Title: The development of competency frameworks in healthcare professions: a scoping review.

Authors

Alan M. Batt MSc [1,2] alan.batt@monash.edu

Walter Tavares PhD [3,4]

Brett Williams PhD [1]

1. Department of Community Emergency Health and Paramedic Practice, Monash University, Victoria, Australia.
2. Fanshawe College, London, Ontario, Canada.
3. Post Graduate Medical Education & Continuing Professional Development, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto
4. The Wilson Centre, University of Toronto

Author for correspondence:

Alan M. Batt, Department of Community Emergency Health and Paramedic Practice, Building H, McMahons Road, Frankston, Vic, 3199, Australia. Email: alan.batt@monash.edu

Competing Interests

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Author Declarations

The authors declare that this work has not been published elsewhere.

Funding & Support

None to declare.

Author Contributions

AB conceived the paper; gathered, analysed, and interpreted data, and prepared the manuscript. WT: contributed to the data analysis and suggested revisions to the manuscript. BW: contributed to the data analysis and suggested revisions to the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

This review was undertaken as part of doctoral studies (AB) supported by the Department of Community Emergency Health and Paramedic Practice, Monash University. The authors wish to thank research librarians Paula Todd (Monash University) and Megan Anderson (Fanshawe College) for their assistance with search strategy development.

Ethical approval

Not applicable for a literature review.

Abstract

Background

Competency frameworks serve many roles including outlining characteristics of a competent workforce, to provide clarity to complex constructs, to facilitate professional mobility, and to help structure analysis, evaluation or assessment of professional expertise. Given these roles and their relevance in the health professions, we sought to understand the methods and strategies used in the development of existing competency frameworks.

Methods

The Arksey and O′Malley framework was applied to undertake this scoping review. Six electronic databases (MEDLINE, CINAHL, PsycINFO, EMBASE, Scopus, and ERIC) and three grey literature sources (greylit.org, Trove and Google Scholar) were searched using keywords related to competency frameworks. Studies of all types were included that described the development of a competency framework in a healthcare profession. Studies were screened for inclusion, and data were extracted independently by two reviewers. Data synthesis was both quantitative and qualitative.

Results

Among 5,710 citations, 190 were selected for analysis. The majority of studies were conducted in medicine and nursing professions. Group techniques were utilised in 140 studies (74%), literature reviews were conducted in 112 (59%), and 81 (43%) outlined some form of stakeholder deliberation. We found a significant degree of diversity in methodological strategies, inconsistent adherence to existing guidance on the selection of methods, who was involved, and based on the variation we observed in timeframes, form, choice, sequence, combination, function, application and reporting of methods and strategies, there is no apparent gold standard or standardised approach to competency framework development.

Conclusions

This review observed significant variation within the conduct and reporting of the competency framework development process. Such variation is a cause for concern, potentially resulting in the development of frameworks that may not have captured the complexities of clinical practice, which are therefore of limited value to the profession, and may unwillingly create and legitimise artificial outcomes. The results of this review suggest there is a need for improved guidance in the process for developing and reporting competency frameworks.

Keywords: professional competence, clinical competence, competency development.

Introduction

As individual health professions evolve, specifying competencies describing required knowledge, skills, attitudes and other characteristics (KSAOs) for effective professional practice are needed by professionals (Campion et al. 2011; Gonczi et al. 1990; Palermo et al. 2017) educators and regulators toward ensuring healthcare professions are well defined, and to promote a competent workforce (World Health Organization 2005). These competencies are often outlined in competency frameworks and have served additional purposes, including for example to facilitate assessment (Eraut 1994; ten Cate 2005; Winter and Maisch 2005), to clarify complexity, to facilitate mobility and articulation across jurisdictions (Gonczi et al. 1990; Heywood et al. 1992), and to analyze and evaluate expertise both within and outside the profession (Baer 1986; Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999). The CanMEDS framework (J. Frank et al. 2015), the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) Outcomes project (reported by Swing 2007), and the 'Jurisdictional Collaborative Project' for entry-level registered nurse practice competencies (Black et al. 2008) are examples of frameworks that have been used in these ways. Given the stakes that such frameworks hold for educators, learners, regulators, health professions and healthcare broadly, development guidelines have been created (Aylward et al. 2014; Heywood et al. 1992; Marrelli et al. 2005; Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999). However, the complexity associated with different professional practices may lead some to enact development activities differently. Indeed, similar professions in different jurisdictions have resulted in different outcomes (J. Frank et al. 2015; Swing 2007), suggesting that different processes may have been used. This emphasis on actual developmental processes, in the context of existing but perhaps outdated guidelines, is the focus of this study. Understanding these activities may provide insights into how these processes shape eventual outcomes and their trustworthiness and provide insights into what may hold value for refinement of existing guidelines.

The development of competency frameworks require strategies to ensure that the complexity associated with professional healthcare practice is captured and represented. This complexity can emerge in a number of ways. For example, regional or contextual variability, unique practice patterns, the role and attributes of individuals and individuals within teams, and other interacting competencies that make practice in multiple contexts possible (Bordage and Harris 2011; Garavan and McGuire 2001; Heywood et al. 1992; Knapp and Supernaw 1977; Lingard 2012; Makulova et al. 2015; Roe 2002). The nature of clinical practice can also be difficult to define or understand fully (Garavan and McGuire 2001; Mendoza 1994). The role of tacit knowledge in professional practice, for example, can be difficult to represent - that is, there can be a disconnect between the personal knowledge of professionals which becomes embedded in their practice, and the publicly accessible knowledge base of the profession (Collin 1989; Eraut 1994). Competence and its component parts are often inconsistently understood or defined and attributed multiple meanings depending on context (Hay-McBer 1996; Spencer and Spencer 1993; ten Cate and Scheele 2007). Other difficulties may include shifting patient demographics or societal expectations, the role of technology, how professions are to be conceptualized, and changes in organizational structures and work processes (Duong et al. 2017; Jacox 1997; Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999). As such, any attempt to examine, capture and represent professional practice must contend with these challenges, leaving developers with decisions on what to include or integrate, and how best to make those choices (Garavan and McGuire 2001; Shilton et al. 2001)

Given this inherent complexity in attempting to capture and accurately represent the features of a health profession, researchers have suggested that a combination of approaches be employed, while taking into consideration practicality, efficiency, and what might be deemed acceptable to the profession (Heywood et al. 1992; Marrelli et al. 2005; Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999). For instance, this may include the identification of relationships between competencies in context (Roe 2002), or the need to examine the existing information on the profession, including developments over time, and other related or adjacent professions (Heywood et al. 1992; Klink and Boon 2002). Methods may require an analysis of both the functions of the profession and the attributes of individuals that enable professional work to be carried out competently (Heywood et al. 1992). Those who will be affected by the framework (e.g., providers, stakeholders), may also provide value in its development, and ensure the final framework is relevant to all those who will be affected by it (Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999).

Collectively, these recommendations suggest that some approaches (particularly singular methods) may be insufficient in providing an accurate account of the subtleties of practice, or of the competencies necessary to enact it (Eraut 1994, p15). While there is no guidance on what specific methods to use, the sequence of methods or even how many strategies or sources to include, there is consensus that in order to increase the validity and utility of competency frameworks a variety of approaches may be necessary, akin to a process of triangulation (Heywood et al. 1992; Klink and Boon 2002; Kwan et al. 2016; Marrelli et al. 2005). For example, in attempting to promote validity and utility, development of the CanMEDS framework and its subsequent revisions involved empirical research, wide consultation, determination of societal need, professional expertise, and educational principles (J. Frank et al. 2015). However, feasibility, the level, depth, and complexity of practice and access to appropriate stakeholders may lead competency developers to prioritise and/or simplify the developmental and validation process (Marrelli et al. 2005; Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999).

These challenges in developing competency frameworks may result in variable or uncertain outcomes that may be of limited validity and utility (Lester 2014; Shilton et al. 2001). This in turn may inaccurately represent the profession, or represent it in unintended ways, and inappropriately impact dependent systems (e.g. policy and standards) with significant effects downstream on curriculum, accreditation, assessment, and subsequent professional practice. Given the activity related to the development of competency frameworks in many health professions, little attention has been paid to the approaches and methods used. Exploration of these aspects may yield useful insights into choices made and why, when developing competency frameworks. As such, the primary objective of this study is to understand the way in which health professions develop competency frameworks and then to consider these activities against existing guidance.

Methods

Design

To address our objective we conducted a scoping literature review. This allowed us to map and present an overview of a heterogeneous body of literature (Arksey and O'Malley 2005) and to examine the depth, breadth, and research activity related to the development of healthcare

professions competency frameworks. We employed a five-stage framework previously described by Arksey and O'Malley which included (1) identifying the research question, (2) identifying relevant published studies, (3) refining the study selection criteria, (4) collecting the relevant data from each published article, and (5) collating, summarizing, reporting, and interpreting the results. We reported our process according to the PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) (Tricco et al. 2018).

Research questions

1. How are competency frameworks developed in healthcare professions?
2. How do competency framework development processes align with previous guidance?
3. What implications do these findings have?

Identify relevant studies

Systematic search

We structured searches using terms that addressed the development of competency frameworks in healthcare professions. We considered competencies and/or competency frameworks as a combination of KSAOs necessary for comprehensive practice within an occupation, or to function to an expected professional standard (Heywood et al. 1992; Shilton et al. 2001; Verma et al. 2009) or "the ability to perform the tasks and roles required to the expected standard" (Eraut and du Boulay 2001). Other related concepts were also considered. For example, Entrustable professional activities (EPA) serve as a type of competency framework, intended to bridge the gap between education and practice (ten Cate and Scheele 2007; Van Loon et al. 2014). Search term examples included competency frameworks, EPAs, competency, and standards, using combinations of keywords and subject headings (see Appendix I for full details). Six databases were selected to ensure a broad range of disciplines could be included: MEDLINE via Ovid, CINAHL/EBSCO, PsycINFO via Ovid, EMBASE via Ovid, Scopus, and Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). The grey literature sites greylit.org and Trove were also searched. Google Scholar was searched and the first 1,000 records were reviewed. Citations within articles were title screened if they appeared relevant to the review (Greenhalgh and Peacock 2005). The search was restricted to articles published in English. No limits were set on publication date, study design or country of origin. Pilot searches were conducted in May and June 2018 with the help of two information specialists to refine and finalize the search strategy. The final searches were conducted in August 2018, tailored to the specific requirements of each database. Systematic search details are provided in Appendix I.

Citations were imported into EndNote X8 (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, PA) and duplicate citations were identified and removed manually. The remaining articles were then uploaded to the online systematic-review software Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia) for title and abstract screening, and data characterisation.

Select the studies

Eligibility criteria
Studies were eligible for inclusion if they (a) involved a healthcare profession, (b) produced a competency framework and (c) explicitly described the development process. Where the same data were reported in more than one publication (e.g., in a journal article and a thesis), only the version reporting the most complete development process data were included. Studies of all types were included assuming they met the criteria listed above. For all included studies we reviewed their reference lists for additional sources. Articles published in languages other than English were excluded.

Title and abstract screening
Initial screening comprised of a review of title and abstracts by two reviewers (AB and BW). Any disagreements were resolved through discussion until consensus was achieved. Where disagreement remained or there was insufficient evidence to make a decision, the citation was included for full article review.

Critical appraisal
In line with the scoping review framework, there was no critical appraisal undertaken (Arksey and O'Malley 2005). Such an appraisal would have been difficult given the significant heterogeneity in the conduct and reporting of frameworks.

Chart the data
To support the full-text review, we developed a standardised data extraction form to organize information, confirm relevance, and to extract study characteristics (Ritchie and Spencer 2002). The information we collected included study characteristics, objectives of studies, and citations. Relevance was confirmed by sampling population (healthcare profession) and objectives (framework development). Characteristics collected via this form included: Author (year), country; Sampling population (profession and sub-discipline); Methods used; Count of methods; Outcomes. This data abstraction form was informed by scoping review methodological frameworks (Arksey and O'Malley 2005; Levac et al. 2010), and was further revised iteratively to accommodate the variations in the methods used. All data were compiled into a single spreadsheet in Microsoft Excel 2013 (Microsoft, Redmond, WA) for coding and analysis. See Appendix II for our final coding template.

Data summary
Due to variation in terminology, methods and strategies used it was necessary to merge some of these in order to facilitate synthesis. This was an iterative process of reducing variation to produce a discrete list of codes, while retaining the pertinent information in each study. For example, 'steering groups', 'working groups', 'committees', 'Delphi method', 'focus groups' and 'expert panels' were all considered sufficiently similar to be coded as a form of 'group technique'. Codes and their definitions are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1. Codes and definitions

Code	Definition/description of approach	Example from included studies
1. Group techniques	Various methods of group processes were used to draft initial frameworks, edit drafts created by expert panels, or provide expert review and input into framework development. These included steering/working groups, expert groups, Delphi process, nominal group technique, conferences or workshops, and group priority sort.	"An Expert Working Group, comprising an SBN *[specialist breast nurse]* and researchers and academics in the field of breast cancer nursing, was convened to synthesise the data that emerged from stakeholder consultation with the published literature." (Yates et al. 2007)
1.1 Delphi process	A facilitated group consensus method conducted over several iterations, in order to elicit opinion and response from a panel of experts, with an emphasis on informed judgement (Brown 1968) in order to inform framework development.	"We convened an inter-professional panel of experts to validate our competency framework by way of a modified Delphi technique" (Moaveni et al. 2010)
1.2 Nominal group technique	A method involving a highly structured meeting during which a group of diverse, but representative participants individually respond to questions, present their responses one at a time, and subsequently prioritize responses in an anonymous fashion (Delbecq and Van de Ven 1971) in order to inform framework development	"We employed three methods in this study: (1) nominal group technique (NGT), (2) expert committee, and (3) text analysis" (Ho et al. 2011)
1.3 Conference or workshop	A method whereby events are hosted to bring together small and large groups, of the same or multiple disciplines, in order to gain input, and depending on the format of the event, consensus and feedback to refine and revise the competency framework	"A one-day conference was held with two leaders from each of 31 medical schools" (Z. Liu et al. 2016)
1.4 Focus groups	A method that involves in-depth group interviews on a particular topic in which participants are selected because they are a purposive sampling of a specific population (Lederman 1990, p117). Competency frameworks were discussed in focus groups with stakeholders or practitioners.	"Preliminary input was obtained through a series of focus groups" (Myers et al. 2015)
1.5 Group priority sort	A method whereby a group of diverse stakeholders identify priorities, define a complex concept and contribute to informed decision making in topics where evidence is lacking or inappropriate (Jacobson et al. 2013)	"The group priority sort method, which involves engaging groups of stakeholders in sorting and ranking activities, was used as a validation method" (Ling et al. 2017)
2. Literature review	A method that seeks to identify current knowledge of a topic, allow for consolidation, and facilitate researchers to build on previous work, to avoid duplication and to identify any omissions or gaps in the knowledge of a topic (Grant and Booth 2009). A review of related research literature was conducted prior to or during the development of the competency framework. These included systematic, scoping, integrative and focused reviews, and other variations such as environmental scans.	"A literature search was carried out in order to identify existing competency frameworks for dementia care" (Smythe et al. 2014)

3. Stakeholder deliberation	A strategy whereby stakeholders (practitioners, external organisations, experts in the field or other relevant parties) were solicited for feedback	"The professional association, occupational health nurses who were not members of ACORN, and other stakeholders in the workplace were invited to provide feedback." (Davey 1995)
3.1 Stakeholder deliberation (patient/carer)	A strategy whereby patients and/or their carers were directly engaged in the framework development process as a stakeholder	"A meeting convened in 2010 involved stakeholders in UK nursing education, practice and management, including patient representatives" (Kirk et al. 2014)
4. Mapping exercise	The competency framework was mapped against existing national or international standards for the profession, or for the health service of the country or region to ensure alignment with existing standards and policies.	"Using the results of the literature review and environmental scan, the Working Group adapted the Irish Palliative Care Competence Framework" (McCallum et al. 2018)
5. Survey	A method whereby an online or offline questionnaire was sent to stakeholders (practitioners, external organisations, experts in the field or other relevant parties)	"…validate the resulting framework by conducting a complex survey of two cohorts of Fellows" (J. R. Frank 2005)
6. Interviews	A method whereby competency frameworks were discussed in interviews (structured, semi-structured , in-depth, group* etc.) with stakeholders or practitioners	"A purposive sample of 25 nurse leaders provided information during structured interviews" (Amendola 2008)
7. Practice analysis	A strategy whereby authors sought to directly or indirectly observe the conduct of practice in the context of the practice environment, operationalized through several different methods	"Over 800 hours of specialist critical care nursing practice were observed and grouped into `domains' or major themes of specialist practice" (Dunn et al. 2000)

Data synthesis

These codes are further explored in order to provide insight into the heterogeneity of methods and strategies, their purpose, and how they were operationalized by authors. We will synthesise the findings of the review, arranged by most popular codes. These included group techniques, literature reviews, stakeholder deliberation, mapping exercises, surveys, focus groups, interviews, and practice analyses. We will outline variations that exist within each code including form, function, application, and intended outcomes. This qualitative approach to analysis was performed inductively and iteratively, allowing the data to be representative of itself. The synthesis and subsequent discussion are influenced by our perspective that context is important both in the

original studies, and in our own interpretation of the literature. Additionally, study authors may have held underlying positions that are distinct from ours, which may result in differing interpretations of their studies.

Results

Search results and study selection

The final search yielded 5,669 citations. An additional 110 citations were identified through searches of grey literature, and hand searching. After elimination of duplicates 5,710 citations were included and screened at the title and abstract level. A total of 5,331 citations were excluded. The remaining 379 citations underwent full-text review, whereby an additional 189 were excluded. The remaining 190 full-texts were included for full-text data extraction and analysis. See Figure 1 for an illustration of these findings using PRISMA Diagram, and Appendix III for a full list of included studies.

Figure 1. PRISMA Diagram

Characteristics of included studies

Included articles were published between 1978 and 2018. The majority were published as peer-reviewed articles (n=173), with the remaining grey literature comprised of reports (n=12) and theses (n=5). The majority of studies were from the USA (n=66, 35%), followed by the United Kingdom (n=28, 15%), Canada (n=27, 14%), and Australia (n=25, 13%). Nursing competency frameworks accounted for the majority (n=66, 35%), followed by medicine (n=65, 34%), and multidisciplinary frameworks (n=32, 17%). See Table 2 for full location and profession characteristics of included articles.

Table 2. Study locations and professions.

Country	**n**	**%**
USA	66	35%
UK	28	15%
Canada	27	14%
Australia	25	13%
Brazil	6	3%
Europe	6	3%
China	5	3%

Netherlands	3	2%
Global	3	2%
South Africa	2	1%
Germany	2	1%
Lebanon	2	1%
India	2	1%
Sweden	1	1%
Italy	1	1%
Thailand	1	1%
Korea	1	1%
Finland	1	1%
Cyprus	1	1%
Taiwan	1	1%
Mexico	1	1%
Western Pacific	1	1%
Belgium	1	1%
Saudi Arabia	1	1%
Africa	1	1%
Ireland	1	1%
Profession	**n**	**%**
Nursing	66	35%
Medicine	65	34%
Multidisciplinary	32	17%
Allied health	8	4%
Pharmacy	7	4%
Public Health	5	3%
EMS	5	3%
CAM	1	1%
Psychology	1	1%

Group techniques were utilised in 140 studies (74%). Literature reviews were conducted in 112 studies (59%), and mapping exercises were conducted in 71 (37%). Strategies of stakeholder involvement were utilised in 82 studies (43%), and practice analysis in 21 studies (11%). See Table 3 for frequency of the methods reported in the development process, and Appendix IV for full details and frequencies.

Table 3. Frequency of reported methods and strategies

Method/strategy	**n**	**%**
1. Group techniques	140	74%
1.1 Delphi process	49	26%
1.2 NGT	5	3%
1.3 Conference / workshop	40	21%
1.4 Focus Groups	35	18%
1.5 Group priority sort	1	0.5%

2. Literature review	112	59%
3. Stakeholder deliberation	82	43%
3.1 Stakeholder deliberation (patient/carer)	21	11%
4. Mapping process	71	37%
5. Survey	49	26%
6. Interviews	30	16%
7. Practice analysis	21	11%

Studies varied in the number of approaches used from one (n=18, 9%) to eight (n=2, 1%). The median number used was three, and a total of 140 studies (74%) utilised three or more methods or strategies. Combinations of methods used varied, and no distinct pattern emerged when analysed by profession. Study periods were not outlined in the majority of studies, but of those that did (n=78), the timeframe for the development of competency frameworks ranged from two days to six years, with 41 (53%) completed in 12 months or less. The objectives of the included studies varied from the explicit development of a competency framework or standard, to exploratory studies into the role of the profession or discipline in question, and frameworks were often developed as a component of a larger project such as national standards.

Table 4. Number of methods and strategies used by studies

Number of methods/strategies	**n**	**%**
1	18	9%
2	32	17%
3	56	29%
4	49	26%
5	24	13%
6	8	4%
7	1	1%
8	2	1%

Variation in application of approaches

While diversity exists in both the combination and number of methods and strategies used in the development of competency frameworks, we also observed variability within these approaches in relation to form, function and application. We observed this in the use of group techniques, literature reviews, the role of stakeholders, in mapping exercises, surveys, interviews and practice analyses. Next we elaborate on these findings, organized from most to least commonly used in developing competency frameworks. Examples are referenced to illustrate variance among and within codes, and are not intended to be exhaustive lists. See Appendix III for full details, frequencies and examples.

Group techniques

Group techniques included (a) working/steering, or expert groups (Aylward et al. 2014; D. Davis et al. 2005), (b) Delphi method (Cappiello et al. 2016; Sousa and Alves 2015), (c) nominal group technique (Kirk et al. 2014; Landzaat et al. 2017), (d) focus groups (Halcomb et al. 2017; Palermo et al. 2016), (e) group priority sort (Ling et al. 2017) and (f) various data collection strategies (e.g.,

conferences and workshops) (Klick et al. 2014; Skirton et al. 2010). Within these techniques, variations were evident along a number of dimensions including form, function, application and intended outcomes (e.g., to achieve consensus, to facilitate dissemination, to review draft documents etc.). For example, while both Aylward and Davis used working/steering groups, one was used to draft the initial framework (Aylward et al. 2014), while the other used it to edit a draft created by an expert group (R. Davis et al. 2008). Cappiello used a Delphi method to gain agreement on competencies early in the development of the framework, while Sousa used it as a final step to gain consensus on the framework. Focus groups varied in composition of the group, the size and number of groups, and the purpose for which the focus group findings were used. For example, the composition for some comprised of members of the same discipline (Halcomb et al. 2017; Palermo et al. 2016), while others saw value in using members from different disciplines (Booth and Courtnell 2012; Gillan et al. 2013) - in direct contrast to the *sine qua non* of focus groups (Lederman 1990). In terms of how this method was used, some used it in the initial identification and drafting of competencies (Booth and Courtnell 2012; Patterson et al. 2000), while others used it to engage stakeholders during the development process (Banfield and Lackie 2009; Smythe et al. 2014). Authors including Myers et al. (2015) used focus groups to validate draft frameworks. Similarly, Kirk and Landzaat used variations of nominal group technique (NGT). Kirk et al. (2014) utilised NGT as traditionally described (Delbecq and Van de Ven 1971), while Landzaat et al. (2017) utilised a hybrid of modified Delphi and NGT components. Ling was the only study to utilise group priority sort method. Authors including Klick et al. (2014) used a large conference to facilitate input and dissemination. Conversely, others such as Skirton et al. (2010) elected for a smaller group workshop to review draft documentation and gain input. The variation evident within these group techniques suggests that authors made choices (that were not always explicit) in what they valued as meaningful data sources and strategies when using such techniques. While there is variation within this overall category and the methods within it, the same holds true for other sources of evidence for competency framework development.

Literature reviews

Different types of literature reviews included (a) systematic reviews (Galbraith et al. 2017; Klick et al. 2014), (b) scoping reviews (AlShammari et al. 2018; Redwood-Campbell et al. 2011), (c) integrative reviews (Camelo 2012), (d) focused reviews (Tavares et al. 2016; Yates et al. 2007), and (e) environmental scans (McCallum et al. 2018; National Physiotherapy Advisory Group 2017). Many authors did not explicitly outline the type of review they conducted, and outlined their review using terms including ‘broad’, ‘extensive’, ‘specific’, and ‘comprehensive’. These choices may be fit for purpose; however, we also observed variation in the function and application of these different types of literature reviews. For example, some authors performed a review to identify existing competencies (Chen et al. 2013; Hemalatha and Shakuntala 2018), while others performed a literature review to inform methodology and methods (Davey 1995; Sherbino et al. 2014). In addition, the majority of authors did not share their search strategies or results as part of their study. It appears that authors make decisions regarding the role and relevance of reviews, and integrate them (or not) for a variety of reasons which may include practicality, expertise, time, and purpose.

Stakeholder deliberation

We also noted variations in the role and relevance of stakeholder deliberation strategies, which included involving (a) healthcare professionals (J. R. Frank 2005; Yates et al. 2007), (b)

professional associations (Davey 1995; Gillan et al. 2013), (c) academics (du Toit et al. 2010; Tangayi et al. 2011), (d) charities and non-profit organisations (Tsaroucha et al. 2013), (e) regulatory bodies (du Toit et al. 2010), (f) trade unions and employers (Reetoo et al. 2005), and (g) patients and their families (R. Davis et al. 2008; Dewing and Traynor 2005). In addition to who was involved, how and why they were involved varied as well, with some authors electing to use focus groups (Hamburger et al. 2015), interviews (Tsaroucha et al. 2013), surveys (Tangayi et al. 2011), action research (Dewing and Traynor 2005), conferences and workshops (D. Davis et al. 2005), online wikis (Ambuel et al. 2011), and/or patient advocacy organisations (Yates et al. 2007). Stakeholder input served different purposes, and was used to draft the initial competency frameworks (Kirk et al. 2014; Macmillan Cancer Support 2017), to refine and revise draft frameworks (Aylward et al. 2014; Davey 1995), and to gain consensus for the adoption of frameworks (Brewer and Jones 2013; Santy et al. 2005). Authors engaged stakeholders to take advantage of professional expertise, acceptance to the profession, and practicality. Despite the focus on 'patient-centred' care outlined in many frameworks, only 21 studies (11%) described engaging patients or their caregivers in order to elicit end-user perspectives. In other instances, it was difficult to understand the role of stakeholders. Thus who to engage as a stakeholder, how to engage them, and for what purpose is, similar to other approaches, also idiosyncratic.

Mapping exercises

We conceptualised a mapping exercise as a strategy whereby existing frameworks or policy documents were used to inform structure, content or scope of the developed framework. The documents used for mapping exercises included (a) specialty board certification exams or reporting milestones (Cicutto et al. 2017; Klein et al. 2014), (b) national policies and health service agendas (Glanville Geake and Ryder 2009; Mills and Pritchard 2004), (c) relevant frameworks from other countries (L. Liu et al. 2014; McCallum et al. 2018), and (d) international or regional frameworks (Barry 2011; Wölfel et al. 2016). Variation within this approach was also apparent, and authors operationalized mapping exercises by several terms that included 'evaluated against', 'based on', 'abide by', 'integrated', 'mapped to', 'inclusive of', and 'according to'. These mapping exercises were used as a foundation for framework development (Boyce et al. 2011; McCallum et al. 2018), to identify a pool of items to use in consensus methods (M. Liu et al. 2007), to generate behavioural items for identified competencies (Aylward et al. 2014) and to organise and tabulate responses from stakeholders (Loke and Fung 2014). Again, the rationale for these choices were not always clear.

Surveys

Surveys also varied in the method of conduct, purpose of survey, and characteristics of survey population. For example, from a methodological perspective, some were conducted online or via e-mail (Barnes et al. 2010; Klick et al. 2014), via post (Bluestein 1993; R. Davis et al. 2008), or using a combination of approaches (Baldwin et al. 2007). In terms of function, surveys were utilised to identify initial competencies (Parkinson's UK 2016), to elicit feedback during the development process (Smythe et al. 2014), and in the subsequent validation of the framework (Sherbino et al. 2014). Sample sizes varied from 33 (Ketterer et al. 2017) to 18,000 (National Physiotherapy Advisory Group 2017), while response rates varied from 3% (NPAG 2017) to 89% (Z. Liu et al. 2016). Actual number of responses ranged from 20 (Ketterer et al. 2017) to 6,247 (Z. Liu et al. 2016)

Interviews

One-on-one interviews demonstrated similar variation in form, function, application and outcomes (e.g. to gain expert input, to analyse behaviours, to engage key informants). The form of interviews included (a) semi-structured (Akbar et al. 2005; Daouk-Öyry et al. 2017), (b) structured (Amendola 2008), (c) in-depth (Blanchette 2015; Tavares et al. 2016), (d) group interviews (Loke and Fung 2014), (e) critical incident (Lewis et al. 2010; McCarthy and Fitzpatrick 2009), and (f) behavioural event interviews (Calhoun et al. 2008; Chen et al. 2013). Participants in interviews included patients and family members (Dijkman et al. 2017; Patterson et al. 2000), academics (Chen et al. 2013; Gardner et al. 2006), and healthcare professionals (Calhoun et al. 2008; Chen et al. 2013). The function of interviews varied, and they were conducted to gain expert input (Smythe et al. 2014; Tavares et al. 2016), to gain insight into practice (Dunn et al. 2000; McCarthy and Fitzpatrick 2009), to confirm findings from other methods (i.e. triangulation) (Dunn et al. 2000; Palermo et al. 2017), and to solicit contributions from diverse stakeholders (Kwan et al. 2016). Application of this method demonstrated variation, and the number of interviews conducted was often not reported. In contrast to the inconsistent reporting of the focus group method however, most authors provided details on the selection process and the methodology used for interviews in their studies. For example, many authors outlined in detail their sample, recruitment strategy, interview technique, recording, transcription, and analysis of interview data (Palermo et al. 2017; Tavares et al. 2016)

Practice analysis

Some authors elected to use analysis of practice as a strategy during competency framework development. This involved methods such as (a) functional analysis (Bench et al. 2003; Palermo et al. 2016), (b) analysis of administrative data (Dressler et al. 2006; Stucky et al. 2010), (c) direct observation of practice (Dewing and Traynor 2005; Underwood et al. 1996), (d) critical incident technique (CIT) (Dunn et al. 2000; Lewis et al. 2010), (e) review of position descriptions (Akbar et al. 2005; Fidler 1997), and (f) task or role analysis (Cattini 1999; Chang et al. 2013). Again, we identified variations in form, function, and application. For example, Dressler et al. (2006) identified commonly encountered conditions in billing data, while Stucky et al. (2010) and Shaughnessy et al. (2013) identified commonly recorded diagnostic codes to inform the development of competency frameworks. Dunn et al. (2000), Underwood et al. (1996), and Dewing and Traynor (2005) observed practice in-person, while Patterson et al. (2000) observed video recorded interactions to develop an understanding of practice. Practice analyses were used to inform the initial list of competencies in frameworks (Dressler et al. 2006; Fidler 1997), as a means of capturing the complexity of practice in context (Dunn et al. 2000; Underwood et al. 1996), to triangulate data from other methods (Lewis et al. 2010; McCarthy and Fitzpatrick 2009), and as a means of validating frameworks (Carrington et al. 2011). Timeframes of data collection also varied significantly, and while not always reported, some methods such as direction observation of practice required hundreds of hours of data collection and coding (Dunn et al. 2000; Underwood et al. 1996)

Discussion

Competency frameworks serve many roles including outlining characteristics of a competent workforce, to provide clarity to complex constructs, to facilitate professional mobility, and to help structure analysis, evaluation or assessment of professional expertise. Given these roles and their relevance in the health professions, we sought to understand the methods and strategies used in

their development. After considering the approaches used from multiple professions and jurisdictions, we found a significant degree of diversity in these methodological strategies used in type, amount and combination (i.e. there is no consistent approach). We found inconsistent adherence to existing (albeit limited) guidance on the selection of methods, who was involved, and based on the variation we observed in timeframes, form, choice, sequence, combination, function, application and reporting of methods and strategies, there is no apparent gold standard or standardised approach. Group techniques and literature reviews were among the most widely used strategies, but even here significant heterogeneity existed within these and other methods. We also observed the use of novel methods when adopting practice analyses. These findings have implications for how we consider future guidance related to the development of competency frameworks.

Given the historical focus on methods in the development of competency frameworks, there is relatively little guidance describing how to identify the most appropriate methods, the recommended sequencing or combination of specific methods, or what might be necessary methods when developing competency frameworks, which may explain some of the variation we observed. While existing guidance suggests a degree of flexibility, allowing developers room in the development process to take into consideration their context (Heywood et al. 1992; Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999), there is less guidance on when, why or how to make those choices. Thus we recognise that what may be fit for one setting, in terms of methodological approaches, may not be for another (Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999), but also that without careful consideration and elaboration of those choices, utility and ultimately the validity associated with outcomes becomes less clear, or at least difficult to examine. The heterogeneity in our findings suggests that developmental strategies and outcomes may be influenced by many factors such as intended purpose, available resources, timeframes, and the experience and expertise of developers. We assume that authors are selecting strategies that seem fit for their context, and while such approaches may be functionally aligned, the utility and/or validity associated with choices made remains an area rich for debate. These influencing factors often remain implicit, and authors often neglected to outline why they selected specific approaches. This could be due in part to a lack of guidance, and/or the absence of reporting guidelines. However, this lack of existing guidance may also have led to the emergence of novel strategies. For instance, although only a small number of studies (n=15) described a practice analysis, six different methods were described under this strategy. Thus the objectives of the framework development process appeared to inform what might be considered appropriate methods to analyse practice. Such methods may be practical, and appropriate or acceptable to stakeholders, and are worth further study. It may be necessary to continue to support such flexibility in approaches but perhaps it may also be necessary to obligate (a) an analysis of the functional alignment of those choices with the intended uses of planned competency frameworks, and (b) an analysis of the outcomes before or at least as part of adoption plans.

In addition to supporting flexibility and analysis of development choices, another strategy to promote better interpretation may be to consider the approaches that underlie the development of competency frameworks. That is, guidance regarding how to develop a framework may benefit from something deeper than previously outlined practicalities (Heywood et al. 1992; Marrelli et al. 2005; Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999). This could include considering the development process as a form of mixed-methods research, whereby qualitative and quantitative approaches to data

collection are combined to provide a more complete understanding of the research problem than either approach could provide alone (Creswell 2014). This has implications for future guidance, in particular related to the identification of the nature of the research problem, the philosophical assumptions of the researchers, and the intended audience of the research product, and may provide developers with a solid foundation, and appropriate boundaries to inform the subsequent selection of literature, procedures, and methods of data collection (Creswell 2014; Scotland 2012). Further interpretations of the quality of the work and trustworthiness of the outcome may leave too much room without explicit consideration of these ideas. Because authors rarely outlined such underlying issues, or provided a rationale to support their choice of approaches, this is likely to present challenges when or if the community attempts to assess the rigour associated with, or validity of the developed framework, or when attempting to compare the final product against stated aims or objectives.

Because these final products can exert significant influence on education, curriculum, assessment, and accreditation (Heywood et al. 1992; Whiddett and Hollyforde 1999), the community needs to remain aware of the 'god-term' status afforded to 'competence' or competency frameworks in healthcare (Lingard 2009). As a result of this status, and the underlying reasons for their creation, competency frameworks are assumed to be legitimate, accurate representations of practice. Clinical practice requires competencies that many current reductionist competency frameworks are unable to identify (Bradley et al. 2015), and it takes place within the context of broader social systems that remain implicit in many studies. Combined with the challenges we have outlined regarding underlying assumptions, feasibility of methods, complexity of practice and access to stakeholders, this means that the delivery of the final product could, perhaps unknowingly, be prioritised over the comprehensiveness of the development process. As a result, developers may artificially legitimise outcomes that are not representative of the profession. This may subsequently result in the creation of what could be termed a 'false-god' framework. A 'false-god' (i.e., idol) is an object of afforded high value that is illegitimate or inaccurate in its professed authority or capability (Toussaint 2009). Such a framework may poorly reflect, or even neglect, the complex realities of practice. However, this framework would appear legitimate, and as such would be 'worshipped', in that it is adopted by the profession, potentially leading to inappropriate downstream influence on policy, standards, and/or education.

Limitations

This study needs to be considered in the context of its limitations. We may not have identified all relevant studies despite attempts to be comprehensive. While our search strategy included terms previously used to describe the development of competency frameworks in various professions, others may exist. The keywords used to index papers lack consistency and a wide variety of descriptive terms are used in abstracts. Our search and review was restricted to articles published in English, but this does not inherently bias a review (Morrison et al. 2012). The Google Scholar search was limited to the first 1000 results; however, the first 200–300 results from Google Scholar are considered adequate for grey literature searches (Haddaway et al. 2015). No new codes were generated after approximately 50 articles were coded, which suggests that the inclusion of additional literature would likely not have influenced the overall findings of this review. Due to the lack of detail provided by many authors regarding their underlying assumptions, rationale,

selection, conduct, and sequencing of methods, and subsequent timeframes, this review cannot provide a concrete overview of all aspects of each included study. Finally, the dynamic nature of research into competency frameworks, EPAs, and the general discourse on competency may be considered a limitation. However, this review offers a comprehensive overview of the development of competency frameworks to date along with suggestions for future research.

Conclusion

This review identified and explored the research pertaining to competency framework development. Research to date has focused predominantly on the framework output, with considerably less attention devoted to the process of development. This review demonstrated that the development process varies substantially, and that there is no standardised approach or apparent 'gold-standard'. We observed variability in the form, choice, sequence, function, application, and reporting of methods and strategies, perhaps as a result of a lack of appropriate guidance. Such variation is a cause for concern, potentially resulting in the development of frameworks that may not have captured the complexities of clinical practice, which are therefore of limited value to the profession, and may unwillingly create and legitimise artificial outcomes.

Future guidance regarding framework development should remain mindful of the need for flexibility, but should also consider framework development as a form of mixed-methods research, and examine functional alignment of methods and strategies in order to promote consistency in the process where it belongs. Conceptualising clinical practice as a complex system that is influenced by broader social forces may present opportunity for those developing competency frameworks to determine approaches that remain practical and acceptable to the profession, but may be better positioned to sufficiently capture the complexities of practice. There is also a need to further research the implementation and evaluation of competency frameworks. It is our hope that this review furthers the conversation related to the development of competency frameworks in healthcare professions. The findings offer those involved in the development process the opportunity to consider the complexity of practice that they must strive to capture with their chosen approaches. The knowledge gained from this review has implications for future guidance on the development of competency frameworks, and provides a rationale for future work to focus more attention on the development process.

References

Akbar, H., Hill, P. S., Rotem, A., Riley, I. D., Zwi, A. B., Marks, G. C., & Mark, T. (2005). Identifying competencies for Australian health professionals working in international health. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Public Health*, *17*(2), 99–103. doi:10.1177/101053950501700207

AlShammari, T., Jennings, P. A., & Williams, B. (2018). Emergency medical services core competencies: A scoping review. *Health Professions Education*. doi:10.1016/j.hpe.2018.03.009

Ambuel, B., Trent, K., Lenahan, P., Cronholm, P., Downing, D., Jelley, M., et al. (2011). *Competencies Needed by Health Professionals for Addressing Exposure to Violence and Abuse in Patient Care*. Eden Prairie, MN.

Amendola, M. L. (2008). *An examination of the leadership competency requirements of nurse leaders in healthcare information technology*. ProQuest Information & Learning US, US. Retrieved from

http://search.proquest.com/pqdtglobal/docview/304320420/abstract/D647C228A884B95PQ/3%5Cnhttp://media.proquest.com/media/pq/classic/doc/1674957421/fmt/ai/rep/NPDF?hl=information,information,for,for,nurses,nurse,nurses,nurse&cit:auth=Amendola,+Mark+Lawrence

Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *8*(1), 19–32. doi:10.1080/1364557032000119616

Aylward, M., Nixon, J., & Gladding, S. (2014). An entrustable professional activity (epa) for handoffs as a model for epa assessment development. *Academic Medicine*, *89*(10), 1335–1340. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000000317

Baer, W. (1986). Expertise and Professional Standards. *Work and Occupations*, *13*(4), 532–552. doi:10.1177/0730888486013004005

Baldwin, K. M., Lyon, B. L., Clark, A. P., Fulton, J., Davidson, S., Dayhoff, N., et al. (2007). Developing clinical nurse specialist practice competencies. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, *21*(6), 297–303. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.NUR.0000299619.28851.69

Banfield, V., & Lackie, K. (2009). Performance-based competencies for culturally responsive interprofessional collaborative practice. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *23*(6), 611–620. doi:10.3109/13561820902921654

Barnes, T. A., Gale, D. D., Kacmarek, R. M., & Kageler, W. V. (2010). Competencies needed by graduate respiratory therapists in 2015 and beyond. *Respiratory Care*, *55*(5), 601–616.

Barry, M. M. (2011). The CompHP Core Competencies Framework for Health Promotion Short Version. *Health education & behavior□: the official publication of the Society for Public Health Education*, *39*(20081209), 648–662. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1090198112465620

Bench, S., Crowe, D., Day, T., Jones, M., & Wilebore, S. (2003). Developing a competency framework for critical care to match patient need. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*, *19*(3), 136–142. doi:10.1016/S0964-3397(03)00030-2

Black, J., Allen, D., Redfern, L., Muzio, L., Rushowick, B., Balaski, B., et al. (2008). Competencies in the context of entry-level registered nurse practice: a collaborative project in Canada. *International Nursing Review*, *55*(2), 171–178. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-7657.2007.00626.x

Blanchette, L. (2015). *An exploratory study of the role of the organization and the* ... ProQuest Information & Learning US, US. Retrieved from http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=psyc13a&NEWS=N&AN=2016-17339-289

Bluestein, P. (1993). A model for developing standards of care of the chiropractic paraprofessional by task analysis. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*, *16*(4), 228–237.

Booth, M., & Courtnell, T. (2012). Developing competencies and training to enable senior nurses to take on full responsibility for DNACPR processes. *International Journal of Palliative Nursing*, *18*(4), 189–195. doi:10.12968/ijpn.2012.18.4.189

Bordage, G., & Harris, I. (2011). Making a difference in curriculum reform and decision-making processes. *Medical Education*, *45*(1), 87–94. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03727.x

Boyce, P., Spratt, C., Davies, M., & McEvoy, P. (2011). Using entrustable professional activities to guide curriculum development in psychiatry training. *BMC Medical Education*, *11*(1), 96. doi:10.1186/1472-6920-11-96

Bradley, J. M., Unal, R., Pinto, C. A., & Cavin, E. S. (2015). Competencies for governance of

complex systems of systems. *International Journal of System of Systems Engineering*, *6*(1/2), 71. doi:10.1504/ijsse.2015.068804

Brewer, M., & Jones, S. (2013). An Interprofessional Practice Capability Framework Focusing on Safe, High-Quality, Client-Centred Health Service. *Journal of Allied Health*, *42*(2), e45-49.

Brown, B. (1968). *Delphi Process: A Methodology Used for the Elicitation of Opinions of Experts*. Santa Monica, CA. https://www.rand.org/pubs/papers/P3925.html

Calhoun, J. G., Ramiah, K., Weist, E. M., Shortell, S. M., Dollett, L., Sinioris, M. E., et al. (2008). Development of an interprofessional competency model for healthcare leadership. *Journal of healthcare management / American College of Healthcare Executives*, *53*(6), 375–391. doi:10.1097/00115514-200811000-00006

Camelo, S. H. H. (2012). Professional competences of nurse to work in Intensive Care Units: an integrative review. *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem*, *20*(1), 192–200. doi:10.1590/S0104-11692012000100025

Campion, M. A., Fink, A. A., Ruggeberg, B. J., Consulting, A., Carr, L., Microsystems, S., et al. (2011). Doing Competencies Well: Best Practices in Competency Modeling. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*, 225–262. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01207.x

Cappiello, J., Levi, A., & Nothnagle, M. (2016). Core competencies in sexual and reproductive health for the interprofessional primary care team. *Contraception*, *93*(5), 438–445. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2015.12.013

Carrington, C., Weir, J., & Smith, P. (2011). The development of a competency framework for pharmacists providing cancer services. *Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice*, *17*(3), 168–178. doi:10.1177/1078155210365582

Cattini, P. (1999). Core competencies for Clinical Nurse Specialists: A usable framework. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *8*(5), 505–511. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2702.1999.00285.x

Chang, A., Bowen, J. L., Buranosky, R. A., Frankel, R. M., Ghosh, N., Rosenblum, M. J., et al. (2013). Transforming primary care training - Patient-centered medical home entrustable professional activities for internal medicine residents. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *28*(6), 801–809. doi:10.1007/s11606-012-2193-3

Chen, S. P., Krupa, T., Lysaght, R., McCay, E., & Piat, M. (2013). The development of recovery competencies for in-patient mental health providers working with people with serious mental Illness. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *40*(2), 96–116. doi:10.1007/s10488-011-0380-x

Cicutto, L., Gleason, M., Haas-Howard, C., Jenkins-Nygren, L., Labonde, S., & Patrick, K. (2017). Competency-Based Framework and Continuing Education for Preparing a Skilled School Health Workforce for Asthma Care: The Colorado Experience. *Journal of School Nursing*, *33*(4), 277–284. doi:10.1177/1059840516675931

Collin, A. (1989). Managers' Competence: Rhetoric, Reality and Research. *Personnel Review*, *18*(6), 20–25. doi:10.1108/00483488910133459

Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design□: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Daouk-Öyry, L., Zaatari, G., Sahakian, T., Rahal Alameh, B., & Mansour, N. (2017). Developing a competency framework for academic physicians. *Medical Teacher*, *39*(3), 269–277. doi:10.1080/0142159X.2017.1270429

Davey, G. D. (1995). Developing competency standards for occupational health nurses in Australia. *AAOHN Journal*, *43*(3), 138–143.

Davis, D., Stullenbarger, E., Dearman, C., & Kelley, J. A. (2005). Proposed nurse educator

competencies: Development and validation of a model. *Nursing Outlook*, *53*(4), 206–211. doi:10.1016/j.outlook.2005.01.006

Davis, R., Turner, E., Hicks, D., & Tipson, M. (2008). Developing an integrated career and competency framework for diabetes nursing. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *17*(2), 168–174. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01866.x

Delbecq, A. L., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1971). A Group Process Model for Problem Identification and Program Planning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *7*(4), 466–492. doi:10.1177/002188637100700404

Dewing, J., & Traynor, V. (2005). Admiral nursing competency project: Practice development and action research. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *14*(6), 695–703. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2005.01158.x

Dijkman, B., Reehuis, L., & Roodbol, P. (2017). Competences for working with older people: The development and verification of the European core competence framework for health and social care professionals working with older people. *Educational Gerontology*, *43*(10), 483–497. doi:10.1080/03601277.2017.1348877

Dressler, D. D., Pistoria, M. J., Budnitz, T. L., McKean, S. C. W., & Amin, A. N. (2006). Core competencies in hospital medicine: development and methodology. *Journal of hospital medicine (Online)*, *1*(1), 48–56. doi:10.1002/jhm.6

du Toit, R., Cook, C., Minnies, D., & Brian, G. (2010). Developing a competency-based curriculum for eye care managers in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Rural and remote health*, *10*(2), 1278.

Dunn, S. V, Lawson, D., Robertson, S., Underwood, M., Clark, R., Valentine, T., et al. (2000). The development of competency standards for specialist critical care nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *31*(2), 339–346. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01292.x

Duong, H. V, Herrera, L. N., Moore, J. X., Donnelly, J., Jacobson, K. E., Carlson, J. N., et al. (2017). National Characteristics of Emergency Medical Services Responses for Older Adults in the United States. *Prehospital Emergency Care*, *0*(0), 1–8. doi:10.1080/10903127.2017.1347223

Eraut, M. (1994). *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*. London: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203486016

Eraut, M., & du Boulay, B. (2001). Developing the Attributes of Medical Professional Judgement and Competence. http://users.sussex.ac.uk/~bend/doh/reporthtml.html

Fidler, J. R. (1997). The role of the phlebotomy technician: Skills and knowledge required for successful clinical performance. *Evaluation and the Health Professions*, *20*(3), 286–301. doi:10.1177/016327879702000303

Frank, J. R. (2005). *The CanMEDS 2005 physician competency framework. Better standsards. Better physicians. Better care.* (J. Frank, Ed.)*The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada*. The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada.

Frank, J., Snell, L., & Sherbino, J. (2015). *CanMEDS 2015 Physician Competency Framework. Ottawa: Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada*. *CanMEDS 2015 Physician Competency Framework. Ottawa: Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada*. http://www.royalcollege.ca/portal/page/portal/rc/canmeds/resources/publications

Galbraith, K., Ward, A., & Heneghan, C. (2017). A real-world approach to Evidence-Based Medicine in general practice: A competency framework derived from a systematic review and Delphi process. *BMC Medical Education*, *17*(1), 1–15. doi:10.1186/s12909-017-0916-1

Garavan, T., & McGuire, D. (2001). Competencies & workplace learning: the rhetoric & the

reality. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, *13*(4), 144–164.
Gardner, G., Carryer, J., Gardner, A., & Dunn, S. (2006). Nurse Practitioner competency standards: Findings from collaborative Australian and New Zealand research. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *43*(5), 601–610. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2005.09.002
Gillan, C., Uchino, M., Giuliani, M., Millar, B.-A. A., & Catton, P. (2013). Defining Imaging Literacy in Radiation Oncology Interprofessionally: Toward a Competency Profile for Canadian Residency Programs. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*, *44*(3), 150–156. doi:10.1016/j.jmir.2013.03.002
Glanville Geake, B., & Ryder, R. (2009). A community nurse clinical competency framework. *British journal of community nursing*, *14*(12), 525–528. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.12968/bjcn.2009.14.12.45527
Gonczi, A., Hager, P., Oliver, L., & Oliver, M. L. (1990). Establishing Competency...:Based Standards in the Professions, (1).
Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health information and libraries journal*, *26*(2), 91–108. doi:10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x
Greenhalgh, T., & Peacock, R. (2005). Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of complex evidence: Audit of primary sources. *British Medical Journal*, *331*(7524), 1064–1065. doi:10.1136/bmj.38636.593461.68
Haddaway, N. R., Collins, A. M., Coughlin, D., & Kirk, S. (2015). The role of google scholar in evidence reviews and its applicability to grey literature searching. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(9), 1–17. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0138237
Halcomb, E., Stephens, M., Bryce, J., Foley, E., & Ashley, C. (2017). The development of professional practice standards for Australian general practice nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *73*(8), 1958–1969. doi:10.1111/jan.13274
Hamburger, E. K., Lane, J. L., Agrawal, D., Boogaard, C., Hanson, J. L., Weisz, J., & Ottolini, M. (2015). The referral and consultation entrustable professional activity: Defining the components in order to develop a curriculum for pediatric residents. *Academic Pediatrics*, *15*(1), 5–8. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2014.10.012
Hay-McBer. (1996). *Scaled competency dictionary*. Boston, MA: Hay-McBer.
Hemalatha, R., & Shakuntala, B. (2018). A Delphi Approach to Developing a Core Competency Framework for Registered Nurses in Karnataka, India. *Nitte University Journal of Health Science*, *8*(2), 3–7. doi:10.12927/cjnl.2011.22142
Heywood, L., Gonczi, A., & Hager, P. (1992). *A guide to development of competency standards for professions*. Canberra.
Ho, M. J., Yu, K. H., Hirsh, D., Huang, T. S., & Yang, P. C. (2011). Does one size fit all? Building a framework for medical professionalism. *Academic Medicine*, *86*(11), 1407–1414. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31823059d1
Jacobson, A., McGuire, M., Zorzi, R., Lowe, M., Oandasan, I., & Parker, K. (2013). The Group Priority Sort: A Participatory Decision-Making Tool for Healthcare Leaders. *Healthcare Quarterly*, *14*(4), 47–53. doi:10.12927/hcq.2013.22651
Jacox, A. (1997). Determinants of Who Does What in Health Care. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, *2*(4).
Ketterer, A., Salzman, D., Branzetti, J., & Gisondi, M. (2017). Supplemental Milestones for Emergency Medicine Residency Programs: A Validation Study. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *18*(1), 69–75. doi:10.5811/westjem.2016.10.31499

Kirk, M., Tonkin, E., & Skirton, H. (2014). An iterative consensus-building approach to revising a genetics/genomics competency framework for nurse education in the UK. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *70*(2), 405–420. doi:10.1111/jan.12207

Klein, M. D., Schumacher, D. J., & Sandel, M. (2014). Assessing and Managing the Social Determinants of Health: Defining an Entrustable Professional Activity to Assess Residents' Ability to Meet Societal Needs. *Academic Pediatrics*, *14*(1), 10–13. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2013.11.001

Klick, J. C., Friebert, S., Hutton, N., Osenga, K., Pituch, K. J., Vesel, T., et al. (2014). Developing Competencies for Pediatric Hospice and Palliative Medicine. *Pediatrics*, *134*(6), e1670–e1677. doi:10.1542/peds.2014-0748

Klink, M. van der, & Boon, J. (2002). The investigation of competencies within professional domains. *Human Resource Development International*, *5*(4), 411–424. doi:10.1080/13678860110059384

Knapp, K. K., & Supernaw, R. B. (1977). A systematic approach to the development of a competency-based Doctor of Pharmacy program. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *41*(3), 290–295.

Kwan, J., Crampton, R., Mogensen, L. L., Weaver, R., Van Der Vleuten, C. P. M., & Hu, W. C. Y. (2016). Bridging the gap: A five stage approach for developing specialty-specific entrustable professional activities. *BMC Medical Education*, *16*(1), 1–13. doi:10.1186/s12909-016-0637-x

Landzaat, L. H., Barnett, M. D., Buckholz, G. T., Gustin, J. L., Hwang, J. M., Levine, S. K., et al. (2017). Development of Entrustable Professional Activities for Hospice and Palliative Medicine Fellowship Training in the United States. *Journal of pain and symptom management*, *54*(4), 609–616.e1. doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2017.07.003

Lederman, L. C. (1990). Assessing educational effectiveness: The focus group interview as a technique for data collection. *Communication Education*, *39*(2), 117–127. doi:10.1080/03634529009378794

Lester, S. (2014). Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education Professional competence standards and frameworks in the United Kingdom Kingdom. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(1), 38–52. doi:10.1080/02602938.2013.792106

Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O'Brien, K. K. (2010). Scoping studes: advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science*, *5*, 69. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-5-69

Lewis, R., Yarker, J., Donaldson-Feilder, E., Flaxman, P., & Munir, F. (2010). Using a competency-based approach to identify the management behaviours required to manage workplace stress in nursing: A critical incident study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *47*(3), 307–313. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.07.004

Ling, S., Watson, A., & Gehrs, M. (2017). Developing an addictions nursing competency framework within a Canadian context. *Journal of Addictions Nursing*, *28*(3), 110–116. doi:10.1097/JAN.0000000000000173

Lingard, L. (2009). What we see and don't see when we look at 'competence': notes on a god term. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, *14*(5), 625–628. doi:10.1007/s10459-009-9206-y

Lingard, L. (2012). Rethinking competence in the context of teamwork. In B. D. Hodges & L. Lingard (Eds.), *The Question of Competence* (pp. 42–70). New York, NY, US: Cornell University Press.

Liu, L., Curtis, J., & Crookes, P. (2014). Identifying essential infection control competencies for newly graduated nurses: A three-phase study in Australia and Taiwan. *Journal of Hospital*

Infection, *86*(2), 100–109. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2013.08.009
Liu, M., Kunaiktikul, W., Senaratana, W., Tonmukayakul, O., & Eriksen, L. (2007). Development of competency inventory for registered nurses in the People's Republic of China: Scale development. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *44*(5), 805–813. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.01.010
Liu, Z., Tian, L., Chang, Q., Sun, B., & Zhao, Y. (2016). A competency model for clinical physicians in China: A cross-sectional survey. *PLoS ONE*, *11*(12), e0166252–e0166252. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0166252
Loke, A. Y., & Fung, O. W. M. (2014). Nurses' Competencies in Disaster Nursing: Implications for Curriculum Development and Public Health. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *11*(3), 3289–3303. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph110303289
Macmillan Cancer Support. (2017). *The Macmillan Allied Health Professions Competence Framework for those working with people affected by cancer*. London: Macmillan Cancer Support.
Makulova, A. T., Alimzhanova, G. M., Bekturganova, Z. M., Umirzakova, Z. A., Makulova, L. T., & Karymbayeva, K. M. (2015). Theory and Practice of Competency-Based Approach in Education. *International Education Studies*, *8*(8), 183. doi:10.5539/ies.v8n8p183
Marrelli, A. F., Tondora, J., & Hoge, M. A. (2005). Strategies for developing competency models. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, *32*(5–6), 533–561. doi:10.1007/s10488-005-3264-0
McCallum, M., Carver, J., Dupere, D., Ganong, S., Henderson, J. D., McKim, A., et al. (2018). Developing a Palliative Care Competency Framework for Health Professionals and Volunteers: The Nova Scotian Experience. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*, *21*(7), 947–955. doi:10.1089/jpm.2017.0655
McCarthy, G., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2009). Development of a Competency Framework for Nurse Managers in Ireland. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, *40*(8), 346–350. doi:10.3928/00220124-20090723-01
Mendoza, J. (1994). If the suit doesn't fit why wear it?'Competency-based training and health promotion. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, *4*(2), 9.
Mills, C., & Pritchard, T. (2004). A competency framework for nurses in specialist roles. *Nursing Times*, *26*(43), 28–29.
Moaveni, A., Gallinaro, A., Conn, L., Callahan, S., Hammond, M., & Oandasan, I. (2010). A Delphi Approach to Developing a Core Competency Framework for Family Practice Registered Nurses in Ontario. *Nursing Leadership*, *23*(4), 45–60. doi:10.12927/cjnl.2011.22142
Morrison, A., Polisena, J., Husereau, D., Moulton, K., Clark, M., Fiander, M., et al. (2012). The effect of English-language restriction on systematic review-based meta-analyses: a systematic review of empirical studies. *International journal of technology assessment in health care*, *28*(2), 138–144. doi:10.1017/S0266462312000086
Myers, J., Krueger, P., Webster, F., Downar, J., Herx, L., Jeney, C., et al. (2015). Development and Validation of a Set of Palliative Medicine Entrustable Professional Activities: Findings from a Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*, *18*(8), 682–690. doi:10.1089/jpm.2014.0392
National Physiotherapy Advisory Group. (2017). *Competency Profile for Physiotherapists in Canada*. National Physiotherapy Advisory Group.

Palermo, C., Capra, S., Beck, E. J., Dart, J., Conway, J., & Ash, S. (2017). Development of advanced practice competency standards for dietetics in Australia. *Nutrition and Dietetics, 74*(4), 327–333. doi:10.1111/1747-0080.12338

Palermo, C., Conway, J., Beck, E. J., Dart, J., Capra, S., & Ash, S. (2016). Methodology for developing competency standards for dietitians in Australia. *Nursing and Health Sciences, 18*(1), 130–137. doi:10.1111/nhs.12247

Parkinson's UK. (2016). *Competencies: A competency framework for nurses working in Parkinson's disease management 3rd edition*. *Royal College of Nursing, PDNSA.* London: Parkinson's UK. doi:10.4137/NMi.s29530

Patterson, F., Ferguson, E., Lane, P., Farrell, K., Martlew, J., & Wells, A. (2000). A competency model for general practice: Implications for selection, training, and development. *British Journal of General Practice, 50*(452), 188–193. doi:10.3399/bjgp13X667196

Redwood-Campbell, L., Pakes, B., Rouleau, K., MacDonald, C. J., Arya, N., Purkey, E., et al. (2011). Developing a curriculum framework for global health in family medicine: Emerging principles, competencies, and educational approaches. *BMC Medical Education, 11*(1). doi:10.1186/1472-6920-11-46

Reetoo, K. N., Harrington, J. M., & Macdonald, E. B. (2005). Required competencies of occupational physicians: A Delphi survey of UK customers. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 62*(6), 406–413. doi:10.1136/oem.2004.017061

Ritchie, J., & Spencer, L. (2002). Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In A. Huberman & M. Miles (Eds.), *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion* (pp. 305–329). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Roe, R. (2002). What makes a competent psychologist? *European Psychologist, 7*(3), 192–202. doi:10.1027//1016-9040.7.3.192

Santy, J., Rogers, J., Davis, P., Jester, R., Kneale, J., Knight, C., et al. (2005). A competency framework for orthopaedic and trauma nursing. *Journal of Orthopaedic Nursing, 9*(2), 81–86. doi:10.1016/j.joon.2005.02.003

Scotland, J. (2012). Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: Relating ontology and epistemology to the methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms. *English Language Teaching, 5*(9), 9–16. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n9p9

Shaughnessy, A. F., Sparks, J., Cohen-Osher, M., Goodell, K. H., Sawin, G. L., & Gravel, J. (2013). Entrustable Professional Activities in Family Medicine. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education, 5*(1), 112–118. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-12-00034.1

Sherbino, J., Frank, J. R., & Snell, L. (2014). Defining the key roles and competencies of the clinician-educator of the 21st century: A national mixed-methods study. *Academic Medicine, 89*(5), 783–789. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000000217

Shilton, T., Howat, P., James, R., & Lower, T. (2001). Health promotion workforce development and health promotion workforce competency in Australia. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia, 12*(2), 117–123.

Skirton, H., Lewis, C., Kent, A., & Coviello, D. A. (2010). Genetic education and the challenge of genomic medicine: Development of core competences to support preparation of health professionals in Europe. *European Journal of Human Genetics, 18*(9), 972–977. doi:10.1038/ejhg.2010.64

Smythe, A., Jenkins, C., Bentham, P., & Oyebode, J. (2014). Development of a competency framework for a specialist dementia service. *Journal of Mental Health Training, Education and Practice, 9*(1), 59–68. doi:10.1108/JMHTEP-08-2012-0024

Sousa, J. M., & Alves, E. D. (2015). Nursing competencies for palliative care in home care. *ACTA Paulista de Enfermagem*, *28*(3), 264–269. doi:10.1590/1982-0194201500044

Spencer, L., & Spencer, S. (1993). *Competence at work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Stucky, E. R., Ottolini, M. C., & Maniscalco, J. (2010). Pediatric hospital medicine core competencies: Development and methodology. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, *5*(6), 339–343. doi:10.1002/jhm.774

Swing, S. R. (2007). The ACGME outcome project: retrospective and prospective. *Medical teacher*, *29*(7), 648–54. doi:10.1080/01421590701392903

Tangayi, S., Anionwu, E., Westerdale, N., & Johnson, K. (2011). A skills framework for sickle cell disease and thalassaemia. *Nurs Times*, *107*(41), 12–13. http://pesquisa.bvsalud.org/portal/resource/es/mdl-23251980

Tavares, W., Bowles, R., & Donelon, B. (2016). Informing a Canadian paramedic profile: Framing concepts, roles and crosscutting themes. *BMC Health Services Research*, *16*(1), 1–16. doi:10.1186/s12913-016-1739-1

ten Cate, O. (2005). Entrustability of professional activities and competency-based training. *Medical Education*, *39*(12), 1176–1177. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02341.x

ten Cate, O., & Scheele, F. (2007). Competency-based postgraduate training: can we bridge the gap between theory and clinical practice? *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, *82*(6), 542–547. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31805559c7

Toussaint. (2009). False god (Wikipedia page). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/False_god. Accessed 30 May 2019

Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., et al. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. doi:10.7326/M18-0850

Tsaroucha, A., Benbow, S. M., Kingston, P., & Le Mesurier, N. (2013). Dementia skills for all: A core competency framework for the workforce in the United Kingdom. *Dementia*, *12*(1), 29–44. doi:10.1177/1471301211416302

Underwood, M., Robertson, S., Clark, R., Crowder, K., Dunn, S., Lawson, D., et al. (1996). The emergence of competency standards for specialist critical care nurses. *Australian critical care : official journal of the Confederation of Australian Critical Care Nurses*, *9*(2), 68–71. doi:10.1016/S1036-7314(96)70355-7

Van Loon, K. A., Driessen, E. W., Teunissen, P. W., & Scheele, F. (2014). Experiences with EPAs, potential benefits and pitfalls. *Medical Teacher*. doi:10.3109/0142159X.2014.909588

Verma, S., Broers, T., Paterson, M., Schroder, C., Medves, J. M., & Morrison, C. (2009). Core competencies: the next generation. Comparison of a common framework for multiple professions. *Journal of Allied Health*, *38*(1), 47–53.

Whiddett, S., & Hollyforde, S. (1999). *The competencies handbook*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development.

Winter, R., & Maisch, M. (2005). *Professional Competence And Higher Education: The ASSET Programme*. Routledge.

Wölfel, T., Beltermann, E., Lottspeich, C., Vietz, E., Fischer, M. R., & Schmidmaier, R. (2016). Medical ward round competence in internal medicine - An interview study towards an interprofessional development of an Entrustable Professional Activity (EPA). *BMC Medical Education*, *16*(1), 1–10. doi:10.1186/s12909-016-0697-y

World Health Organization. (2005). *Preparing a health care workforce for the 21st century: The challenge of chronic conditions*. Geneva, Switzerland.

Yates, P., Evans, A., Moore, A., Heartfield, M., Gibson, T., & Luxford, K. (2007). Competency standards and educational requirements for specialist breast nurses in Australia. *Collegian (Royal College of Nursing, Australia)*, *14*(1), 11–15. doi:10.1016/S1322-7696(08)60542-9

PRISMA Flow Diagram – Scoping Review

Competency Framework Development in Healthcare Professions



From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). *Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses*: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit www.prisma-statement.org.