APPENDICES

1. EVALUATION MATRICES

2. TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

3. LISTING OF PATIENT RELATIONS MATERIALS FROM ALL COLLEGES

Appendix 1 - Evaluation Matrices

Regulated Health Professional Colleges Patient Relations (PR) Programs

Issue/Questions	Sub-questions	Data	Basis of Judgement	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
Rationale					
1. Does the PR program address the area(s) of concern for good patient relations?	1.1 Does the PR program address the main area(s) of concern to this College?	1.1 College identified areas of concern in Patient Relations and their program activities and intended outcomes and impacts.	1.1 Comparison of identified area(s) of concern with program activities and intended outcomes and impacts.	1.1 College program staff, program documents.	1.1 - review existing documents (email, courier, web) -consultation with College contacts
	1.2 Are there areas of concern that are not but perhaps should be addressed by the program?	1.2 General PR issue areas identified in the literature and areas covered by other College PR programs, types of member - patient contact.	1.2 Comparison of College PR program with other PR programs where the member - patient contact is similar.	1.2 PR literature, program descriptions for the 21 Ontario Colleges, College PR contacts.	1.2 - literature review, program document review, interview
2. Are the PR Program activities logically connected to realizing the desired outcomes?	2.1 Is there a documented or hypothesized cause-effect relationship between activities and desired outcomes and impacts?	2.1 Program results chain describing activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts.	2.1 Are there gaps in the results chain connecting activities to outcomes and impacts?	2.1 College program staff, program documents.	2.1 - consultation with College contact - review documents
	2.2 Is the cause-effect relationship plausible?	2.2 Program history and/or evidence from similar programs.	2.2 Have the activities been shown to achieve the desired outcomes and impacts?	2.2 College program staff, program performance documents, other College program documents.	2.2 - Consultation with Colleges: contacts, review documents
Efficiency					
1.Can the PR program activities be delivered at lower cost and in a more timely manner without losing quality?	1.1 Are there opportunities for collaboration among Colleges?	1.1 Do other Colleges have similar PR programs/activities? 1.1 Would governing Council br receptive? 1.1 What would the savings/economies be?	1.1 Standard profile for P.R. Program. 1.1 Positive Statements From Council. 1.1 Positive savings.	1.1 College P.R. program descriptions. 1.1 Council Minutes. 1.1 Analysis by P.R. contact.	1.1 Review documents 1.1 Request Minutes 1.1 Interview
	1.2 Are there opportunities to have college QA and other program staff participate?	1.2 Do QA staff have time available for P.R. program participation?	1.2 Positive statements from QA and P.R. staff and registrar.	1.2 Registrar, P.R. Staff	1.2 Interview
2. Was there sufficient staff and budget to do the work required by	2.1 How much work was done? How many staff were involved?	2.1& 3.1 Activity schedule, # of participants, the plan with	2.1& 3.1 Plan compared to	2.1 Newsletter, staff reports, reports from	2.1 Document review 2.1 Interview

Issue/Questions	Sub-questions	Data	Basis of Judgement	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
the patient relations program?? 3. Is the program being implemented as scheduled in the implementation plan?	3.1 Is there a plan? What was the implementation schedule? Reasons for deviation from schedule?	dates, activity reports, amount of material distributed, # of meetings.	actual, participants compared to market, workload compared to time available.	service providers. 3.1 Minutes of P.R. committee, the plan, newsletter, promotional material.	3.1 Interview
Effectiveness 1. Have members learned from the Patient Relations Program as evidenced by the use of PR techniques/activities in their practice?	1.1 Have members learned from the PR program? 1.2 Has there been a change in member's behaviour as a result of the PR program?	1.1 Participation in program, self or 3rd party assessments of learning. 1.2 Change in statistics re complaints against members 1.2 Self-reporting of practice changes. 1.2 3rd party evaluation results. 1.2 Use of Program materials by members.	1.1 % of members participating compared to 100%, +/- balance of self and 3rd party assessments. 1.2 Gold standard = "0" incidents of sexual abuse and other behaviour leading to complaints against members. Comparison with "0" at all stages in reporting/resolution system and direction of change over time. 1.2 +/- balance in self and 3rd party reports. 1.2 % of members requesting program materials compared with 100%.	1.1 & 1.2 College Program Contacts , Program records, evaluation documents.	1.1 & 1.2 Interview, request documents and reports, review documents and reports.
2. Has the Program been effective in educating patients as evidenced by realistic expectations and appropriate behaviour?	2.1 Have patients learned from the PR program? 2.2 Do members and their patients have a more clear and common understanding of the service being provided as a result of the program?	2.1 Member use of patient oriented program materials. 2.1 College, member or 3rd party survey results. 2.2 Change in nature of inquiries and complaints to the College. 2.2 Self-reporting by members and patients.	2.1 % of members sent/requesting patient oriented materials compared to 100%. 2.1 +/- survey results. 2.2 Reduction in inquiries and complaints indicating lack of common understanding. 2.2 Balance of +/- findings in existing surveys.	2.1 College PR Contacts. 2.1 Program Documents. 2.1 Survey/Evaluation reports. 2.2 College PR Contacts. 2.2 Program Documents. 2.2 Survey/evaluation reports.	2.1 Interview 2.1 Document review 21. Request/review reports. 2.2 Interview 2.2 Document review 2.2 Request/review reports.

Issue/Questions	Sub-questions	Data	Basis of Judgement	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
Impact					
1. Do College members have confidence in the ability of the College to represent their interests and meet their needs re PR?	1.1 Are members satisfied with PR programs and mechanisms put in place by their College?	1.1 Opinions of members.	1.1 Comparison with a target 100% positive responses.	1.1 Program records. 1.1 College PR Contacts. 1.1 Complaints records. 1.1 Evaluation reports.	1.1 Records review. 1.1 Interview 1.1 Records review 1.1 Review reports.
	1.2 Are members satisfied with the way the PR program and mechanisms are being implemented?	1.2 Opinions of members.	1.2 Comparison with a target 100% positive responses.	1.2 Same as 1.1	1.2 Same as 1.1
2. Do College members have confidence that their peers practice in a manner consistent with the intent of PR legislation, regulations and guidelines?	2.1 Do members believe there is a need to improve PR practices among members?	2.1 Opinions of members.	2.1 Document areas of need and frequency identified by members. Greater frequency = greater need.	2.1 Evaluation reports. 2.1 College PR Contacts. 2.1 Complaints records.	2.1 Review reports. 2.1 Interview. 2.1 Records review.
	2.2 Do members believe the PR program will result in any necessary improvement?	2.2 Opinions of members.	2.2 Balance of +/- responses.	2.2 Evaluation reports. 2.2 College PR Contacts.	2.2 Review reports. 2.2 Interview
3. Are College members perceived to be technically and HR competent?	3.1 To what extent is the College satisfied with the technical and HR competence of members?	3.1 Opinion of College PR Contact and of College Registrar (0 to 10 scale). 3.1 Level of resources committed to PR program (% of budget).	3.1 Report findings. 3.1 Compare level of concern and resources committed with level of complaints across Colleges.	3.1 College PR Contact and Registrar. 3.1 Program documents.	3.1 Interview. 3.1 Document review.
	3.2 To what extent are patients satisfied with the technical and HR competence of members?	3.2 Opinion of patients. 3.2 Number of complaints against members.	3.2 Balance of +/- opinions. 3.2 % of members having complaints filed with College compared across Colleges.	3.2 Evaluation reports. 3.2 College PR Contact. 3.2 Program records.	3.2 Review reports. 3.2 Interview. 3.2 Review records.
	3.3 To what extent is the general public confident that members are technically and HR competent?	3.3 Opinions of a representative sample of the general public.	3.3 Balance of +/- opinions. 3.3 Range and distribution of opinions.	3.3 Evaluation reports.	3.3 Review reports.
4. Do patients believe there is an appropriate body to whom they can direct queries or complaints about College members?	4.1 Do patients believe the College is an appropriate body for this purpose?	4.1 Patient opinions. 4.1 Total number of patients contacting the College by year. 4.1 Number of patient contacts with College that were referred from another	4.1 Balance, range and distribution of opinions. 4.1 % of patient contacts with College referred from another body.	4.1 Evaluation reports. 4.1 College PR Contact.	4.1 Review reports. 4.1 Interview

Issue/Questions	Sub-questions	Data	Basis of Judgement	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
	4.2 Do patients believe some other body would be more appropriate, i.e., HPRAC?	body (identify other bodies). 4.2 Same as 4.1	4.2 Balance, range and distribution of opinions. 4.2 Extent of patient first contacts being a body other than the College.	4.2 Evaluation reports. 4.2 College PR Contact.	4.2 Review reports. 4.2 Interview

Issue/Questions	Sub-questions	Data	Basis of Judgement	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
Equity					
1. Do all College members in all locations in Ontario have equal access to the Program?	1.1 Does the PR program recognize the unique situation of members living in remote communities?	1.1 Participation rates of members in PR program by region. 1.1 Feedback of members in remote regions on PR program delivery.	1.1 Recognition of differences. 1.1 Participation rates in remote areas at least equal to Toronto rates. 1.1 +/- balance of member feedback.	1.1 College PR staff and/or committee member. 1.1 PR Program records. 1.1 Baseline survey done by College.	1.1 Interview with College PR staff and/or committee member. 1.1 Review of feedback from College members and patients.
	1.2 Are attempts made to mitigate against the unequal access of the PR program to members in remote areas?	1.2 Delivery of special programs for members in remote areas. 1.2 Appointment of a regional staff person	1.2 Existence of regional programming/resources.	1.2 PR files and documents. 1.2 College PR Contact.	1.2 Review of PR workshop evaluations. 1.2 Interview
2. Do young and old College members, men & women and members with foreign and Canadian training receive PR training appropriate to their needs?	2.1 Do all members within regions have equal access to the PR program?	2.1 Participation rates of members in PR program by age, gender, and training background.	2.1 Expectation of equal participation rates across all variables.	2.1 PR Evaluations completed. 2.1 College PR staff. 2.1 Program records.	2.1 Request/review evaluation reports. 2.1 Interview. 2.1 Review records.
	2.2 Are attempts made to mitigate against the unequal access of the PR program to minority members?	2.1 & 2.2 Feedback of members by age, gender and training background on PR program delivery.	2.1 and 2.2 +/- balance of feedback.	2.1 & 2.2 Baseline survey done by College. 2.2 College PR Contact.	2.2 Review of feedback from College members. 2.2 Interview
	2.3 Is culturally appropriate training provided for members that serve minority communities?	2.2 & 2.3 Delivery of special programs for members with specific needs or minority members.	2.2 Yes/no	2.2 & 2.3 PR files and documents.	2.2 & 2.3 Review files & documents.
		2.3 Checks in place to monitor equal access of members to PR program..	2.3 Yes/no	2.3 College PR Contact. 2.3 College policies. 2.3 PR Program/activity evaluations completed.	2.3 Interview. 2.3 Review policies. 2.3 Request/review evaluation reports.

Appendix 2 - Technical Assessment Questions

1. Do the PR activities of the College meet the requirements of the RHPA 1991?

1.1 Are all the required elements present?
a. educational requirements for members
b. guidelines for the conduct of members with their patients
c. training for College staff
d. provision of information to the public.

1.2 Have all the elements been implemented?

2. Do the PR activities go beyond the specifically mandated sexual abuse issue?

2.1 Did the College identify patient relations issues in addition to sexual abuse?

2.2 Do the College's PR activities address these issues?

2.3 If the College did not identify issues other than sexual abuse, do the complaints statistics support their position?

3. To what extent do the College's PR activities conform to current best practices for optimizing professional/patient relations and minimizing or eliminating patient abuse?

3.1 Did the College take a proactive approach to identifying and addressing the learning needs of members, patients and the public?

3.2 Did the College implement a system for reacting to patient, public and member inquiries, including potential boundary violation questions from members?

3.3 Is information on patient rights and responsibilities made available to patients?

3.4 Are there both professional skills/knowledge and human relations skills and knowledge development opportunities provided for members?

3.5 Is information on appropriate professional behaviour readily available to members, patients and the general public?

3.6 Was the training material designed specifically for the intended audience?

3.7 Does the training material encourage participation in "treatment decision-making" in a manner *desired by the patient*?

3.8 Does the PR material emphasize that "all touch is potentially problematic"?

3.9 Is there provision for on-going development and delivery of training for members?

3.10 Is there a reward to members who participate in continuing education?

3.11 Does the College have a systematic approach to training College staff, Councillors and Committee members?

3.12 Does the College have an implementation plan for its PR activities which includes targets for dates, locations, participation, etc.?

3.13 Does the College have an evaluation plan for its PR activities, including both process and outcome evaluation?

Appendix 3 - Patient Relations Materials from all Colleges

Prepared by the College of Dental Hygienists of Ontario

1. Complete Guide to the Regulated Health Professions Act
   - Richard Stannic
   - Sexual Abuse Provisions, Chapter 10

2. Regulated Health Professions Act, A Practical Guide
   - Linda S. Bohnen

3. One is One Too Many
   - College of Nurses of Ontario
   - A Program for Learning About Prevention of Abuse of Clients

4. Boundaries in Professional Relationships, A Training Manual
   - Jeanette Hofstee Milgrom, MSW
   - A Walk-in Counseling Centre Publication

5. Professional Boundaries: A discussion paper on expectations for nurse-client relationships
   - Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, January 1997

6. Culture, Health and You, Discussion Stimulator Video Workbook
   - University of Western Ontario

7. How to Write Reasons
   - Rick Stannic

8. Mock video tape of discipline hearing
   - College of Chiropodists

9. The Discipline Hearing - video
   - College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario