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Introduction – what is eprofessionalism?

= eprofessionalism?
Introduction – professional guidance?
Introduction – concerns over FtP cases
To systematically review professional body and regulatory organisation guidance on the use of social media for registered healthcare professionals.
Method – PRISMA-P & PROSPERO

Method – search terms

- English language from 1/1/10 to 28/2/16
- Healthcare professionals, guidance, social media, eprofessionalism
- Medline, CINAHL, AMED, IPA, Sage, Cochrane, Science Direct, Google
- Two independent reviewers
- Existing critical appraisal tools
Results - type

32 guidance documents → 11 journal articles
Results - global

4 guidelines related to more than one geographical area

Australia/New Zealand (n=1), global (n=2) and Europe (n=1)
Results – professional groups

- Medicine (n=13)
- Nursing & Midwifery (n=8)
- Allied health professionals (n=5)
- Psychology (n=1)
- Dentistry (n=1)
- Pharmacy (n=3)
- Social work (n=1)
- Chiropractors (n=1)
Results – limited applicability

No common structure to the guidance

Few described their development, implementation or evaluation

No clear, agreed definition of social media (SoMe)

Identified inappropriate but not appropriate behavior

Related to FtP or disciplinary procedures
Results – devil is in the detail

None of the papers discussed guidance in detail, or evaluated the guidance, rather commented on the context of a wider discussion on social media use.
Conclusion – defining the line

CAUTION using social media

APPROPRIATE online behaviour not defined
Further research – use of social media

- Reporting results of systematic review
- Exploration of appropriate online behaviour
- Pharmacy student development of social media guidance