

Are we failing our trainees in providing opportunities to attain procedural confidence?

Practical procedures play a crucial role in clinical outcome. High proportions of Mersey trainees report a lack of procedural confidence despite the fact that the majority want to perform more procedures. Training has to be carefully analysed to address these shortcomings.

Background

Practical procedures play a crucial role in clinical outcome (Allery, 2009). The UK Joint Royal Colleges of Physicians Training Board (2009) outlines practical competency requirements for trainees. Procedures commonly performed in a hospital setting include central venous catheter insertion, lumbar puncture, pleural aspiration, ascitic aspiration and intercostal chest drain insertion (Connick et al, 2009). Some procedures require allied training in ultrasound to maximize safety (Joint Royal Colleges of Physicians Training Board, 2009).

The core medical training curriculum (Joint Royal Colleges of Physicians Training Board, 2009) specifies that by the end trainees should:

- Be clinically independent in lumbar puncture, nasogastric tube insertion, ascitic and pleural tap
- Have completed skills lab training or have had satisfactory supervised practice in central venous catheter insertion, direct current electrical cardioversion and intercostal chest drain insertion, with ultrasound guidance for pleural effusion.

Dr Jakub Lagan is Registrar in the Department of Cardiology and **Dr Louise Cutts** is Registrar in the Department of General Internal Medicine, Arroue Park Hospital, Wirral CH49 5PE, **Dr Seher Zaidi** is Research Fellow in the Department of Respiratory Medicine, University Hospital of South Manchester, Wythenshawe, Manchester, **Dr Ian Benton** is Respiratory Consultant in the Department of Respiratory Medicine, Countess of Chester Hospital, Chester, and **Dr Jamie Rylance** is Clinical Lecturer in Respiratory Medicine, University Hospital Aintree, Liverpool

Correspondence to: Dr J Lagan
(jakub.lagan@nhs.net)

The general internal medicine curriculum (Joint Royal Colleges of Physicians Training Board, 2009) expects registrars to:

- Be clinically independent in direct current electrical cardioversion and ascitic aspiration
- Insert a central venous catheter and perform intercostal drainage of pneumothorax either independently or with supervision by the end of general internal medicine training
- Have completed skills lab training for ultrasound-guided intercostal drainage of pleural effusion by the end of general internal medicine training.

Procedural competence is acquired in stages: conceptualization, visualization, verbalization, ending with practice and feedback (Allery, 2009). This balanced feedback with a phased withdrawal of supervision allows for the transition into an independent practitioner (Allery, 2009). The link between confidence and procedural competence is complex and their correlation has been reported to be poor (Barnsley et al, 2004). Most medical education programmes nevertheless rely on trainees to self-identify and prioritize their educational needs in order to drive improvement (Hays et al, 2002). Trainees are expected to work within limits of their competence (General Medical Council, 2013) and their confidence affects willingness to perform procedures and ability to assess their skills and ask for support (Hays et al, 2002). Further, a lack of confidence can in itself adversely affect performance (Byrne et al, 2005).

The decline in the number and variety of practical procedures performed by general internists has led to shortfalls in training opportunities (Wigton and Alguire, 2007). A survey of core medical trainees confirmed that procedural exposure is lacking (Tasker et al, 2013). This can be attributed to changes in practice of general

internal medicine, increases in regulatory oversight, technological advances, greater availability of procedure-oriented services (Wigton and Alguire, 2007), concerns for maximizing patient safety and altered working patterns (General Medical Council, 2013; Tasker et al, 2013).

A regional online survey was undertaken to:

1. Explore general attitudes towards procedural education and skills
2. Assess trainee procedural confidence
3. Explore the procedural training and procedural exposure
4. Demonstrate whether there is a correlation between procedural confidence and exposure.

Methods

The authors performed a regional survey of core medical training trainees and specialty registrars at the end of their training year in the Mersey Deanery from June to August 2013 using an online questionnaire. Respondents were identified at regional teaching events and from existing contact lists. Approval for the survey was granted by the Countess of Chester Hospital Audit Department (#3504).

Respondents reported their level of specialty training and specialty interest. General attitudes towards practical procedures were sought by open and closed questions. Trainees self-identified their level of procedural confidence as either 'able unsupervised', 'limited supervision', 'direct supervision' or 'unable to perform' for pleural aspiration, Seldinger type chest drain insertion, ascitic tap and drain insertion, central venous catheter insertion, arterial line placement, direct current electrical cardioversion, lumbar puncture and ultrasound for pleural and vascular procedures. Procedural training methods were categorised as: 'none', 'watch and learn', 'manikin practice' or 'formal course'.

Practical experience was determined semi-quantitatively by retrospective recall.

Statistical analysis was performed using Stata 12.0 (StataCorp, US). Correlations were tested using Spearman's rank correlation. Šidák correction was applied for multiple tests to limit family-wise error rates to <5%.

Results

Responses were received from 83 core medical training doctors and 73 specialty registrars (ascertainment rate 59.7% and 56.2% respectively). *Table 1* summarizes respondents' characteristics.

General attitudes towards practical procedures

Out of all the respondents, 109 (69.9%) wanted to perform more procedures, six (3.8%) wanted fewer and 41 (26.3%) wanted about the same number. Of these, 100 (64.1%) enjoyed practical procedures, 46 (29.5%) perceived them as simply part of the job and 10 (6.4%) did not like doing them. A total of 125 (80.1%) respondents disagreed with the statement 'practical procedures should be reserved for the specialists with an interest in them' and 154 (98.7%) felt they should be procedurally competent in case of emergencies.

Common themes in general comments from respondents included lack of adequate supervision, lack of time to perform procedures and lack of ultrasound training,

and in the core medical training group feeling unprepared for the registrar position.

Procedural confidence

The ratio of respondents reporting confidence to perform procedures unsupervised

is shown in *Table 2*. Among registrars, 15 (20.5%) were not independent in chest drain insertion and 19 (26%) in central venous catheter. In the core training year two group, i.e. 'registrars-to-be', the numbers were 26 (60.5%) and 37 (86%)

Table 1. Number of trainees invited to respond and respondents' characteristics

	Core medical trainee		Registrar	
Invited to participate	139		130	
Opted out	5		4	
No response	49		49	
Incomplete questionnaire	1		4	
Core anaesthesia before core medical training	1		0	
Fully completed	83 (59.7%)		73 (56.2%)	
Level of training	Year 1	40 (48.2%)	ST 3–4	27 (37%)
	Year 2	43 (51.8%)	ST 5–7	43 (58.9%)
			Unknown	3 (4.1%)
Specialty interest	General/acute medicine	15 (18.1%)	Respiratory	15 (20.5%)
	Care for the elderly/stroke medicine	13 (15.7%)	Cardiology	14 (19.2%)
	Respiratory medicine	7 (8.45%)	Care for the elderly/stroke medicine	13 (17.8%)
	Cardiology	7 (8.45%)	General/acute medicine	7 (9.6%)
	Haematology	6 (7.2%)	Gastroenterology	7 (9.6%)
	Palliative medicine	6 (7.2%)	Infectious diseases	7 (9.6%)
	Other specialties	27 (32.5%)	Other	8 (11%)
	No preference	2 (2.4%)	Unknown	2 (2.7%)

Table 2. Respondents reporting no procedural training, no procedural exposure in 12 months and those confident to perform procedures independently

	No procedural training		No procedural exposure in 12 months		Confident to perform procedure independently		
	Core medical trainee (n=83)	Registrar (n=73)	Core medical trainee (n=83)	Registrar (n=73)	Core medical trainee (n=83)		Registrar (n=73)
					Year 1 (n=40)	Year 2 (n=43)	
Pleural aspiration	3 (3.6%)	1 (1.4%)	12 (14.5%)	20 (27.4%)	15 (37.5%)	32 (74.4%)	65 (89%)
Chest drain insertion	4 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	35 (42.2%)	26 (35.6%)	10 (25.0%)	17 (39.5%)	58 (79.5%)
Ascitic tap	1 (1.2%)	2 (2.7%)	7 (8.4%)	24 (32.9%)	33 (82.5%)	41 (95.3%)	72 (98.6%)
Ascitic drain insertion	12 (14.5%)	4 (5.5%)	61 (73.5%)	33 (45.2%)	21 (52.5%)	34 (79.1%)	67 (91.8%)
Central venous catheter	9 (10.8%)	0 (0%)	61 (73.5%)	28 (38.4%)	4 (10.0%)	6 (14.0%)	54 (74.0%)
Arterial line placement	44 (53%)	17 (23.3%)	65 (78.3%)	46 (63.0%)	9 (22.5%)	14 (32.6%)	47 (64.4%)
Lumbar puncture	3 (3.6%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.2%)	10 (13.7%)	32 (80.0%)	42 (97.7%)	71 (97.3%)
Direct current cardioversion	3 (3.6%)	3 (4.1%)	38 (45.8%)	20 (27.4%)	16 (40.0%)	28 (65.1%)	69 (94.5%)
Ultrasound for pleural procedures	31 (37.3%)	31 (42.5%)	---	---	4 (10.0%)	2 (4.7%)	24 (32.9%)
Ultrasound for central venous catheter	21 (25.3%)	3 (4.1%)	---	---	8 (20.0%)	8 (18.6%)	50 (68.5%)

respectively. Of respondents, 126 (80.8%) were not independent in ultrasound chest for pleural procedures and 90 (57.7%) in vascular ultrasound for insertion of a central venous catheter.

Procedural training and exposure

The ratio of respondents reporting no procedural training and no exposure in 12 months is shown in *Table 2*. The procedures with the highest number of respondents reporting no training included arterial line placement (61, 39.1%) and ascitic drain insertion (16, 10.3%). With regard to imaging, 62 (39.7%) received no training in ultrasound chest for pleural procedures and 24 (15.4%) received no training in vascular ultrasound for central venous catheter.

Procedures that respondents had the least exposure to were chest drain insertion (61, 39.1%), central venous catheter (89, 57.1%), ascitic drain placement (94, 60.3%) and arterial line placement (111, 71.2%).

Correlation between procedural confidence and exposure

There was a significant positive correlation between procedural exposure and confidence for all eight procedures in the core medical training group ($P < 0.003$, Šidák correction for multiple testing). Among registrars, this was true for pleural aspiration, chest drain insertion, central venous catheter and arterial line placement ($P < 0.003$). There was a significant, positive correlation for ultrasound chest expertise and confidence in performing pleural procedures and for vascular ultrasound and central venous catheter insertion ($P < 0.017$, Šidák correction for multiple testing).

Discussion

This survey presents an interesting insight into the general attitude towards procedures, procedural confidence, training and exposure of trainees in the Mersey Deanery. The type of procedures and level of expertise required is stated in published curricula (Joint Royal Colleges of Physicians Training Board, 2009). However, trainees face challenges in acquiring procedural competencies (Wigton and Alguire, 2007; General Medical Council, 2013).

Among medical registrars, a significant proportion still reported a lack of confidence in central venous catheter and chest drain insertion. This was even more evident among year two core trainees, who might soon be expected to perform these procedures in less supported out-of-hours settings. Indeed, many core trainees do not feel prepared to become medical registrars (Tasker et al, 2013).

This survey shows that with a few exceptions only a minority of respondents reported no procedural training. This was most deficient in arterial line placement. However, this procedure is more common in higher dependency units and likely does not play a crucial part in procedural education in this group. The relatively high levels of training in the remaining procedures suggest that the reported lower levels of confidence were related to limited exposure or other factors as shown by general comments, e.g. insufficient supervision or lack of time.

There is a significant deficiency in practical exposure with high proportions of trainees not performing procedures regularly. Since confidence may affect performance (Byrne et al, 2005) and willingness to perform procedures (Hays et al, 2002), regular practice is crucial as confidence falls significantly after 1 year without exposure (Connick et al, 2009). Indeed for all surveyed procedures, there was a significant correlation between exposure and confidence for core medical training doctors. A lack of similar correlation in the registrar group for direct current electrical cardioversion, lumbar puncture, ascitic tap and drain insertion can be explained by their perceived simplicity and that once confidence is achieved, it is maintained despite limited exposure.

The significant correlation between ultrasound expertise and procedural confidence in central venous catheter and pleural procedures strongly suggests that a lack of ultrasound training is a limiting factor in developing procedural confidence. A more organized approach is required if all trainees are to become confident in using imaging. This could take the form of a yearly practical course incorporated into general medical teaching sessions.

This survey is limited by recall bias and self-reporting. There is a risk of selection

bias as a result of the ascertainment rate and a high predominance of cardiology and respiratory specialty trainees who might be more procedure-focused. More senior trainees may not be required to perform certain procedures. Additionally, the questionnaire did not specify indications for pleural procedures. It is anticipated that confidence in performing pleural procedures would be higher if they were indicated for pneumothorax when ultrasound is not indicated. Lastly, as a survey of a single region, findings may not be representative of the whole of the UK.

Conclusions

Postgraduate medical training should be carefully analysed to address the lack of confidence in performing practical procedures and inadequate exposure. Educational supervisors have a crucial role to play in ensuring that trainees' knowledge, skills and behaviours progress appropriately (Joint Royal Colleges of Physicians Training Board, 2009). Regular appraisal meetings and review of competences should be used to identify the areas where practical confidence and exposure is lacking. Trainee physicians enjoy and are keen to perform more practical procedures and are aware that they have to be procedurally competent in case of an emergency.

Supervisors have to ensure that trainees have adequate opportunities to gain and demonstrate practical skills. Training should focus on procedures where there is a strong correlation between exposure and confidence in both surveyed groups: pleural tap, chest drain insertion and central venous catheter insertion. Potential solutions include an 'on call procedural team', bringing together educators and trainees. Additionally, rostering trainee physicians for short periods to specialties such as interventional radiology and critical care could also enhance training opportunities. In all cases the authors recommend that medical departments and specialty teams should maintain records of the procedures performed, and whether there was a trainee in attendance. This would enhance awareness of the potential training opportunities and maximize trainee inclusion. **BJHM**

The authors are grateful to all Mersey trainees who took part in this survey.

Conflict of interest: none.

Allery L (2009) Teach practical skills. *Educ Prim Car* 20(1): 58–60

Barnsley L, Lyon PM, Ralston SJ et al (2004) Clinical skills in junior medical officers: a comparison of self-reported confidence and observed competence. *Med Educ* 38(4): 358–67

Byrne AJ, Blagrove MT, McDougall SJ (2005) Dynamic confidence during simulated clinical tasks. *Postgrad Med J* 81(962): 785–8

Connick RM, Connick P, Klotsas AE, Tsagkaraki PA, Gkrania-Klotsas E (2009) Procedural confidence in hospital based practitioners: implications for the training and practice of doctors at all grades. *BMC Med Educ* 9: 2 (doi: 10.1186/1472-6920-9-2)

General Medical Council (2013) *Good medical practice*. General Medical Council, London

Hays RB, Jolly BC, Caldon LJ et al (2002) Is insight important? Measuring capacity to change performance. *Med Educ* 36(10): 965–71

Joint Royal Colleges of Physicians Training Board (2009) *Specialty Training Curriculum for Core Medical Training*. Joint Royal Colleges of

Physicians Training Board, London
Tasker F, Newbery N, Burr B et al (2013) Survey of core medical trainees in the United Kingdom 2013 - Inconsistencies in training experience and competing with service demands. *Clin Med* 14(2): 149–56 (doi: 10.7861/

clinmedicine.14-2-149)

Wigton RS, Alguire P (2007) The declining number and variety of procedures done by general internists: a resurvey of members of the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med* 146(5): 355–60

KEY POINTS

- Practical procedures play a crucial role in clinical outcome.
- A high proportion of core medical trainees and medical registrars report a lack of procedural confidence and insufficient exposure.
- Postgraduate medical training needs to be carefully analysed to assure that trainees have adequate opportunities to gain and demonstrate practical skills.
- It is especially crucial for central venous catheter, pleural aspiration and drainage where there is a significant correlation between procedural confidence and exposure.
- Lack of ultrasound training is a limiting factor in achieving procedural independence.

Organised by
BRITISH JOURNAL OF
**HOSPITAL
MEDICINE**

12th International Conference

London Eating Disorders Conference 2015

A three-day practical conference & exhibition

Institute of Education, London

18th, 19th & 20th March 2015

PROGRAMME ORGANISERS

- Bryan Lask (UK) & Rachel Bryant-Waugh (UK)

PRE-CONFERENCE TRAINING WORKSHOP

(17th March 2015)

- Prevention in the field of eating disorders: looking backwards, moving forwards, looking inward, moving outward:
Dianne Neumark-Sztainer (USA)

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

- The enduringness of adversity: new vistas for theory and treatment in eating disorders: Michael Strober (USA)

For the full programme and to book, visit our website: www.eatingdisordersconference.com

PLENARY SESSIONS

- Stigma, shame and disgust: Graham Thornicroft (UK), Kenneth Nunn (Aus), Josie Geller (Can)
- Making diagnosis more clinically relevant: David Clinton (Swe), Angelica Claudino (Bra), Robyn Sysko (USA)
- Evidence-based practice: research, clinical and patient perspectives: Carol Peterson (USA), Janet Treasure (UK), Carolyn Becker (USA)

In addition to the plenary sessions there will be interactive clinical workshops, short paper sessions and posters.



Follow us on Twitter: @MAHealthEvents
Tweet about the conference: #LEDC2015



For more information or to register your interest, please email us at:

✉ conferences@markallengroup.com or visit www.eatingdisordersconference.com