P 057

EDUCATION LEADS' VIEWS ABOUT UNDERGRADUATE PALLIATIVE CARE (PC) TEACHING IN THEIR MEDICAL SCHOOL: A UK WIDE SURVEY

Steven Walker, 1,2 Jane Gibbins, 3 Stephen Barclay, 4 Mandy Barnett, 5 Astrid Adams, 6 Paul Paes, ⁷ Philip Lodge, ⁸ Madawa Chandratilake, ² Bee Wee⁶. ¹Marie Curie Hospice, Hampstead, London, UK; ²Centre for Medical Education, University of Dundee, UK; ³Cornwall Hospice Care, Royal Cornwall Hospital & Peninsula Medical School, Truro, UK; ⁴University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; ⁵University of Warwick, Coventry, UK; ⁶Sir Michael Sobell House & University of Oxford, Oxford, UK; ⁷Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust & Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK; ⁸University College London & Royal Free Hospital, London, UK

10.1136/bmjspcare-2014-000654.98

Background The views of newly-qualified doctors regarding their readiness to care for PC patients have been investigated.¹ By comparison, less is known about the opinions of undergraduate PC leads concerning their course provision, role and institutional support.

Aims To investigate the views of undergraduate PC leads across all UK medical schools regarding teaching at their university. Methods A 40 point web-based questionnaire was developed and sent to identified PC leads in all UK medical Schools. This

study received ethical approval.

Results Results were obtained from all 30 UK medical schools. Nineteen respondents (63%) consider that PC training should be a separate course partially integrated within the curriculum, 10 (33%) fully integrated and 1(3%) would prefer a completely separate course.

A minority expressed concerns about PC training being recognised as important (5, 17%), support from university colleagues (5, 17%) dedicated teaching time (10, 33%) and funding (10, 33%). Conclusion The views of PC leads are generally positive across UK

	Strongly agree/agree	No strong view/neutral	Disagree/ strongly disagree
Fulfils GMC requirements	19 (63%)	9 (30%)	2 (7%)
Prepares students well for PC in Foundation Year 1	18 (60%)	3 (10%)	9 (30%)
Overall delivers quality PC training	22* (76%)	2* (7%)	5* (17%)
Varies depending on where students are sent	15 (50%)	8 (27%)	7 (23%)
ls delivered by enthusiastic colleagues	27 (90%)	3 (10%)	
Is limited by availability of local services	20 (67%)	4 (13%)	6 (20%)
Enables each student to visit a hospice and see doctors care for the dying	17 (57%)	3 (10%)	10 (33%)
Is highly-rated by students	26 (87%)	4 (13%)	
My role in PC training is satisfying	27 (90%)		3 (10%)

^{*29} responses

medical school. It is suggested that negative opinions may be influenced by local organisational difficulties.

REFERENCE

1 Gibbins J, et al. Med Educ 2011;45(4):89–99.