

Summary of Regulator Input Regarding Motion from Floor

<p>BC</p>	<p>In terms of impact we would I believe need to register anyone with a similar license based on our current bylaws. I don't think the fact we name the PCE really matters as it would afford the person the same rights in SK as BC.</p> <p>On motions 2 and 3 I am not sure what else can be shared and is not transparent now. Think it's a question for CAPR with expertise to answer.</p> <p>It also seems to me that the PCE maybe the most evaluated exam ever. I suppose that doesn't answer the question of is it the right exam but is it a good process it seems like the answer is yes.</p> <p>While you did not ask for other comments this begs the question is it not a COI coming from educators?</p>
<p>NS</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Board sets exam requirement in NS so a potential issue if we stay with PCE as I suspect we would. 2. Transparency is a two way street - universities should have the students share their exam performance with them (they do get results) and use the feedback to review the education program constructively with student feedback. 3. I think CAPR has always been transparent in their processes (increasingly so in the past few years) with the Board and Registrars and it is up to us to take that information back. There is also information on the website. <p>I fully support convening a work group, but suggest that it look at both sides of the issue which is, higher failure rates and exam validity before they talk of removal of the exam. It is possible that the exam is doing exactly what it was meant to do ... weed out the incompetent and unsafe practitioners!</p> <p>It would be interesting at some point to see if there is any link between those that fail the exam and their actual performance in clinical placements...there is a tendency when one is a preceptor to "fail to fail" and thus give false positive feedback. I am less inclined to think of this as an exam failure and more inclined to think it is a system failure from educators, preceptors and student's expectations. The registrants are informed as to where they scored low...perhaps they need to be sharing that back to their program...Who says they are "competent" yet fail? ... an employer who needs staff or an educator trying to validate their program?...As regulators, we need to assure ourselves of a base entry level competency that is consistent across the country. The exam is based on current practice and analysed regularly for validity. CAPR is in the process of updating the exams as is done on a regular cycle. There is information on the website on the validity of the exam and the clinical site examiners. It is an exam run by PTs. I have faith in the process and the validity of the exam. We can only assume the educators are doing their job, the only way we have of evaluating that, is the exam. They don't share the student performance data with us and it is a two way street in my mind. As we all know, accreditation is not a given and there have been close calls for some institutions in the past, with 3 Canadian University programs on probationary accreditation status at this time, do they share that with the provincial regulator? Do they share the names of those students that have been carried along in the program because failure is not an option?</p> <p>I would hesitate to say that U of S is not the only institution that has seen an increase in failures, and as a regulator I have seen an increase in failures and in complaints (many regarding older therapists who are potentially the mentors of these new grads ... perhaps they are learning bad habits before they sit the exam? I am also curious</p>

	<p>about the new grads “under supervision for months”...do we know the quality of the supervision or is it minimal if they are recruited to rural areas? My sense is that the new grads ‘do not know what they don’t know’ and yet they rush to add skills before they have even consolidated the knowledge and skills they graduated with. I think that some times confuses them during a clinical test of entry level.</p>
QC	<p>This is a very good opportunity to question ourself on certain topics.</p> <p>PCE is a good tool to assess students at the end of a program. It’s not the only one. In Quebec, for example, we have introduced a final PCE within each physiotherapy program. A mandatory PASS is required for a licence to practise. Of course, universities in Quebec have the opportunity to follow the students for 4 years prior to graduation.</p> <p>Is it better than PCE? No.</p> <p>Is the PCE not a good tool to assess competencies? No.</p> <p>Shall we consider more than one way to assess competencies? It deserves a good chat. Honestly, I think there’s more than one way to go to Rome</p>
ON	<p>Our College is planning to undertake a review of our entry to practices program over the next couple of years and this might include consideration of the examination to ensure it is fit for purpose.</p> <p>However in the interim, I can say that a decision to review the need for the examination based on concerns relating to people who fail the examination is of significant concern to us as we, based on the degree of validity the examination has demonstrated, are not convinced that exam failures are based on the failure of the examination but more likely indicate that the examination is serving the purpose for which it was designed.</p> <p>Departing from the examination without demonstrated concerns about its validity being identified seem likely to place the public at risk by permitting risky or incompetent people to practice</p>
AB	<p>It is always beneficial to question decisions, assumptions and perspectives as time passes. This does not necessarily mean it will result in a change but at least we have asked the question. Is the exam doing what it is intended to do, this may be a philosophical discussion that the Registrar’s Committee has. Is the exam doing what we need it to do as regulators? This discussion does not question the validity of the exam but eludes to the point that there may be more than one way. Since the exam requirement came to be, has there been changes to curriculum and how educators assess competency? I think there are some questions for the educators. How do they address the concerns that may be expressed by preceptor’s about performance? If they repeatedly hear a student is not performing, do they address this (and how) or do they hope the exam will catch these individuals?</p>

	I think all groups have different perspectives and a working group might facilitate some of these conversations.
YK	Our regulation requires that a PT pass “the national competency examination or an equivalent examination acceptable to the registrar.” As a small jurisdiction where PTs do not self-regulate, we depend on the PCE as an indicator of whether a PT is competent to practice. As a non-physio myself, I have no view at this time on the question of whether it in its current form still serves the intention of ensuring new grads are safe to practice, but I am very interested in the views of others and ultimately Yukon would likely defer to the collective wisdom. Perhaps some stats on current pass rates (disaggregated by P/T, if folks are comfortable) and any information we have on how valid an indicator of competency the exam is would usefully inform further discussion?