



Non-Standard ARCP Training

Scenario 1

How can the panel best support this trainee?

- CT2 trainee where exam pass is required for completion of core training
- Previously awarded an outcome 3 with 6 months additional training for exam failure
- Diagnosed 2 months previously with dyslexia via the TSS
- Has now passed the 1st part of the exam, but still needs to pass the 2nd part
- Otherwise satisfactory trainee with high ratings on MSF

Given that the trainee has already received additional training, what options are available to the panel? Is it in the trainee's best interest to use their remaining exceptional time in core training, leaving no additional time for their higher training?



Non-Standard ARCP Training

Scenario 2

- ST5 trainee who has previously been awarded outcome 1s.
- The panel discover that an abstract uploaded to the trainee's personal library is identical to a project that a panel member previously supervised.
- The educational supervisor's report states that the trainee has had mitigating personal circumstances which has meant they have got behind on their educational evidence, but that the supervisor feels they will catch up.
- Otherwise, the trainee's clinical performance is satisfactory.

How should the panel treat the possible probity issue uncovered? What should the panel write under 'revalidation'? What ARCP outcome should the panel award? If they don't raise the issue as part of the ARCP, how should the panel take this information forward?



Non-Standard ARCP Training

Scenario 3

You are the chair of an ARCP panel reviewing an ST4 trainee:

- The trainee has presented 9 WPBAs out of the 12 required, all presented WPBAs are satisfactory
- The trainee has not presented evidence of an audit or presentation
- The trainee's MSF has insufficient raters
- Otherwise, the trainee's progress is satisfactory

Two of your colleagues feel that the trainee should be awarded an outcome 2, the APD shares they feel a 5 is more appropriate while another colleague feels a 3 is necessary.

How would you deal with the difference of opinion amongst the panel members? How would you reconcile the various views on the outcome so that all panel members feel heard? What outcome do you feel is most appropriate?



Non-Standard ARCP Training

Scenario 4

- ST7 trainee, previous outcome 2s for surgical skills and attitude towards colleagues.
- Most recent ARCP was an outcome 3 for surgical skills, communication with patients, and lack of insight.
- The trainee has now received 12 months additional training and is at CCT.
- Trainers' reports show some improvement in surgical skills, although some issues remain. MSF continues to show communication difficulties.
- Trainee has previously been offered assistance with the TSS but did not engage

Does the panel have enough evidence to award an outcome 4? If not, what outcome should they award? Does the lack of engagement with the TSS have any bearing on the panel's decision?



Non-Standard ARCP Training

Scenario 5

- ST3 trainee who has completed 6 months additional training due to exam failure, where the exam was required for entry into ST4
- Trainee has attempted the exam 3 times and has 1 attempt remaining
- Trainee declared 2 significant events, including 1 resolved event where the trainee had some culpability
- Clinically the trainee is satisfactory, but there are a few concerns highlighted in the MSF

The majority of panel members feel the trainee should be awarded an outcome 3 with 6 months of additional training. However, the lay representative is uncomfortable with this decision given the significant events and lack of performance in the exam.

As chair, how would you deal with the lay representative's view, given that they do not have a role in formal decision-making, but are present to represent the public interest. What outcome should the panel give?