

New ways of seeing: supplementing existing competency framework development guidelines with systems thinking

Authors

1. Alan M. Batt MSc PhD(c)
2. Brett Williams PhD
3. Madison Brydges MA PhD(c)
4. Matthew S. Leyenaar MA PhD(c)
5. Walter Tavares PhD

1. A.M. Batt is PhD candidate, Dept. of Paramedicine, Monash University, Frankston, Victoria, Australia; Senior Fellow, McNally Project for Paramedicine Research, Ontario, Canada. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6473-5397>
2. B. Williams is Professor and Head of Department, Department of Paramedicine, Monash University, Frankston, Victoria, Australia. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6307-1779>
3. M. Brydges is PhD candidate, Dept. of Health Aging & Society, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada; Senior Fellow, McNally Project for Paramedicine Research, Ontario, Canada.
4. M.S. Leyenaar is PhD candidate, Health Research Methodology, Dept. of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada; Senior Fellow, McNally Project for Paramedicine Research, Ontario, Canada. <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1151-9479>
5. W. Tavares is Assistant Professor, Post Graduate Medical Education & Continuing Professional Development, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Scientist, The Wilson Centre, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Scientist, McNally Project for Paramedicine Research, Ontario, Canada. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8267-9448>

Author for correspondence:

Alan M. Batt, Dept. of Paramedicine, Building H, McMahons Road, Frankston, Vic, 3199, Australia; Email: alan.batt@monash.edu; Twitter: @alan_batt; Phone: +1-905-973-6497

Author Contributions

AB conceived the paper; gathered, analysed, and interpreted data, and drafted the initial manuscript. BW, MB, ML & WT critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content, and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Abstract

Introduction

Competency frameworks provide a link between professional practice, education, training, and assessment. They support and inform downstream processes such as curriculum design, assessment, accreditation and professional accountability. However, existing guidelines are limited in accounting for the complexities of professional practice potentially undermining utility of such guidelines and validity of outcomes. This necessitates additional ways of “seeing” situated and context-specific practice. We highlight what a conceptual framework informed by systems thinking can offer when developing competency frameworks.

A Systems-Thinking Approach

Mirroring shifts towards systems thinking in program evaluation and quality improvement, we suggest that similar approaches that identify and make use of the role and influence of system features and contexts can provide ways of augmenting existing guidelines when developing competency frameworks. We framed a systems thinking approach in two ways. First by adapting Ecological Systems Theory (EST) which offers a realist perspective of the person and environment, and the evolving interaction between the two. Second, by leveraging complexity thinking, which obligates attention to the relationships and influences of features within the system, we can explore the multiple complex, unique, and context-embedded problems that exist within and have stake in real-world practice settings.

Summary

The ability to represent clinical practice when developing competency frameworks can be improved when features that may be relevant, including their potential interactions, are identified and understood. A conceptual framework informed by systems thinking makes visible features of a practice in context that may otherwise be overlooked when developing competency frameworks using existing guidelines.

Introduction

Competency frameworks provide a link between professional practice, and education, training, and assessment (ten Cate and Carraccio 2019). As a midstream process, they support and inform downstream processes such as professional accountability, standard-setting, assessment strategies, and curriculum design (Norman et al. 2014; Sherbino et al. 2020) (Figure 1). However, their development is highly variable across different health professions, in part due to the absence of rigorous development and reporting guidelines leading to some uncertainty regarding their validity or utility (Batt et al. 2020). While some of this uncertainty stems from methodological choices during their development, further uncertainty stems from the absence or limited accounting for the complex nature of practice, the contexts in which such practice is enacted, and the elements of competence needed to enact it. Multiple and interrelated issues in healthcare that evolve in response to changes within specific profession, adjacent professions, the larger medical field (e.g. policy), and larger societal forces (e.g., changes in public expectations) contribute to the challenge of representing it all (or as much as possible) when developing competency frameworks. These issues suggest that the competency frameworks on which many educational programs and assessment processes are built may be incomplete or inadequate

representations of practice. The downstream effects of incomplete competency frameworks can be significant for education. This can include, for example, an unprepared workforce, problematic assessment models, and inadequate accreditation expectations.




Figure 1. Upstream, midstream and downstream processes related to healthcare professions.

In this perspective we highlight how despite being the link between practice and downstream processes, competency frameworks can often fail to adequately define or describe practice, thus leading to opportunities for missed details that undermine the final product. In addition, we will explore how existing guidelines may be limited due to a lack of conceptual or theoretical frameworks for guiding thinking on competency framework development. In response we draw on systems theories to elucidate how a shift in approach can reveal hidden or less commonly attended to issues in competency framework development. We conclude with recommendations for the community to consider as a way forward.

About Practice, without Including Practice Leading to Misses

Our recent scoping review demonstrated that a minority of competency frameworks in healthcare professions (only 12% of those reviewed) included an analysis of practice during their development process (Batt et al. 2020). This is despite existing guidance that reinforces the importance of practice analysis when developing competency frameworks (Lucia and Lepsinger 1999; Roe 2002). This may be due in part to the inherent challenges in accurately representing practice. Perhaps in part due to such challenges, there is emerging evidence in the education literature that competency frameworks poorly represent contemporary healthcare practice, that is situated and context-specific (Whitehead et al. 2015). Consider as an example, how contemporary healthcare practice is widely recognized as a “team sport” that should be focused around the needs of the patient (Leasure et al. 2013; Lingard 2012). Authors have discussed the need for the removal of “silos”, and the further development and integration of multi-disciplinary

teams. However, existing competency frameworks largely focus on the competence required of individual healthcare professionals. Indeed, Lingard argues that competence is viewed as “*a quality that individuals possess*” (Lingard 2012). This focus on individual competence does not, therefore, accurately represent how practice is enacted (Hodges 2013). While competency frameworks may contain generic competency statements such as “*Function effectively in a team environment*”, the true essence of team and collective competence is poorly represented in many frameworks.

Merely identifying these roles of individual professionals, such as that of a team-member, may also fail to capture the realities of practice. Accurate representation of such roles requires explicit acknowledgement of the situated and contextual nature of the roles in practice (Whitehead et al. 2011). For example, recent discourse has shifted towards the concept of “structural competence”, which promotes an understanding of how multiple complex, interrelated structural forces (such as social determinants of health) influence access to healthcare, healthcare experiences, and health outcomes (Bell 2010; Salhi et al. 2020). Individual patient care occurs within contexts that are heavily influenced by historical, political, and societal forces, which competency frameworks have historically ignored. It is important to acknowledge that such influences are constantly changing as society and policy acknowledge shortcomings in traditional approaches – which in turn suggests that competency in this area is not a “once-and-for-all mastery of issues of structure” (Salhi et al. 2020), and those developing competency frameworks will need to make choices about which influences are relevant when developing a competency framework.

There are further examples where existing competency approaches fail to represent contemporary practice such as the integration of technology and virtual care models (Hilty et al. 2019; Holmboe et al. 2016) and the focus on patient and professional wellbeing (Bodenheimer and Sinsky 2014; Holmboe et al. 2016; Sargeant et al. 2017). Additionally, some have criticized competency frameworks for representing much of the objective knowledge and skills required for professional practice without also sufficiently accounting for subjective attributes (e.g., honesty, integrity, self-awareness, emotional intelligence), and non-technical skills (e.g., decision-making, critical thinking, clinical reasoning, self-care, judgment) that are integral to practice (Bodenheimer and Sinsky 2014; Evans and Donnelly 2006; Norman 2005; Talbot 2004; Veen et al. 2020; Weng et al. 2011; Whitehead and Kuper 2015). Further critiques have been levelled at existing competency-based approaches for being overly reductionist, for emphasizing a minimum standard, for failing to account for complexities of context-bound practice, and for restricting innovation and professional development (Brightwell and Grant 2013; Glass 2014; Hodges 2013; Malone and Supri 2012).

In summary, competency frameworks may fail to fully represent the construct of professional practice. This is due to a number of reasons, including the tendency to focus on practice as “doing the work” instead of approaching practice as “doing the work in place”. In addition, there are many influences on practice that differ depending on these contexts, placing an emphasis on making choices about which influences are relevant. To date, such choices seem to be shaped in uncertain ways or in ways that are not explicitly reported or included. These issues in turn lead to potential threats to the validity of framework outcomes (Batt et al. 2020), and fail to provide educators with the tools by which to approach downstream processes such as curriculum and assessment.

Guidelines, not sufficiently guiding

One reason why these choices are uncertain may be in the structure of existing competency framework development guidelines. While they may be helpful, they may also be lacking in theoretical and conceptual guidance (Whitehead et al. 2011). To date, guidance has mainly focused on the practical considerations of the development process, and ignored the importance of broader ways of seeing the developmental process. For example, only one existing source of guidance mentions consideration of theoretical issues, and this is related to the selection of methods of data collection, and not how to approach or guide the work, in the way that conceptual and/or theoretical frameworks can (Bordage 2009; Heywood et al. 1992; Varpio et al. 2020). Guidance provided by Heywood, Marrelli and others fails to stimulate thinking on how the intended competency framework is situated in, or influenced by, contextual features. Attention to context is rather, confined to analysis of the profession (e.g., job or role analysis) (Heywood et al. 1992; Marrelli et al. 2005). In addition, existing guidance appears vague in how to stimulate thinking on or how to organize the reflection and inclusion of ‘real world’ complexities, thus neglecting core concepts and subsequently threatening validity claims (Batt et al. 2020).

Despite these shortcomings, but not directly related to competency framework development, researchers have attempted to utilize a number of theoretically-informed strategies to describe practice, including grounded theory (Shepard et al. 1999), expertise modeling (Evans and Donnelly 2006), phenomenology (Taylor 1993), taxonomies (Weis 2000), and critical ethnography (Street 1992). While these approaches are theoretically-informed, and may capture how healthcare professionals care for patients, they are generally methodological approaches and may neglect how to account for the complex interactions between individuals and the broader healthcare environment. When this happens, core features of ‘person-in-environment’ interactions may be lost (e.g. contextually specific influences of social determinants of health, access to healthcare). Social contexts and the sometimes hidden interactions between elements of practice, present challenges when efforts are made to try to capture or clarify this complexity within the system.

Thus, in order to reduce the risk of uncertain outcomes when developing competency frameworks, there may be a benefit in shifting the focus from proof of completion of “competencies” to understanding how healthcare professionals perform their work in context, and from simplifying and reducing, to embracing complexity to promote better understanding of the people, elements, and contexts involved in the real-world enactment of clinical practice (Regehr 2010). While a competency framework can never fully represent the competencies required for professional practice, we suggest that some of the shortcomings of current guidance could be addressed by supplementing it with ways of stimulating and organizing thinking about the complexities of situated and context-specific professional practice

Rethinking Guidance by Embracing the System and Complexity

Shifts toward embracing complexity in medical education have demonstrated value. For

example, in program evaluation a growing number of researchers have acknowledged the complex environments in which programs are enacted, appreciating the messy and unpredictable nature of real-world processes (Frye and Hemmer 2012; Haji et al. 2013; Rojas et al. 2018; Van Melle et al. 2017). There is a recognition of how simply reducing programs and their evaluation to methods focused largely on outcomes may be inadequate to generate meaningful understanding of processes, contexts, and how and why programs thrive. As a result, researchers have emphasized the need to acknowledge context, to capture processes, and to report on the messiness in which programs exist (Doll Jr and Trueit 2010; Hamza et al. 2020; Horsley and Regehr 2018). In program evaluation, approaches have included systems approaches (Rich et al. 2019; Rojas 2018), contribution analysis (Van Melle et al. 2017), program-theory based evaluation (Hamza et al. 2020), and the role of conceptual and theoretical frameworks to guide their work (Haji et al. 2013). For example, Rojas et al. developed a program evaluation framework informed by systems engineering (closely related to systems thinking) (Rojas et al. 2018). This framework provides those evaluating programs with the ability to evaluate intended, enacted and absent program elements (processes and outcomes). The ability to capture and evaluate emergent (i.e. unplanned) elements embraces the unique characteristics of every program implementation, and provides evaluators with additional perspectives when evaluating a program. This has provided researchers with means by which to think about program evaluation in ways that make better use of the relationships between interventions, processes, and outcomes.

Another area of healthcare that has embraced the interactions between people, processes, and outcomes is quality improvement. The complexity of systems in which patient care is delivered is often at the root of many patient safety and healthcare quality problems (J. K. Johnson et al. 2008; Kohn, L. T.; Corrigan, J. M.; Donaldson 2000). Systems-based practice is an awareness of and responsiveness to the larger context and system of health care, and is considered a core competency for high quality and safe patient care (Dyne 2002). In this case, systems thinking (described in more detail below) is the foundational construct of systems-based practice (Plack et al. 2019). The benefits of this type of thinking are tangible. Johnson et al., Vollbrecht, and Carey illustrated that approaching practice with a systems thinking perspective as part of diverse quality improvement initiatives resulted in improved patient care and outcomes in geriatric emergency medicine (Vollbrecht et al. 2018) (e.g. reduction in revisits), vascular surgery (C. E. Johnson et al. 2019) (e.g. reduction in length of stay), and neonatal intensive care (Carey and Colby 2013) (e.g. reduction in catheter-related blood stream infection). Similarly, Englander demonstrated that when concepts of larger systems were part of how practice was intended to take place, this generated solutions shaping reductions in hospital costs, leading to more economical healthcare delivery (Englander et al. 2006). Systems-based thinking can also enable us to identify influences on patient outcomes – the importance of healthcare professional wellbeing for example resulted in Bodenheimer’s proposal to alter the original Triple Aim for Healthcare (IHI) into the Quadruple Aim (Bodenheimer and Sinsky 2014). However, even strategies shaped by systems thinking have been criticized for being too healthcare system centric, while largely ignoring social and structural determinants of health (Castillo et al. 2020) – thus an opportunity remains to identify means by which to represent these influences on health.

These shifts in program evaluation and quality improvement represent efforts to stimulate ways of seeing and thinking that encompass a broader and more holistic understanding of situated and context-specific practice in ways we have yet to observe in competency framework development.

‘Systems thinking’ helps to identify and make use of the role and influence of system features and contexts in ways that can provide new insights when developing competency frameworks in health professions education. Such approaches can provide those developing competency frameworks with a means by which to support improved representations of practice. Next, we will outline a systems thinking approach by which to supplement existing guidance that may allow those developing competency frameworks to better understand and represent practice.

Being Guided by a systems approach to competency framework development

To better understand the concept of practice in context, we must first have means by which to identify the contexts in which practice is situated and enacted. Practice is enacted within larger societal contexts that when viewed together, comprise a system. Looking at this ‘system’ then offers those developing competency frameworks with a perspective of the dynamics of features and relationships in particular contexts rather than global phenomena (Whitehead et al. 2015). We suggest that considering practice through this ‘systems’ perspective provides new ways of seeing in competency framework development. Next, we will provide an overview of systems thinking, including two forms of systems thinking that may provide valuable insights when exploring the concept of practice in context.

Systems thinking

General Systems Theory is a macro-theoretical framework which suggests that systems share universal organizing principles (von Bertalanffy 1968). There are many definitions of system, but broadly speaking, a system can be described as an organized assembly of components that share a special relationship with each other. Each system represents a whole with boundaries that delineate it from other systems, yet allows them to interact (Friedman 1997; Sturmberg 2007a). Components within systems can include people, elements (e.g. policies, equipment, curricula), the roles of people, their needs, concerns, obstacles, conflicts, targets, processes, and more (Armson 2011). Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory [EST], for example, (described in more detail below) offers a realist perspective of the “person, of the environment, and especially of the evolving interaction between the two” (Bronfenbrenner 1979). EST furthers General Systems Theory by attempting to capture the complex dynamics within social systems. Outcomes cannot be explained simply by the components of a system; the relationships between components and their environment must also be considered (Kannampallil et al. 2011; Mennin 2010; Sturmberg 2007a; Sweeney and Griffiths 2002). This perspective brings a second and related feature of “systems thinking”, that is the role of complexity. Complexity thinking obligates attention to a large number of heterogeneous elements which are influenced by, and in turn influence other elements within a system. These features, along with many diverse agents, working autonomously yet connected, combine to make a system complex but meaningful (Kannampallil et al. 2011; Mennin 2010; Sturmberg 2007a; Sweeney and Griffiths 2002). It is these ways of “seeing” – the application of “systems thinking” - that sheds light on relevant relationships or interactions that have status in shaping what professions must account for in ‘real world’, messy contexts (Doll Jr and Trueit 2010; Manson 2001; Paul E Plsek and Wilson 2001). This may allow us to improve the competency framework development processes in novel ways. Next, we examine EST in more detail, including its limitations, followed by a focus on applied complexity thinking in healthcare.

Ecological Systems Theory

Originally conceived as a theoretical perspective for research in human development, Bronfenbrenner describes EST using the analogy of “a set of nested structures, each inside the next, like a set of Russian dolls” [52, p3]. It comprises the person situated within four interrelated environmental systems, namely, the (1) micro-, (2) meso-, (3) exo-, and (4) macro-systems, and obligates a focus on the person, processes, context, and time. EST stresses person-context interrelatedness, and the levels describe settings in which people directly interact (micro- and meso-systems) to larger settings that indirectly influence people (exo- and macro-systems) (Bronfenbrenner 1979; Etekal and Mahoney 2017). All levels of the system are enacted within the chronosystem, which are changes that occur within the system over time (Bronfenbrenner 1979). Bronfenbrenner illustrates his theory with the example of a child learning to read. The reading ability of a child is heavily influenced by a multitude of factors at various system levels: at person level (e.g. home or school setting, how the child is taught); the relationship between settings (e.g. the links between home and school); broader settings where the child is not present (e.g. the employment status of the child’s parents); societal influences (e.g. culture); and the impacts of global events (e.g. economic crises that impact parental employment). EST has been used to explore the influences on human development in settings such as social care (Friedman 1997).

When EST is applied to healthcare, the person level reflects a “patient-centred” system. Clinical microsystems are embedded in larger systems and are by their definition “patient-centred” (Nelson et al. 2008). Patients’ health status is influenced by a multitude of social, economic, cultural, and other factors. The microsystem refers to the immediate clinical practice environment, and all components within it (including people, their characteristics, places etc.). Next, the mesosystem represents the interactions that occur between people, and the enactment of policies and procedures (Pask et al. 2018). The exosystem refers to the community level or the service delivery level (e.g. hospitals, clinics, healthcare services). While healthcare services exist at the exosystem level, the delivery of such services takes place via the mesosystem through the complex interactions between people and policies. National or local level influences such as government policies, culture, religious movements, the economy, and societal issues are examples of macro-system level forces. Broader influences such as global events (e.g. pandemics), and sociopolitical issues such as war, and mass immigration exist at the supra-macro level. Finally, the chronosystem refers to the changes over time, which can occur at all levels of the system. See Figure 2 for an illustration of EST applied to healthcare.




Figure 2. Ecological Systems Theory (EST) applied to healthcare.

The black arrow represents the creation of the mesosystem level through the interactions between people, policies etc. in the microsystem and exosystem. The grey arrow illustrates the ability of any given level to influence any other level. Labels briefly describe each system level applied to healthcare.

EST facilitates a focus on the features of various healthcare system levels to better inform dependent outcomes (e.g. policy, program design). Researchers have used elements of EST to identify the features of the healthcare system in which individuals directly interact (e.g. clinical practice) to larger settings that indirectly influence patient care (e.g. hospitals, healthcare policy) (Dobbs and Burholt 2016; Friedman 1997; Pask et al. 2018). For example, Dobbs used EST as a framework to identify which level of system changes needed to be made to improve end-of-life care (EoLC) (Dobbs and Burholt 2016). They identified changes at multiple system levels, in particular the need to refocus aspects of EoLC to be more person- and carer-centred. Pask et al. used EST to explore the complexity of palliative care (Pask et al. 2018). Their research uncovered issues such as the complexity surrounding dissonance between healthcare professionals and families, individual patient needs and characteristics, and the need for multidisciplinary team approaches to care. When applied to healthcare, EST suggests that patient care, which is enacted in the microsystem of clinical practice, cannot be viewed in isolation but must be considered as a person-focused process that occurs in the context of broader environments that change over time. As such, using EST presents an opportunity to conceptualize the influences on patient care, and the contexts that shape practice to identify the

agents, elements, and other components that should be considered when attempting to represent clinical practice when developing competency frameworks.

Complexity thinking

While EST may allow us to conceptualize the persons, processes and contexts in which clinical practice occurs, it faces a challenge when we attempt to explore how we enact practice in the messy real-world, where multiple complex, unique, and context-embedded problems exist, few of which could be described as simple (Brown 2006; Fraser and Greenhalgh 2001; Kannampallil et al. 2011; Miles 2009; P E Plsek and Greenhalgh 2001). How the features of each level of a system interact creates unique problems that can be so messy and unwieldy that they defy traditional analysis approaches, and may resist definitive resolution (Peters 2017; Varpio et al. 2017). Instead, they require a shift towards acknowledging and embracing complexity, and its underlying logic (Greenhalgh and Papoutsis 2018).

Examples of complexity in healthcare can be identified when we consider case-mix, the unpredictable progress of disease, practice variations between professionals, and the concept of adaptive expertise (Mylopoulos et al. 2018; P E Plsek and Greenhalgh 2001; Sweeney and Griffiths 2002) in various contexts such as primary care (Love and Burton 2005; Sturmberg 2007a, 2007b; Wilson et al. 2001), nursing (Chaffee and McNeill 2007), and palliative care (Pask et al. 2018). It is only when “problems” are viewed through these “complexity” lenses – particularly when applied to EST – that we can find new ways of seeing, and follow new paths to solutions. To illustrate this point, we revisit each level of the system outlined earlier and suggest a source of complexity evident at each level. Patients themselves, their disease progression, and the influencing factors on their health are complex systems (Pask et al. 2018; Sturmberg 2007a, 2007b). In the microsystem of clinical practice, the tacit knowledge of professional practice, and the unpredictable nature of clinical practice present challenges when we attempt to describe them. At the mesosystem level, interactions between large numbers of heterogeneous agents, the dynamics of these interactions, and the influences on such interactions are numerous. Healthcare system dynamics in the exosystem (i.e. how services are delivered, by which agencies, and how various policies may complement or conflict) can be complex and subject to regular change. The overlapping functions of regulation and education of health professionals at regional or national levels represent an additional source of complexity. On an even larger scale, the impact of forces such as financial crises, work shortages, and pandemics can be unpredictable, expansive, and dynamic. As such, when we fail to acknowledge and capture the complex contexts in which healthcare delivery is enacted, we fail to accurately represent clinical practice, and we fail to adapt to future challenges.

At least three implications are derived when such complexity is considered along with EST when developing competency frameworks. First, complexity thinking illustrates how systems are not as linear and predictable as EST (and existing guidelines) may suggest. To fully understand a system and sufficiently describe it, the relationships, interactions, and dependencies at and between levels may need to be explored. Second, neither EST nor complexity thinking alone may be sufficient to conceptualize clinical practice (Pask et al. 2018; Thompson et al. 2016); EST may struggle to illustrate real-world relationships, while complexity thinking can be difficult to understand and approach. Third, combining both as a conceptual framework may enable (but not necessarily directly provide) a more meaningful view of practice, or at least one

we better understand, through the ways in which contexts and relationships are connected (Pask et al. 2018).

We suggest that the application of a systems thinking conceptual framework can (i.e., EST combined with complexity thinking) provide the ability to see the broader influences on patient care, and therefore relevant outcomes that may otherwise remain hidden when developing competency frameworks. Figure 3 provides a conceptual linking of the levels of EST and their relationships and dependencies, with examples of system influences that may be evident.




Figure 3. A systems map of healthcare contexts.

The linear system levels identified via EST in Figure 1 have been transposed into a systems map, designed to illustrate the relationships or interactions between the system levels in a 'real world', non-linear sense. Note: (a) size of elements is irrelevant; (b) overlaps do not illustrate

significance but rather illustrate influence; (c) model is a partial representation of healthcare systems (as are all models), and contains examples of the influences that may be evident in the system.

Considerations

We suggest that considering practice through a systems-thinking conceptual framework provides an improved way of understanding and describing situated and context-specific practice when developing competency frameworks. However, supplementing existing development guidance with a conceptual framework that includes systems thinking and a consideration of inherent complexity, may pose challenges. For instance, that no single correct outcome exists for a complex problem; much depends on the specific contexts and relationships. Recognizing that each ‘way of seeing is also a way of not seeing’ (Burke 1984), we acknowledge that there may be other approaches that provide insights neglected by the proposed systems thinking conceptual framework. Just as no universal solution exists to a complex problem, there is no single ‘correct’ approach to describing clinical practice or the required competencies to enact it. However, we suggest that the strength of a systems thinking approach lies in its ability to highlight broader structural features that have historically been overlooked when developing competency frameworks. Professional practice is more than “doing the work”.

Saying that, we are not suggesting that all influences and contexts must be accounted for when developing a competency framework; rather, what matters is that we are sensitized to these issues when describing practice, and in turn, when making choices about what to include in the competency framework. The dynamic nature of these forces also suggests that competency frameworks themselves require the ability to adapt to changing influences on practice. How this conceptual approach would be worked in practice still needs to be elaborated. What we propose with this systems thinking perspective is stimuli for the community to consider the utility of such a proposal to explore situated and context-specific practice.

An additional critique that can be levelled at competency frameworks as we highlighted earlier is that they emphasize a minimum standard, and are a poor approach to by which to describe ‘expert practice’. Indeed, some researchers would contend that expert practice is not amenable to competency approaches (REF), and competency frameworks may be developed to outline the minimum competencies, differentiate between low and high-performers, or delineate the competencies developed as expertise progresses. Regardless of the intent of the competency framework, we suggest that identifying the competencies required for situated, context-specific practice would support the development of graduated expertise competencies via appropriate pedagogical approaches if this was the choice of those developing the framework.

Finally, a number of critiques could be leveled against systems thinking being too broad, overwhelming, and/or generalist to be useful. However, systems thinking is merely another tool to use. It does present developers with some challenges, but can supplement existing guidance, and provide a means to test systems thinking across professional practice contexts. Doing so may help developers gain a better understanding of the system they are attempting to represent. While it is likely true that we may never fully capture the complex world of clinical practice, systems thinking can help us to expose components and relationships that further our understanding in meaningful ways (Greenhalgh and Papoutsis 2018).

Ways Forward

As a way forward, we propose the following:

- Test the utility of a supplementing a systems based approach in a variety of contexts and practice settings. This will elaborate the feasibility of considering geographical, discipline-specific, societal, social and cultural boundaries for a given competency framework (Whitehead et al. 2015). Implementation will benefit from further consideration, negotiation, alteration, and adaptation by the community (Bordage 2009).
- Conduct further research on how to structure choices related to the various features and connections that are possible when applying a systems framework to supplement existing guidelines when developing competency frameworks. This includes examining their impact on the validity of outcomes. Developers and medical educators may need a deeper understanding of systems thinking applied to this context in order to use this as a way of supplementing existing competency framework development guidelines.. A full treatment of systems thinking is what can be provided here. While we suggest EST and complexity thinking combined offer a logical systems-based approach, but there are other conceptual frameworks and approaches that may be more appropriate for given contexts and purposes (Bordage 2009).
- Those developing competency frameworks should clearly articulate the role of a specific theoretical or conceptual framework during the competency framework development process. Doing so can aid in identifying solutions to problems that may arise during the development process, and allow others to build on the work.
- Developers should explicitly outline the choices made regarding which features informed by systems thinking are included (or not), elaborating on how and why they were made. This also includes elaborating on the context in which the choices are made. For example, a framework developed for a specific localized purpose may not require the same in-depth consideration of supra-macro influences as another context. This will help end users determine the suitability of such choices.

Conclusions

Efforts to describe clinical practice for the purpose of developing competency frameworks may be improved by intentionally “seeing” and attending to healthcare features (influences and relationships) that are made visible when viewed through a conceptual framework shaped by system thinking. Systems thinking includes adapting Ecological Systems Theory and complexity thinking. Ecological systems theory provides a means to identify and describe the relevant persons, processes, and contexts of the healthcare system. Complexity thinking complements this perspective by obligating a focus on the non-linear relationships and dynamics these features across all levels of the healthcare system. Collectively and when viewed through this lens, we have highlighted how an opportunity exists to identify how some competency framework may be left wanting. That is, competency framework development guidelines supplemented with a conceptual framework informed by systems thinking illustrates how important features may previously have been overlooked, and how our previous attempts to describe clinical practice may be insufficiently aligned with the realities and complexities of practice. However, we are now afforded the opportunity to integrate situated and context-specific clinical practice features and their potential interactions, toward an improved and more representative competency framework.

Declarations of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Armson, R. (2011). *Growing Wings on the Way Systems Thinking for Messy Situations*. Axminster: Triarchy Press.
- Batt, A. M., Tavares, W., & Williams, B. (2020). The development of competency frameworks in healthcare professions: a scoping review. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 25(4), 913–987. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-019-09946-w>
- Bell, E. J. (2010). Climate change: what competencies and which medical education and training approaches? *BMC Medical Education*, 10(1), 31. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-10-31>
- Bodenheimer, T., & Sinsky, C. (2014). From Triple to Quadruple Aim: Care of the Patient Requires Care of the Provider. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 12(6), 573–576. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1713>
- Bordage, G. (2009). Conceptual frameworks to illuminate and magnify. *Medical Education*, 43(4), 312–319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03295.x>
- Brightwell, A., & Grant, J. (2013). Competency-based training: who benefits? *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 89(1048), 107–110. <https://doi.org/10.1136/postgradmedj-2012-130881>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, C. A. (2006). The application of complex adaptive systems theory to clinical practice in rehabilitation. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 28(9), 587–593. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222930500219175>
- Burke, K. (1984). *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose* (3rd ed.). University of California Press.
- Carey, W. A., & Colby, C. E. (2013). Educating fellows in practice-based learning and improvement and systems-based practice : The value of quality improvement in clinical practice ☆. *Journal of Critical Care*, 28(1), 112.e1-112.e5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2012.07.003>
- Castillo, E. G., Isom, J., DeBonis, K. L., Jordan, A., Braslow, J. T., & Rohrbaugh, R. (2020). Reconsidering Systems-Based Practice. *Academic Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003559>
- Chaffee, M. W., & McNeill, M. M. (2007). A model of nursing as a complex adaptive system. *Nursing Outlook*, 55(5), 232-241.e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2007.04.003>

- Dobbs, C., & Burholt, V. (2016). End-of-life-care for older people in Wales : Policy , practice and the effectiveness of the Integrated Care Pathway Final Report, (October). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13521.74085>
- Doll Jr, W. E., & Trueit, D. (2010). Complexity and the health care professions. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 16(4), 841–848. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01497.x>
- Dyne, P. L. (2002). Systems-Based Practice: The Sixth Core Competency. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 9(11), 1270–1277. <https://doi.org/10.1197/aemj.9.11.1270>
- Englander, R., Agostinucci, W., Zalneraiti, E., & Carraccio, C. L. (2006). Teaching Residents Systems-Based Practice Through a Hospital Cost-Reduction Program: A “Win–Win” Situation. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, 18(2), 150–152. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328015tlm1802_10
- Ettekal, A., & Mahoney, J. (2017). Ecological Systems Theory. In K. Peppler (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Out-of-School Learning*. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, California 91320: SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483385198.n94>
- Evans, R. J., & Donnelly, G. W. (2006). A Model to Describe the Relationship Between Knowledge, Skill, and Judgment in Nursing Practice. *Nursing Forum*, 41(4), 150–157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6198.2006.00053.x>
- Fraser, S. W., & Greenhalgh, T. (2001). Coping with complexity : educating for capability. *BMJ*, 323(October), 799–803.
- Friedman, B. (1997). Systems Theory. In J. Brandell (Ed.), *Theory and practice in social work* (pp. 3–17). New York, NY, US: The Free Press.
- Frye, A. W., & Hemmer, P. A. (2012). Program evaluation models and related theories: AMEE Guide No. 67. *Medical Teacher*, 34(5). <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.668637>
- Glass, J. M. (2014). Competency based training is a framework for incompetence. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 348, g2909–g2909. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g2909>
- Greenhalgh, T., & Papoutsi, C. (2018). Studying complexity in health services research: desperately seeking an overdue paradigm shift. *BMC Medicine*, 16(1), 95. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-018-1089-4>
- Haji, F., Morin, M.-P., & Parker, K. (2013). Rethinking programme evaluation in health professions education: beyond ‘did it work?’ *Medical Education*, 47(4), 342–351. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12091>
- Hamza, D. M., Ross, S., & Oandasan, I. (2020). Process and outcome evaluation of a CBME intervention guided by program theory. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, (December 2019), jep.13344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13344>
- Heywood, L., Gonczi, A., & Hager, P. (1992). *A guide to development of competency standards for professions*. Canberra.
- Hilty, D. M., Chan, S., Torous, J., Luo, J., & Boland, R. J. (2019). A Telehealth Framework for

- Mobile Health, Smartphones, and Apps: Competencies, Training, and Faculty Development. *Journal of Technology in Behavioral Science*, 4(2), 106–123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41347-019-00091-0>
- Hodges, B. D. (2013). Assessment in the post-psychometric era: Learning to love the subjective and collective. *Medical Teacher*, 35(7), 564–568. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2013.789134>
- Holmboe, E. S., Foster, T. C., & Ogrinc, G. (2016). Co-Creating Quality in Health Care Through Learning and Dissemination. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 36, S16–S18. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CEH.0000000000000076>
- Horsley, T., & Regehr, G. (2018). When are two interventions the same? Implications for reporting guidelines in education. *Medical Education*, 52(2), 141–143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13496>
- Johnson, C. E., Peralta, J., Lawrence, L., Issai, A., Weaver, F. A., & Ham, S. W. (2019). Focused Resident Education and Engagement in Quality Improvement Enhances Documentation, Shortens Hospital Length of Stay, and Creates a Culture of Continuous Improvement. *Journal of Surgical Education*, 76(3), 771–778. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2018.09.016>
- Johnson, J. K., Miller, S. H., & Horowitz, S. D. (2008). *Systems-Based Practice: Improving the Safety and Quality of Patient Care by Recognizing and Improving the Systems in Which We Work. Advances in Patient Safety: New Directions and Alternative Approaches (Vol. 2: Culture and Redesign)*.
- Kannampallil, T. G., Schauer, G. F., Cohen, T., & Patel, V. L. (2011). Considering complexity in healthcare systems. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 44(6), 943–947. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2011.06.006>
- Kohn, L. T.; Corrigan, J. M.; Donaldson, M. S. (2000). *To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Report of the Institute of Medicine. National Academy Press.* [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1051-0443\(01\)70072-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1051-0443(01)70072-3)
- Leasure, E. L., Jones, R. R., Meade, L. B., Sanger, M. I., Thomas, K. G., Tilden, V. P., et al. (2013). There is no “i” in teamwork in the patient-centered medical home: defining teamwork competencies for academic practice. *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 88(5), 585–592. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e31828b0289>
- 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.
- Love, T., & Burton, C. (2005). General practice as a complex system: a novel analysis of consultation data. *Family Practice*, 22(3), 347–352. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmi023>
- Lucia, A. D., & Lepsinger, R. (1999). *The art and science of competency models : pinpointing critical success factors in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Malone, K., & Supri, S. (2012). A critical time for medical education: the perils of competence-based reform of the curriculum. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 17(2), 241–246.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-010-9247-2>

- Manson, S. M. (2001). Simplifying complexity : a review of complexity theory. *Geoforum*, 32, 405–414.
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-005-3264-0>
- Mennin, S. (2010). Complexity and health professions education. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 16(4), 835–837. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01502.x>
- Miles, A. (2009). Complexity in medicine and healthcare: people and systems, theory and practice. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 15(3), 409–410.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2009.01204.x>
- Mylopoulos, M., Kulasegaram, K., & Woods, N. N. (2018). Developing the experts we need: Fostering adaptive expertise through education. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 24(3), 674–677. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.12905>
- Nelson, E. C., Godfrey, M. M., Batalden, P. B., Berry, S. A., Bothe, A. E., McKinley, K. E., et al. (2008). Clinical Microsystems, Part 1. The Building Blocks of Health Systems. *The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 34(7), 367–378.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1553-7250\(08\)34047-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1553-7250(08)34047-1)
- Norman, G. (2005). Research in clinical reasoning: Past history and current trends. *Medical Education*, 39(4), 418–427. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02127.x>
- Norman, G., Norcini, J., & Bordage, G. (2014). Competency-Based Education: Milestones or Millstones 1 ? *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 6(1), 1–6.
<https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-13-00445.1>
- Pask, S., Pinto, C., Bristowe, K., van Vliet, L., Nicholson, C., Evans, C. J., et al. (2018). A framework for complexity in palliative care: A qualitative study with patients, family carers and professionals. *Palliative Medicine*, 32(6), 1078–1090.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216318757622>
- Peters, B. G. (2017). What is so wicked about wicked problems? A conceptual analysis and a research program. *Policy and Society*, 36(3), 385–396.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2017.1361633>
- Plack, M. M., Goldman, E. F., & Scott, A. R. (2019). *Systems Thinking in the Healthcare Professions : A Guide for Educators and Clinicians in the*.
- Plsek, P E, & Greenhalgh, T. (2001). Complexity science: The challenge of complexity in health care. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 323(7313), 625–628.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.323.7313.625>
- Plsek, Paul E, & Wilson, T. (2001). Complexity , leadership , and management in healthcare organisations four articles. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 323(September), 746–749.
- Regehr, G. (2010). Itâ€™s NOT rocket science: rethinking our metaphors for

- research in health professions education. *Medical Education*, 44(1), 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03418.x>
- Rich, J. V, Fostaty Young, S., Donnelly, C., Hall, A. K., Dagnone, J. D., Weersink, K., et al. (2019). Competency-based education calls for programmatic assessment: But what does this look like in practice? *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, (July), jep.13328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13328>
- Roe, R. (2002). What makes a competent psychologist? *European Psychologist*, 7(3), 192–202. <https://doi.org/10.1027//1016-9040.7.3.192>
- Rojas, D. (2018). *Using Systems Engineering to Inform Program Evaluation Practices in Health Professions Education: Conceptualizing Educational Programs as Socio-Technical Systems to Study System Emergence*. University of Toronto. Retrieved from <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/92008>
- Rojas, D., Grierson, L., Mylopoulos, M., Trbovich, P., Bagli, D., & Brydges, R. (2018). How can systems engineering inform the methods of programme evaluation in health professions education? *Medical Education*, 52(4), 364–375. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13460>
- Salhi, B. A., Tsai, J. W., Druck, J., Ward-Gaines, J., White, M. H., & Lopez, B. L. (2020). Toward Structural Competency in Emergency Medical Education. *AEM Education and Training*, 4(S1), 88–97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aet2.10416>
- Sargeant, J., Wong, B. M., & Campbell, C. M. (2017). CPD of the future: a partnership between quality improvement and competency-based education. *Medical Education*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13407>
- Shepard, K. F., Hack, L. M., Gwyer, J., & Jensen, G. M. (1999). Describing Expert Practice in Physical Therapy. *Qualitative Health Research*, 9(6), 746–758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973299129122252>
- Sherbino, J., Bandiera, G., Doyle, K., Frank, J. R., Holroyd, B. R., Jones, G., et al. (2020). The competency-based medical education evolution of Canadian emergency medicine specialist training. *CJEM*, 22(1), 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cem.2019.417>
- Street, A. F. (1992). *Inside Nursing: A Critical Ethnography of Clinical Nursing Practice (SUNY Series, Teacher Empowerment and School Reform)*. State University of New York Press.
- Sturmberg, J. P. (2007a). Systems and complexity thinking in general practice: part 1- clinical application. *Australian family physician*, 36(3), 170–173.
- Sturmberg, J. P. (2007b). Systems and complexity thinking in general practice. Part 2 – application in primary care research. *Australian family physician*, 36(3), 170–173.
- Sweeney, K., & Griffiths, F. (Eds.). (2002). *Complexity and Healthcare: An Introduction*. Oxford: Radcliffe Medical Press.
- Talbot, M. (2004). Monkey see, monkey do: a critique of the competency model in graduate medical education. *Medical Education*, 38(6), 587–592. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.2004.01794.x>

- Taylor, B. (1993). Understand Nursing Practice. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 30(2), 171–179.
- ten Cate, O., & Carraccio, C. (2019). Envisioning a True Continuum of Competency-Based Medical Education, Training, and Practice. *Academic Medicine*, 94(9), 1283–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002687>
- Thompson, D. S., Fazio, X., Kustra, E., Patrick, L., & Stanley, D. (2016). Scoping review of complexity theory in health services research. *BMC Health Services Research*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-016-1343-4>
- Van Melle, E., Gruppen, L., Holmboe, E. S., Flynn, L., Oandasan, I., & Frank, J. R. (2017). Using Contribution Analysis to Evaluate Competency-Based Medical Education Programs. *Academic Medicine*, 92(6), 752–758. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001479>
- Varpio, L., Aschenbrenner, C., & Bates, J. (2017). Tackling wicked problems: how theories of agency can provide new insights. *Medical Education*, 51(4), 353–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13160>
- Varpio, L., Paradis, E., Uijtdehaage, S., & Young, M. (2020). The Distinctions Between Theory, Theoretical Framework, and Conceptual Framework. *Academic Medicine*, 95(7), 989–994. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003075>
- Veen, M., Skelton, J., & de la Croix, A. (2020). Knowledge, skills and beetles: respecting the privacy of private experiences in medical education. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 9(2), 111–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-020-00565-5>
- Vollbrecht, M., Biese, K., Hastings, S. N., Ko, K. J., & Previll, L. A. (2018). Systems-Based Practice to Improve Care Within and Beyond the Emergency Department. *Clinics in Geriatric Medicine*, 34(3), 399–413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cger.2018.04.005>
- von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*. New York, NY, US: George Brazillier Inc.
- Weis, D. (2000). Use of a taxonomy to describe parish nurse practice with older adults. *Geriatric Nursing*, 21(3), 125–131. <https://doi.org/10.1067/mgn.2000.108259>
- Weng, H. C., Steed, J. F., Yu, S. W., Liu, Y. Ten, Hsu, C. C., Yu, T. J., & Chen, W. (2011). The effect of surgeon empathy and emotional intelligence on patient satisfaction. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 16(5), 591–600. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-011-9278-3>
- Whitehead, C. R., Austin, Z., & Hodges, B. D. (2011). Flower power: the armoured expert in the CanMEDS competency framework?. *Advances in health sciences education : theory and practice*, 16(5), 681–694. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10459-011-9277-4>
- Whitehead, C. R., & Kuper, A. (2015). Competency-based training for physicians: Are we doing no harm? *Cmaj*, 187(4), E128–E129. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.140873>
- Whitehead, C. R., Kuper, A., Hodges, B., & Ellaway, R. (2015). Conceptual and practical challenges in the assessment of physician competencies. *Medical Teacher*, 37(3), 245–251. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2014.993599>

Wilson, T., Holt, T., & Greenhalgh, T. (2001). Complexity science: Complexity and clinical care. *BMJ*, 323(7314), 685–688. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.323.7314.685>