



## The Faculty Governance Statement

The 2015 Work Place Based Assessment (WPBA) Schedule includes a Faculty Governance Statement at the end of the period of training. This statement summarises the collated views of the training faculty as to the progress of the trainee, specifically, their suitability to move to the next year of training. This judgement is based on the observation of the trainee in the workplace, on feedback from staff and patients and on overall performance in WPBA. The Faculty Governance Statement is drawn together at an Educational governance meeting.

The Educational governance meeting is comprised of the educational or clinical supervisor and at least 2 other consultant level trainers. At this meeting the progress of the trainee is discussed. The output of this meeting is the Faculty Governance Statement. This is held on the eportfolio and is accessed by the educational or clinical supervisor only. Within this statement the strengths of the trainee are summarised as well as areas to develop. The faculty are also asked to commit to stating whether, in their opinion, the trainee is ready to move on to the next year of training. A key example would be whether someone leaving ST3 is ready for HST and potentially working without senior supervision directly available in the ED.

This statement does not replace ARCP. It is an additional, albeit very powerful, piece of evidence used for judgement at ARCP. The introduction of this statement is part of the shift in the 2015 WPBA schedule from the collation of numerous data points to evidence satisfactory performance to giving greater weight to the experience and judgement of senior clinicians.

A decision that a trainee is not ready is not to be considered punitive, but highlights the different rates at which trainees develop. In such a case there will be significant areas to work on that will form an educational plan for the next part of training.

The training of supervisors highlights the importance of communicating concerns to trainees, and it is expected that the decision not to progress would not be a surprise at the end of the training block. Good practice from a number of centres has been that 'educational governance' is a standing agenda item at consultant meetings and discussions of all trainees occur at regular, for example, 2 monthly intervals. Other centres have a training faculty from among their consultant body that perform this function. It is expected that supervision would include regular feedback of concerns, when present, with steps to support development. If, however, the opinion of the faculty at the end of the block is that the trainee is not ready to move to the next year, they are required to express this.

The Faculty Governance Statement, therefore, denotes RCEM's appreciation of the expertise of the training faculty in making judgements about the doctors in training in their ED.