Preparing for revalidation

Recording attendance at radiology discrepancy meetings

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](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
- Self-review of practice for clinical radiologists undertaking interventional procedures
- 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 to help Fellows and members produce the supporting information that they will require to achieve revalidation, and to support them in improving their professional practice.

The RCR publication *Standards for Radiology Discrepancy Meetings*\(^1\) emphasises the importance of discrepancy meetings to facilitate collective learning from radiology discrepancies leading to improved professional practice and, as a result, raising the standards of patient care and safety. The recommended standard within the document for minimum individual attendance at local radiology discrepancy meetings is at least 50% at all meetings held. The standard for the minimum frequency of meetings held is at least every two months. The pro forma within this document allows radiologists to document that they are meeting these standards for attendance at discrepancy meetings and to reflect on what they have learnt and any changes to practice that have been implemented as a result.

In addition to attending discrepancy meetings, the RCR also recommends personal reflection on discrepancies and has published a separate tool *Personal reflection on discrepancies and adverse events*\(^2\) to allow radiologists to record evidence of personal reflection.

The RCR has published its specialist standards framework\(^3\) which details the types of supporting information clinical radiologists will need to produce to support their revalidation. Evidence of attendance at discrepancy meetings comes under the ‘Practice’ section.

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 radiologists who use the pro forma to assist with this process.
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### Pro forma to record attendance at discrepancy meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequently are discrepancy meetings held in your department? (Please note the RCR recommended standard(^1) for minimum frequency of meetings held is at least every two months).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many were actually held in the last 12 months?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many did you attend?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have copies of the attendance register? Please attach if available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you reach the RCR target attendance rate of 50%? (^1) If not, please state the reason(s) for this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you learn from the discrepancies presented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what way has your practice/service altered as a result?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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