

Developing healthcare safety investigator competencies for a consensus study

Sophie Hide and Rosemary Lim

Health Services Safety Investigations Body, UK

SUMMARY

There is a drive to professionalise healthcare safety investigators but there are currently no agreed core competencies. This paper describes the process of generating an initial set of competencies for healthcare safety investigators. The outputs formed the basis for a later consensus study.

KEYWORDS

Competencies, healthcare safety investigators

Introduction

Recent patient safety initiatives promote a systems approach to investigations (NHSE, 2022), but there is limited available resource from which to propose investigator competencies. Our wider study aimed to develop a competency framework for healthcare safety investigators in England. We report an early phase of the study in this paper: the development of an initial set of competencies for healthcare safety investigators, for later use in a consensus study.

Methods

Data source

We used existing interview data ‘vignettes’ from a project exploring the scope of a good and effective healthcare safety investigation. Interviews were conducted with 50 international and national safety specialists with varied expertise in contemporary healthcare safety investigations.

Analysis and competency development

Salient interview vignettes (n= 886), that varied in length (10-200 words), were analysed by two researchers with a varied background in healthcare, patient safety and human factors / ergonomics. For the first (approximate) third of interview vignettes (n=316), each researcher independently created ‘competency descriptors’ (i.e. describing a practice or quality of an investigator). These competency descriptors were discussed in depth to reach agreement. Thereafter, for the remaining vignettes (n=570), either researcher proposed competency descriptors for consideration by the other. Differing interpretations were resolved through discussions.

The competency descriptors (n=1214) were then grouped by meaning and application. These were informed by the relevant literature (e.g. Lester, 2014; Nixon and Braithwaite, 2018). Four distinct ‘domains’ were developed (see Table one), with subsidiary ‘domain areas’ (n=9) and 40 draft competencies (aggregates of the competency descriptors). The emphasis upon, and scope, of ‘Personal qualities’ and ‘Effective and compassionate engagement’ were noted for this role.

Results

Table one shows the draft competencies for healthcare safety investigators.

Table 1: Draft investigator competencies for use in the consensus study

| Domain (n=4) | Domain area (n=9) | Draft competencies (n=40) | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------|--|
| Personal qualities | Inherent characteristics | Is empathic | Is inquisitive | Is rigorous | |
| | Professional identity | Demonstrates knowledge in healthcare safety investigation | | | |
| | | Invests in own professional development | | | |
| | | Supports development of knowledge in investigation practice | | | |
| | | Is perceived as a credible professional | | | |
| | | Promotes team-working | | | |
| | Ethical practice | Demonstrates integrity | Demonstrates diplomacy | | |
| | | Reflects on the impact of their own expertise and experiences | | | |
| | | Is sensitive and responsive to the needs of investigation participants | | | |
| | | Seeks and offers peer review | | | |
| | | Demonstrates independence | | | |
| | | Maintains confidentiality | | | |
| | | Investigation knowledge and skill application | Demonstrates core knowledge and understanding of: | The investigation context | |
| | Complex healthcare systems | | | | |
| Principles core to a healthcare safety investigation | | | | | |
| Principles of engagement | | | | | |
| Principles of just culture | | | | | |
| Investigation practice: Demonstrates applied skills as an investigator to: | Plan, prepare and review the design of an investigation | | | | |
| | Use systems-based investigation methodologies | | | | |
| | Use investigation methods and techniques | | | | |
| | Collect investigation data | | | | |
| | Analyse and interpret data | | | | |
| | Develop recommendations | | | | |
| | Report the investigation | | | | |
| | Assure quality of investigation integrity | | | | |
| Effective and compassionate engagement | Being supportive of people involved in an investigation | | Demonstrates insight into the experiences of others | | |
| | | Manages care of those involved in an investigation | | | |
| | Meaningful engagement with people | Prepares for engagement | | | |
| | | Engages intentionally and genuinely with people | | | |
| | Promotes engagement through interview practice | Prepares and supports interviewees | | | |
| | | Conducts the interview | | | |
| | Writes for the audience | Tailors written materials for the user | | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Manages investigation lifecycles | Identifies opportunities to learn from reported incidents | Manages data |
| | Uses established investigation protocols | Schedules work and manages time |
| | Monitors and measures the impact of investigation outputs | |

Key learning points from this process

To our knowledge, this draft competency framework is the first of its kind for healthcare safety investigators globally. The study demonstrates the rich outputs that can be gained from secondary data analysis. For later use in a consensus study, the outputs allow for review and further development by and for healthcare safety investigation stakeholders in England.

References

- Lester, S. (2014) Professional competence standards and frameworks in the United Kingdom, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), 38–52
- NHS England, (2022) Patient Safety Incident Response Framework, available at <https://www.england.nhs.uk/long-read/patient-safety-incident-response-framework/> (accessed 25 November 2024)
- Nixon, J. and Braithwaite, G.R. (2018) What do aircraft accident investigators do and what makes them good at it? Developing a competency framework for investigators using grounded theory, *Safety Science* 103 (2018) 153–161