**PBE Standards: Overview**

**How were the Professional and Practice-based education standards derived?**

The Education For Practice Institute led the development of the Professional and Practice-Based Education Standards for CSU undergraduate and graduate entry courses in 2010. A holistic view of education was fundamental to the development of the CSU professional and practice-based education standards with four aspects being identified as influencing the quality of learning and teaching at the course level, these are; learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, course infrastructure at a local level and infrastructure at the university level. A total of 70 standards were produced within these four aspects. Extensive consultation with the CSU community was undertaken to ensure the course learning outcomes defined in Table 1 were applicable to the wide range of undergraduate and graduate entry courses offered at CSU and that the curriculum renewal degree initiatives were included.

Two principles underpin the design of the professional and practice-based education standards.

1. **Professional values** are a central feature of practice-based education. Learning activities including assessment must be designed to direct learning and evaluate the attainment of professional values. The curriculum goals should be designed to encompass respect, empathy, integrity, altruism, accountability, effective communication, teamwork, leadership, service, an appreciation for the interactions and contributions of those outside the discipline in which one works and a commitment to life-long learning (Lazarus, C.J., Chauvin, S.W., Rodenhauser, P., Whitlock, R. (2000) *Teaching and Learning in Medicine* 12(4):208-211).

2. **Entry into contemporary practice** in a profession/discipline is the main goal for practice-based education. The focus of the curriculum is to create a learning environment that well equips graduates for entry into the world of work and to have capacity for future practice.

The P&PBE Standards were accepted by CSU Academic Senate (September 2010) as descriptors of excellence.

**What is the purpose of the Professional and Practice-based education standards**

The primary aims of the professional and practice-based standards are to:

- Enhance the quality of education using a continuous quality improvement cycle of plan, implement, review and improve. The standards provide a frame of reference for this review cycle by course teams.
- Provide a means for accountability in the delivery of professional courses, for example internal benchmarking.
- Provide a means of reflection at subject level to evaluate their performance and contribution to the quality of CSU professional courses.

**A Possible Method for Implementing a Quality Enhancement Cycle of Review**

A quality enhancement cycle of reflection and action can be used by course teams in their review of the professional and practice-based education standards.

**Steps in the Process of Quality Enhancement**

The steps in this evaluation and improvement cycle are described. The figure below displays the process.

Step 1 – evaluate the level of attainment of the P&PBE standards and chart the results.

Step 2 – review the levels and set strategic priorities for improving standards.

Step 3 – plan the implementation for reaching the targets e.g. changes to teaching and learning methods and assessment within a subject.

Step 4 - re-evaluate the attainment of the standards and report to demonstrate the continued cycle of improvement (enhancement).
Explanation of the Process

The process for evaluating, improving and tracking quality improvement of the standards is explained.

Step 1 - Each course will need to review the achievement of the standards and identify the level of attainment. Ranking attainment for each standard could be as - unacceptable, acceptable, advanced, highly advanced. In some rare cases there will be a standard which is ‘not applicable’ and will therefore not be part of the review and target setting cycle for improvement. Chart the level of attainment for all standards and use this as a baseline. An example of a chart is provided below.

***Table 1. Level of attainment***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2 - Once a baseline evaluation has been conducted, priorities need to be assigned to the management of the standards. In other words targets need to be set for improving the ranking of some of the standards. The timeline for improving the set standards will be influenced by consideration of the:

- relative importance of the domain of the standard to the course
- the level of urgency in addressing improvement and risk
- feasibility and resourcing issues that limit or facilitate improvement in the standards.

This step produces a plan to improve quality over a period of time which is dependent upon the ranking (priority) e.g. a standard deemed important to the course with an associated high risk to learning should have changes made within 1 year and would therefore be ranked with a Priority 1. A set of suggested priority rankings are defined:

**Priority 0** (no priority) is where no priority is given to standards therefore no action in this cycle of enhancement.

**Priority 1** (high priority) is where improvement is required in the shortest possible time frame i.e. within one year because of an associated substantial risk to quality.

**Priority 2** (moderate priority) is a standard that is deemed acceptable but is an item that is desirable to improve over a moderate time frame i.e. 3 years.

**Priority 3** (low priority) is where a standard is at an advanced or highly advanced level and therefore needs only to be maintained, with possibly minor improvements to enhance its quality over a long time frame i.e. 5 years.

An example of strategic priorities (targets) for improvement is displayed in table 2.
Table 2. Prioritising Improvement

**Step 3** - Implement changes in order of priority taking into consideration staffing and resource implications.

**Step 4** - Evaluate the effectiveness of changes after a year of the change being implemented.