**Review of ESR for ARCP**

GP StR: ST1 / ST2 / ST3 FT/LTFT%

Educational Supervisor:

Date of ARCP:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Satisfactory (Y/N)** | **Comments** |
| **Competence Areas – Trainee Self rating** |  |  |
| **Competence Areas – Educational Supervisor Feedback** |  |  |
| **Curriculum Statement Headings** |  |  |
| **Curriculum Coverage Comments** |  |  |
| **CEPS:** | Male Genital: YES/NO |  |
|  | Female Genital: YES/NO |  |
|  | Breast: YES/NO |  |
|  | Prostate: YES/NO |  |
|  | Rectal: YES/NO |  |
| **Workplace Based Assessment:** | COT: YES/NO |  |
|  | CbD: YES/NO |  |
|  | CSR: YES/NO |  |
|  | PSQ: YES/NO |  |
|  | MSF: Professional: YES/NO  Clinical: YES/NO |  |
| **Competence Areas** |  |  |
| **Review of PDP by ES** |  |  |
| **Quality of Evidence** |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Satisfactory (Y/N)** | **Comments** |
| **Progress to Certification:** | AKT: YES/NO |  |
|  | CSA: YES/NO |  |
|  | CPR: YES/NO |  |
|  | KIDS: YES/NO |  |
|  | Theory: YES/NO |  |
|  | Practical: YES/NO |  |
| **Revalidation: Details of Concerns / Investigations** |  |  |
| **Recommendation** |  |  |
| **Learning Log:** |  |  |
| **Out of Hours** | ST1: 36 Hrs: YES/NO |  |
|  | ST1: 72 Hrs: YES/NO |  |
| **Audit or Projects** |  |  |
| **SEAs:**  **One per 6 months** |  |  |
| **Log Entries** |  |  |
| **PDP** |  |  |
| **Educators’ Notes** |  |  |
| **Overall, is the ESR satisfactory?** |  |  |
| **Trainee “signed off” ESR?** |  |  |

**The ESR criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Acceptable** | **Needs Further Development** |
| 1. Judgements are generally referenced to a range of relevant evidence selected by trainees and/or ES\* 2. Judgements appear to be justifiable and include a description of how the evidence supports the ES’s decision 3. Suggestions for trainee development are routinely made by the ES and appear to be appropriate | * + 1. The Educational Supervisor (ES) has not based their judgement on appropriate evidence selected by trainee and/or the ES     2. When making their judgement, the ES has not explained how the evidence supports their decision     3. The ES has not provided appropriate action plans for future trainee development, including in the final review of GP Training |

\* If the trainee has constructed a good ePortfolio as a whole and has written a very good self-rating statement accompanied by appropriate evidence then it may be acceptable for the ES to accept what the trainee has written and neither write much more themselves nor provide any new evidence. However the ES must remember the probity of their actions. If the ES relies solely on the trainee’s narrative and evidence then the ES must be absolutely sure that it is correct and justifiable.

If the Trainee’s ePortfolio evidence is borderline satisfactory/unsatisfactory or indeed definitely unsatisfactory then the ES will need to write their own appropriate narrative and supply supporting evidence against the competencies.

As this assessment forms parts of a licensing exam it is essential that it is a clear grading by the educational supervisor that makes the recommendation and not that of the trainee.