

ARCP Checklist: in LESS than 15 easy steps (advanced version)

Trainee: ST Stage : <i>select here</i>	Panel Member: Specialty:	Ed. Sup: Date:
--	------------------------------------	--------------------------

1. 'PROFILE' - DECLARATIONS

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Declarations (probity, health, educational contract) for this post been **signed**?

YOUR COMMENTS:

2. 'EVIDENCE' - CBDs, COTs, miniCEXs

Looking at the mapping sheets will help you with this – uploaded in 'Learning Log'

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- **CBDs/COTs/CEXs:** appropriate **numbers, context** (mental health, elderly etc), **challenge & progression** (look at the mapping sheets - esp imp't for ST3s → CCT)

YOUR COMMENTS:

3. 'EVIDENCE' – MSFs and PSQs

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- **MSF** – is **aggregate score** for *behaviour AND clinical* ability above/near mean?
- **PSQ** – are the component scores above or near the peer mean?

YOUR COMMENTS: comment on good and bad themes that emerge from the free text AND on the 'range' of the scores

MSF:

PSQ:

4. 'EVIDENCE' – Clinical Supervisor's Report (CSR) & Educator Notes

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

YOUR COMMENTS – on the following themes:

CSR - *Relationships*:

CSR - *Diagnostics*:

CSR - *Management*:

CSR - *Professionalism*:

Anything in the *Educator Notes*?

5. 'PDP'

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- **Proper use** : based on learning needs, of a variety etc. , **Up to date?** Being **actioned?** **Deep/meaningful/SMART?**

YOUR COMMENTS:

6. 'LEARNING LOG' – LOG ENTRIES: *sample some of the entries until you feel you have a general idea about them.*

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- **Numbers** adequate? **Added over time?**
- **Breadth?** (clin. encounters, prof. conv., tutorials etc) **Depth?** (i.e. *reflects and analyses*) **Validity** of the links.

YOUR COMMENTS: (e.g. *on the quality, level of reflection*)

7. 'LEARNING LOG' – OUT OF HOURS *(for those in GP posts only)*

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- **Numbers:** (6 sessions per 6m in GP); **Breadth?** **Depth?** **Validity** of the linkage.

YOUR COMMENTS:

8. 'LEARNING LOG' – NOE (Naturally Occurring Evidence)

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant Event Analyses (SEAs) – <i>at least 6 per year</i> • Audit/Reflection on QoF/Project - <i>only one in entire scheme</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study / Presentation - <i>2 per year</i> • Reflection on key learning points - <i>for each post</i> |
|--|---|

YOUR COMMENTS: (e.g. *on the quality*)

9. 'REVIEWS' – Self and ES Rating of Competencies

GREEN	AMBER	RED
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ARCP Checklist: in *LESS* than 15 easy steps (advanced version)

- Trainee rated themselves? Has Educational Supervisor rated with evidence in the 'comment's box'? Is there a large variance between the two? For ST3 going onto CCT: all professional competencies marked as competent?

YOUR COMMENTS:

10. 'REVIEWS' – Curriculum Coverage

GREEN

AMBER

RED

- Reasonable coverage? Sample some. Weaker areas achievable in remainder of scheme? What does ES say?
- ST3s → CCT: if small numbers, sample and see if they are quality type of entries. If so, that might be good enough.

YOUR COMMENTS:

11. 'REVIEWS' – SKILLS LOG (DOPS)

GREEN

AMBER

RED

- Have all the mandatory ones **been done**. Any others done? Check signing by senior and not peers. What does ES say?

YOUR COMMENTS:

12. 'REVIEWS' – Educational Supervisor's Report (WPBA)

GREEN

AMBER

RED

- What does ES say re: **quality of evidence, concerns (at home or in the post)?**
- What do you think of the 'agreed learning plan'? Remember, review 12m of ESRs not 6!

YOUR COMMENTS:

13. 'PROGRESS TO CERTIFICATION' – ONLY complete if ST3 moving to CCT.

GREEN

AMBER

RED

Passed AKT?

select here

Passed CSA?

select here

CPR/AED cert ticked?

select here

OOH requirement ticked?

select here

YOUR COMMENTS:

14. OTHER BITS AND BOBS/SUMMARY

GREEN

AMBER

RED

- E-portfolio **highlights**:
- Suggestions for future **improvement**:
- Statement of **total leave** taken in the year: (*Sick, Maternity, Paternity etc*)
- **Attendance** record at VTS teaching: (approx. 70%)
- Any **complaints** or adverse incident reports?

Remember: any trainee who is out of programme should as a minimum continue to have annual ARCP panel assessments.

ANY OTHER COMMENTS:

15. YOUR RECOMMENDATION TO DEANERY PANEL

GREEN

AMBER

RED

Your recommendation

select here

Other:

If referring to the Deanery panel, please state clearly the reasons here:

ARCP Checklist: in LESS than 15 easy steps (advanced version)

Feedback for the Educational Supervisor

Please make some notes to feed back to the Educational Supervisor on their performance. This is a mandatory requirement of ARCP panels and therefore you need to do this. The table below will help you.

Educational Supervision		
Not acceptable <i>descriptive</i>	Acceptable <i>analytical</i>	Excellent (in addition to the acceptable column) <i>evaluative</i>
The basis for judgements is not clear, i.e. they are not referenced to the evidence.	Judgements are generally referenced to the available evidence.	Judgements show sophistication, synthesising evidence from a number of sources.
Where the judgements can be evaluated, they do not appear to be justifiable.	Judgements appear to be justifiable.	Suggestions from trainee development clarify the learning outcomes to be achieved.
No comment is made on the current state and the progression of competence.	The current state and the progression of competence are made clear.	
Suggestions for trainee development are inadequate in number and/or quality.	Suggestions for trainee development are routinely made and appear to be appropriate.	The supervisor comments on the quality and range of the evidence-set in order to improve trainee insight and future data.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of Educational Supervisor: <i>(you will find this by clicking on the 'Profile' tab on the trainee's e-portfolio)</i> 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of Trainee 	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">ST stage:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><i>select here</i></td> </tr> </table>	ST stage:	<i>select here</i>
ST stage:	<i>select here</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of Educational Supervision: 	<i>select here</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments for the Educational Supervisor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - try and write in terms of the descriptors in the table above - include suggestions of how to improve (again, the descriptors in the table should give you some sort of idea) 			

If there are any problems with this form, email me on rameshmehay@googlemail.com

Please email a completed version of this form to your panel chair. He or she will use it to give feedback to both the trainee and Educational Supervisor. It goes without saying that your comments need to be descriptive and specific rather than overtly judgemental.