

## ARCP External Advisor Report Form

This report summarises feedback following observation of the ARCP process as an external adviser.

Please return the completed form to [QATraining@rcr.ac.uk](mailto:QATraining@rcr.ac.uk) and the Administrator/chair of the ARCP panel within two weeks of the panel meeting. One summary form is required per visit.

**Note:** Any serious concerns should be raised with the Postgraduate Dean immediately. Please include the RCR in any correspondence relating to this by copying in [QATraining@rcr.ac.uk](mailto:QATraining@rcr.ac.uk)

<b>Name</b>		<b>Deanery/LETB visited</b>	
<b>Date</b>		<b>Format</b>	in person <input type="checkbox"/> remote <input type="checkbox"/>

Please select a response for each of the questions below and use the 'feedback' section at the end of this form to explain the reason for any negative responses or any other concerns you have identified.

<b>1. Process</b>	Yes	No	N/A
Was the panel chair identified at the start of the meeting?			
Were there at least 3 panel members, including relevant specialist/sub-specialist/academic input where necessary?			
Were any conflicts of interest managed appropriately?			
Did the panel ensure that the reasons for any outcomes 2, 3, 4, or 10 and any specific capabilities to be acquired were recorded clearly?			
Were plans made for trainees awarded outcome 2, 3, 4 or 10 to meet with an appropriate senior educator at the earliest opportunity?			

<b>2. Decision-making</b>	Yes	No	N/A
Were outcome decisions appropriate and based on the evidence available?			
Did the panel ensure that all relevant evidence in the e-Portfolio was reviewed in the same amount of depth for all trainees?			
Did the panel consider alternative evidence of progress where appropriate?			
Were outcome decisions based on RCR curriculum requirements <u>only</u> ? If no, please document local variation below.			
Were mitigating circumstances considered?			
Were alternative sources of advice considered if decision making was unclear or high stakes e.g. head of school, associate dean?			

<b>3. Equality and Diversity</b>	Yes	No	N/A
Did you notice any signs of systematic bias at any point in the process? (e.g. personal remarks that suggest anything prejudicial about candidates) If yes, please comment below on details and what action was taken.			
Were the decisions made based <u>only</u> on the evidence presented in the trainees' e-portfolio?			
Was consideration made to differential attainment when relevant?			

<b>4. Quality of evidence:</b> Was the evidence provided by the trainee and educational supervisor of a sufficient standard to make an informed decision?	Yes	No	N/A
In general, did the trainee(s) make appropriate use of their e-portfolio to record evidence of their progress?			
In general, did the trainee(s) complete WPBAs in a timely manner, spread appropriately through the period under review?			
Is there a process in place to feedback to trainees and their supervisors where WPBAs are not completed in a timely manner, so that this can be remedied?			
In general, did the educational supervisor(s) provide a sufficiently detailed report which accurately reflects progress?			
In general, are supervisors providing quality feedback (WPBAs, appraisals, structured reports) and in sufficient quantity?			
Is there a process in place to give feedback to educational supervisors on the quality and content of their reports?			

<b>5. Curriculum delivery</b>	Yes	No	N/A
Is there any difficulty in providing experience and training in specific areas of the curriculum? If so, please give detail in the comments section below			
Are clinical supervisors assisting sufficiently with curriculum delivery as evidenced by the provision of WPBA?			
Was adequate consideration given to PSU* referral/exam support/SuppoRTT** etc. when considering educational plans?			

<b>6. HEE/Deanery support</b>	Yes	No
Did you have adequate admin support for this process (e.g. provision of advance information, support and information on the day, and communication overall)?		
Did you have adequate support from your trust to allow you to attend the ARCP (e.g. ability to book leave and arrange cover for work)?		

\*performance support unit

\*\*supported return to training

**7. Outcomes awarded to trainees (include only the reviews you observed)**

Outcome	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Trainees					
Outcome	6	7	8	10.1	10.2
No. of Trainees					

**Reasons for trainee non-progression**

--

**8. Feedback****Good practice**

--

**Areas for improvement/concerns**

--

**General comments**

--