

Framework for Providing Feedback on the Quality of a Personal Development Plan

	Criteria	Level A	Level B	Level C	Level D	Level E
Assessing the Plan for Learning	Learning Needs <i>Personal Identified Stated</i>	No statement	Statement of learning needs No evidence of how needs determined	Learning needs identified (needs not wants) A variety of topics considered (eg clinical, communication, ethical, managerial...) Some selection and prioritisation.	Detailed statement of prioritised learning needs Arise from several sources (eg self, practice, local, national...) Most have evidence of their origin	Detailed and insightful statement of learning needs. Carefully selected from wide variety of topics and sources All have good evidence of origin . (eg: actions from previous plan, PUN, audit, appraisal, MCQ, peer review...)
	Learning Plan <i>Appropriate Achievable Matches Needs</i>	No plan	Learning plan Does not cover all learning needs Methods scantily covered Plan may be difficult to achieve	Learning plan achievable & relevant. Learning methods appropriate for needs (eg: skill need: practical training..., knowledge need: books, lectures..., understanding needs: discussion, groups...)	Plan is detailed and achievable Variety of appropriate learning methods should provide thorough cover of most aspects of each topic	Detailed and thoughtful plan Contexts and methods carefully tailored to maximise learning opportunities
	Assessment Plan <i>Appropriate Objective Matches Plan</i>	No plan	Plan is simplistic and vague Endpoints and standards are unclear	Assessment methods appropriate Should indicate satisfactory completion of plan. Limited use is made of target dates, standards, objective or external assessment	Assessments proposed match the learning needs well (eg: skill: practical assessment... knowledge: MCQ, MEQ..., understanding: peer review, teach,...). Some targets and standards set Some objective assessments planned	Wide range of assessments planned Should provide comprehensive coverage of the learning. Objective and independent assessments are included Standards set and target dates explicit
Assessing the Evidence of Learning	Records <i>Detailed Log Supporting Evidence</i>	No records	Simple log with little detail Few references Some omissions	Record complete and consistent Some supporting evidence: (references, extracts, notes, certificates, dates....)	Detailed log Good supporting evidence in most cases.	Detailed log Pertinent supporting evidence, much of which is externally validated.
	Understanding <i>Reflection Objective Evidence</i>	No evidence of learning	Some statements about extent to which learning needs met.	Statement of extent to which learning needs met for each topic. Some discussion about what has been learned and what is yet to be learned	Detailed personal assessment of what has been learned and what is yet to be learned Some supporting evidence presented (exams, assessments, reflections, guidelines, teaching....)	Comprehensive, insightful personal assessment of what has been learned and what is yet to be learned Succinct and relevant supporting evidence
	Performance <i>Assessed Improved</i>	No assessment of performance	Attempt to assess performance in a few areas	Some assessments of performance Limited improvements shown	Formal review of performance for each major topic (audit, case reports, peer review, appraisal, written reflection....) Some improvements shown	All areas subject to performance review Several significant improvements demonstrated

Framework for Providing Feedback on the Quality of a Personal Development Plan

When to use the Framework

Use it twice:

Before the work is done to assess the quality of the original plan (top three rows)

After the work is done to assess the quality of the evidence presented. (bottom three rows)

How to use the Framework

Assess the plan, or the evidence, in terms of the vignettes in the boxes. The match may not be perfect, that doesn't matter – the aim is not to say “you are at level C”. The aim is to help the learner move their plan, and their evidence of learning, to the right.

The framework should assist you to analyse the plan, or the evidence, and help you to provide simple, practical advice to the learner about how to make the plan, or the evidence better next time.

The plan should be used formatively, to aid development and assess progress.

Who should use the Framework?

It was developed for GP Tutors faced with assessing general practitioners' PDPs and advising upon them.

Anyone faced with the same problem may find it useful: GP appraisers, course organizers, trainers...

Learners may find it helpful too.

Copyright:	Feel free to copy and use the matrix, unaltered, as you wish.
Amendments:	Feel free to amend it too but please acknowledge your source.
Comments to:	iaian@angliagp.org.uk

Does training help?

Yes. Try getting a group of assessors together with a selection of real (anonymised) PDPs. Practice using the framework and role-playing the feedback to the learner. The value is in the role-play and the discussion not in the judgements made.

What are its limitations?

It should not be used summatively, for judgement or making comparisons between individuals.

It assesses plan and evidence separately. So it is possible, using the framework, to have a really good plan, and really good evidence of learning which has little to do with the original plan.

It does not address the balance of learning. A perfectly good plan, and perfectly good evidence can be produced on a single rarefied topic.

How was it developed?

Starting with the extant (very limited) assessment categories for determining whether PDPs should receive PGEA a group of Tutors developed the original matrix. This was intended for summative use – to make the PGEA judgment more robust.

Three groups of ten tutors then used the matrix with real anonymised PDPs at a series of workshops. They refined the wording and structure considerably.

All felt the matrix to be a useful formative tool but it was decided not to use it summatively. It is not used for making judgements about PGEA.