments
1			<input type="checkbox"/> Suboptimal <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good	
2			<input type="checkbox"/> Suboptimal <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good	
3			<input type="checkbox"/> Suboptimal <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good	
4			<input type="checkbox"/> Suboptimal <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good	
5			<input type="checkbox"/> Suboptimal <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good	
etc			<input type="checkbox"/> Suboptimal <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good	

Appendix B. Template to record reflections on results of self-review of practice

Date self-review of practice exercise was undertaken

What did you learn from this exercise?

Did you identify any particular strengths or weaknesses? Give examples if appropriate.

Are you carrying out any further actions as a result? Eg, changes to practice, further review etc.

Citation details:

The Royal College of Radiologists. *Self-review of practice for clinical radiologists undertaking interventional procedures*. London: The Royal College of Radiologists, 2010.

Ref No. BFCR(10)11 © The Royal College of Radiologists, July 2010

For permission to reproduce any of the content contained herein, please email: permissions@rcr.ac.uk

This material has been produced by The Royal College of Radiologists (RCR) for use internally within the National Health Service in the United Kingdom. It is provided for use by appropriately qualified professionals, and the making of any decision regarding the applicability and suitability of the material in any particular circumstance is subject to the user's professional judgement.

While every reasonable care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of the material, RCR cannot accept any responsibility for any action taken, or not taken, on the basis of it. As publisher, RCR shall not be liable to any person for any loss or damage, which may arise from the use of any of the material. The RCR does not exclude or limit liability for death or personal injury to the extent only that the same arises as a result of the negligence of RCR, its employees, Officers, members and Fellows, or any other person contributing to the formulation of the material.