



JURISPRUDENCE

EDUCATION PROGRAM

**An Evaluation of the Initial Cycle of the
Jurisprudence Education Program**

**Completed by:
The Registration Committee
February 15, 2007**

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
a. Voluntary Period	1
b. Process	2
c. Online Education Module	2
d. Workshops	2
2. Initial Cycle Results	3
3. Evaluation Survey	4
4. Key Issue Analysis	7
a. Clarity	7
b. Correct Answers	7
c. References	7
d. Value of Learning Experience	7
e. Collaborative Discussion	7
5. Recommendations	8
a. Recommendation #1	8
b. Recommendation #2	8
c. Recommendation #3	9
6. Conclusion	9

1. Introduction

The Jurisprudence Education Program is designed to assist registrants in understanding and applying legislation and College rules that govern the practice of physiotherapists in Ontario. Physiotherapists should be familiar with these rules and know where to find support documents when addressing ethical or legal dilemmas encountered in practice. It is not necessary to memorize all of these documents, only to be aware of them so that they can be accessed when circumstances arise. The aim of the jurisprudence program is to give registrants a greater understanding of the legislation and standards that impact their practice.

Registrants are required to complete the program when entering the Independent or Academic Practice categories of registration. As well, all current Independent and Academic Practice certificate holders will be required to complete the module in five-year cycles. The initial cycle occurred in 2006, with future cycles planned for 2011, 2016, 2021, and so on. Physiotherapists have six months to complete the module and may make two attempts within the six months. If a physiotherapist is unsuccessful or does not attempt the module at the end of the six-month period, policy requires that they attend a mandatory workshop before attempting the module one last time.

The Jurisprudence Education Module is an online tool. It contains fifty multiple choice questions in the form of scenarios. The technology is user friendly and allows physiotherapists to log in and out of the module as often as they like.

Physiotherapists are encouraged to discuss the questions with other physiotherapists when completing the module to promote network building as a support to physiotherapists when managing practice issues.

The Jurisprudence Education Program was created using a rigorous development process. Assessment Strategies Inc. (ASI) was retained to assist the College in the development of the Jurisprudence module. ASI followed a test development process to produce the final module, including a blueprinting phase, item writing, piloting and a validation phase.

a. Voluntary Period

The Jurisprudence Education Module was launched on January 1, 2006. As amendments to the Registration Regulation had not yet passed, the program remained voluntary until March 31, 2006. During the voluntary period, registrants could attempt the module twice and if unsuccessful would have further opportunities during the mandatory period. Successful completions during the voluntary period were honoured. The amendments to the Registration Regulation were approved by the government in March 2006 and the module became mandatory on April 1, 2006. Registrants were notified by mail of the shift to the mandatory period. Therefore the end date for the initial cycle of the module was September 30, 2006.

b. Process

Registrants involved in the initial cycle received a letter in November 2005 introducing the program and outlining the College requirement to complete the module. Registrants were provided with their user ID, password and a program guide. An online reference section was posted on the College website to provide answers to questions about the program using a frequently asked questions document and sample scenarios.

In April 2006, an informational webcast was broadcast to assist registrants in understanding the program and to provide advice on how to approach scenarios. The webcast was archived and is available through the College website at any time.

At the end of the six month cycle, monthly results from ASI were reviewed and compiled to determine the status of each registrant required to complete the module. The 5,606 registrants who successfully completed the module have fulfilled their jurisprudence requirement for the next five years. Registrants who have resigned, moved to retired or inactive status, or have been suspended for non-payment of fees are not currently required to complete the module. The remaining registrants either did not attempt the module or were not successful in their attempt(s). These registrants were then notified that they were required to view the mandatory online workshop and attempt the module again within two months. The mandatory period for this group runs from December 1, 2006 – January 31, 2007. Of those registrants who completed the module, those who were unsuccessful will be referred to the Quality Management Committee for a more thorough review, while those who did not complete the module by January 31, 2007 will be referred to the Executive Committee for non-compliance.

c. Online Education Module

The College created the Jurisprudence Education Program as an online module. Throughout its development, there was some discussion about whether all physiotherapists would have access to computers to complete the module. In order to accommodate those who were unable to complete the module online, a paper version was created. To restrict distribution of the questions, a proctoring system was implemented. Registrants wishing to complete the module on paper were asked to make a written request explaining why they were unable to complete the module online. In the initial six month cycle only two requests for paper versions were received. The first request was from a visually impaired registrant and the second was from a registrant who indicated that she did not have the necessary computer skills to complete the module online.

d. Workshops

Two workshops were developed as a part of the Jurisprudence Program. The first workshop was offered as a webcast, which aired in April. Forty-eight registrants responded to a feedback survey at the end of the webcast. The survey indicated that 93.4% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they preferred the webcast format over teleconferences or videoconferences. 91.3% of respondents agreed or strongly

agreed that the workshop assisted them in understanding the jurisprudence education program.

Since the feedback from the initial webcast was very positive, it was determined that another webcast was the best way to present the mandatory workshop. This webcast was pre-recorded so that a more polished presentation would be available online. This workshop provides a more in-depth review of jurisprudence concepts to assist those who had challenges in completing the module. Registrants are guided through the different documents referenced in the module. Key concepts covered in each content domain are explained and sample scenarios are used to assist registrants in understanding how to approach the module.

2. Initial Cycle Results

The threshold that was determined to be a measure of the success of the jurisprudence module was that at least ninety percent of registrants successfully complete the module in the initial six-month period for completion. The first cycle of the program exceeded the ninety percent success mark! Ninety-six percent of registrants who were required to complete the module were successful in the initial six-month period.

The chart below outlines the overall results for the 6,045 registrants who were issued passwords to complete the first cycle of the program.

Result	# of Physiotherapists
Successful Completion	5606
Unsuccessful result	31
Did not complete	198
Deferrals	6
No longer required to complete	204
TOTAL	6045

Five thousand six hundred and six registrants were successful in completing the Jurisprudence Education Program. This group has fulfilled their jurisprudence requirement for the next five years. Of the 5,606 registrants who successfully completed the module, 5,418 were successful on their first attempt, 182 were successful on their second attempt, 5 registrants needed three attempts to pass and 1 registrant used all four attempts to successfully complete the module.

Thirty-one registrants were not successful in their attempt to complete the module. Of these thirty-one registrants, seventeen attempted the module only once. The remaining fourteen utilized both available attempts at the module and were unsuccessful in both of these attempts. There were no registrants who were unsuccessful in the voluntary period who did not successfully complete the module in the mandatory period.

One hundred and ninety-eight registrants who were required to complete the module did not. The reasons that these individuals did not complete the module are unknown.

The Committee policy on deferrals indicates that deferrals can only be granted for a serious reason, such as medical or compassionate grounds. Deferrals are granted for a period of up to one year. The specific circumstances, along with input from the registrant, help to determine the exact length of the deferral. Six registrants were granted deferrals of between six months and one year to complete the program later. These deferrals were only granted in the case of extenuating circumstances such as severe illness of a registrant or one of their close family members.

Two hundred and four registrants were no longer required to complete the module as during the time period for completion they resigned their registration, switched to an Inactive certificate of registration or Retired Status or were suspended for non-payment of fees. Only registrants holding Independent or Academic Practice certificates are required to complete the module.

3. Evaluation Survey

At the end of the module registrants were asked to complete a survey. This information was gathered to seek registrants' impressions about the module.

5,496 registrants completed the survey. The first several questions were demographic and have not been included in this report. The remaining questions were about registrants' perceptions about completing the module.

Question: Questions were clearly written and understandable.

Responses:

Response	# of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Strongly Disagreed	127	2.3%
Disagreed	1093	19.9%
Neutral	1188	21.6%
Agreed	2694	49%
Strongly Agreed	394	7.2%
TOTAL	5496	100%

Question: Scenarios were realistic and could be encountered in practice.

Responses:

Response	# of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Strongly Disagreed	46	0.8%
Disagreed	301	5.5%
Neutral	817	14.9%
Agreed	3334	60.7%
Strongly Agreed	998	18.2%
TOTAL	5496	100%

Question: Questions were too easy.

Responses:

Response	# of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Strongly Disagreed	891	16.2%
Disagreed	3542	64.4%
Neutral	990	18%
Agreed	58	1.1%
Strongly Agreed	15	0.3%
TOTAL	5496	100%

Question: The Jurisprudence Education Module assisted me in understanding and applying jurisprudence knowledge.

Responses:

Response	# of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Strongly Disagreed	87	1.6%
Disagreed	317	5.8%
Neutral	974	17.7%
Agreed	3259	59.3%
Strongly Agreed	859	15.6%
TOTAL	5496	100%

Question: The module was discussed with other physiotherapists.

Responses:

Response	# of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	4795	87.2%
No	701	12.8%
TOTAL	5496	100%

Question: The website or Cd-Rom was referenced during completion of the module.

Responses:

Response	# of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	4833	87.9%
No	663	12.1%
TOTAL	5496	100%

Question:

How long did it take to complete the module?

Responses:

Response	# of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less than 1 hour	265	4.8%
1 – 2 hours	1315	23.9%
3 – 4 hours	2095	38.1%
More than 5 hours	1821	33.1%
TOTAL	5496	100%

Registrant Comments

An open ended request for any additional feedback was included at the end of the survey. Many registrants took the initiative to provide very valuable feedback. The feedback was reviewed and grouped by theme. Some comments had many issues which were commented on and therefore have been counted more than once.

Issue	# of Comments
Some questions were unclear	713
Want to know the correct answers	664
References were hard to find	403
Value of the learning experience	298
Good discussion occurred	179
Some questions did not apply to their practice setting	160
The module is a very good tool to learn jurisprudence	92
The module was time consuming	82
There was lots of emphasis on private practice	80
The educational material provided was very helpful	42
The module was interesting/thought-provoking	37
The module was not a useful learning experience	35
The experience was very stressful	33
Receiving feedback on the domains was not helpful	31

The remaining comments were stated by less than thirty registrants: the technology used in the module was good (27); the questions were very clear (23); completing the module was an enjoyable experience (23); surprise at not having done better (20); the module was a waste of time/not a valuable learning experience (20); the questions should be coded by domain (17); the scenarios were very realistic (16); the scenarios were not very realistic (16); it would be preferable to receive a paper version (15); discovered areas where they needed to improve their practice (13); it is unreasonable to test registrants (9); liked the ability to log in and out (9); the module should be completed more often than every five years (8); there is an overlap between QM and jurisprudence (8); wanted to discuss the module, but was not able to (6); happy to see that more education will be provided (5).

Issues raised by fewer than five registrants were not included in the list of issues on the previous page.

4. Key Issue Analysis

a. Clarity

Registrants felt that some of the questions and answers in the module lacked clarity. The comments included:

- More than one answer seemed correct
- The questions were too “grey” and required further clarification
- Not enough information was available
- The language used was not clear

b. Correct Answers

Registrants want to know the correct answers so that they may learn about situations where they responded incorrectly. They want to ensure that they are not practising inappropriately. Some registrants even indicated just knowing which specific questions they got wrong would be enough information, so that they could educate themselves.

c. References

Many registrants indicated they had trouble locating the appropriate information to assist them in completing the module. The main reasons for this seem to be:

- Cd-Rom needs an index; needs to be more easily searchable and is not user-friendly¹
- Website was challenging to navigate
- College documents are too vague, often use legal language
- Confusion about new documents and the previous documents

d. Value of Learning Experience

Many registrants indicated that they found the module to have been a useful experience, which allowed them to learn more about jurisprudence issues and familiarize themselves with College documents. A few registrants even indicated that they had discovered areas where they needed to improve their knowledge and had now set learning goals to achieve these learnings.

e. Collaborative Discussion

Many registrants indicated that they discussed the scenarios with other physiotherapists (most often work colleagues). It was mentioned that these discussions were key to the learning and value of the module.

¹ This has been addressed in the new 2007 version of the Registrant’s Guide on CD-ROM.

5. Recommendations

a. Recommendation #1

Registrants generally felt that the module was a positive experience. The goal of the program is to educate registrants. In order to complete the education process from the initial cycle, registrants need to be aware of the correct answers to the module. It is recommended that all answers and rationales for the current questions be released to registrants. The implication of this is that current questions will need to be removed from the item bank. The issuance of such a document would complete the educational experience for current registrants and be a responsive way to manage the feedback received.

New registrants are currently completing the module and have various six-month periods to do so. Most recently passwords have been issued for new registrants to start the module on December 1. It is recommended that no more passwords be issued for the current module so that all of the answers can be released to registrants in a timely manner after the six-month period expires for the last group on May 31, 2007.

The College may not wish to continue to release answers after each annual administration. In order to provide more education for registrants the module functionality should be re-designed so that upon submitting the answers, incorrect answers are identified, along with the content domain and appropriate reference materials so that registrants can more easily identify the appropriate answer. Registrants would then need to look up the answer on their own.²

b. Recommendation #2

The collaborative discussion was highlighted as a valuable learning method that assisted registrants with completion of the module. As only a few new registrants start the module each month it is a concern that this discussion will not be able to occur. Registrants will be encouraged to collaborate with other physiotherapists who are currently attempting the module or those who may have previously completed the jurisprudence requirement. In order to facilitate this collaboration it is recommended that all future new registrants complete the module in a group once a year. Conducting the module once a year will eliminate the confusion for registrants starting at different times and eliminate the administrative work associated with issuing new passwords and reviewing results every month.

² The other option is to release all answers and rationales for all questions annually. There is not a cost difference between the options, as the intent is to hold annual item writing and validation sessions. Council can determine which of these options it prefers.

c. Recommendation #3

Practice setting should be added to the jurisprudence blueprint to ensure that all practice settings are represented in each version of the module. This will ensure that any one practice setting is not over-represented.

6. Conclusion

The launch of the Jurisprudence Education Program was a success! Whenever positive comments are received about a mandatory program, it is something to be celebrated. As with any new program, there are always areas for improvement that should be considered. The recommendations for changes to the program would assist in addressing the major concerns that have been raised.