

Understanding the progression reports

Annual Review of Competence Progression | Postgraduate

The annual review of competence progression (ARCP) postgraduate reports show the percentages of unsatisfactory ARCP outcomes for various groups of doctors in postgraduate training.

To create the reports, we have used data collected from Deaneries and Health Education England (HEE) and combined with data from the medical register and the National Training Survey (NTS) and Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA).

In these reports, you can explore ARCP outcomes by:

- Specialty
- Deanery/HEE local office or UK Nation
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Age group
- World region of primary medical qualification
- Training pattern - Full time or less than full time
- Deprivation quintile

Special notes

Reporting outcomes outside of the reporting period	Each year the Briefing Note requests all outcomes that took place in the preceding training year defined as from the 1st Wednesday in August through to Tuesday before the 1st Wednesday in August in the following year. On occasion we receive outcomes that relate to an earlier training year. This means that for Deaneries/ LETBs where this occurred there will be very small changes to the previously reported numbers.
Dual-CCT and sub-specialty ARCPs	<p>Please note that these reports are not suitable for understanding trainee progression in 2nd specialty (e.g. General (Internal) Medicine) or subspecialties (e.g. Neonatal Medicine) as despite the requirements of the Gold Guide there is evidence of substantial underreporting to us.</p> <p>The Gold Guide states</p> <p>“Outcomes from the ARCP</p> <p>4.74 The ARCP panel will recommend one of the eight outcomes described below for each specialty/sub-specialty for each trainee, including those on integrated clinical/academic programmes.”</p> <p>Therefore trainees with a 2nd specialty or a sub-specialty should have ARCP outcomes recorded for that specialty or sub-specialty.</p> <p>We audited ARCP returns against specialist registry entries:</p> <p>We checked all sub-specialty register entries since 01/01/2015 to establish if an ARCP outcome had been submitted to us for that sub-specialty. We note that only 15% of subspecialty register entries (N = 3,045) had a corresponding ARCP outcome.</p> <p>We checked dual-CCT and Combined programme register entries since 01/01/2015 to establish if an ARCP outcome had been submitted to us for both specialities. Dual-CCT was defined as a trainee with two specialties on the specialist register with the same date of entry. We noted, for example, that there are 161 General (Internal) Medicine and 149 for Intensive Care Medicine register entries with no ARCP records.</p> <p>We are working with colleagues in LETBs and deaneries to encourage accurate recording. We are also discussing whether the GMC’s Specialist Applications Team can do anything to encourage more complete training records.</p>

Technical notes

GMC confidentiality rules	To protect the confidentiality of doctors, we do not report on any group smaller than three people.
HESA data	The report includes information derived from that collected by the Higher Education Statistics Agency Limited (“HESA”) and provided to the GMC (“HESA Data”). Source: HESA Student Record 2002/2003 to 2017/2018. Copyright Higher Education Statistics Agency Limited. HESA makes no warranty as to the accuracy of the HESA Data and cannot accept responsibility for any inferences or conclusions derived by third parties from data or other information supplied by it.
HESA confidentiality rules	Where we have used HESA's data, we have agreed different confidentiality rules. Here we do not report on any group smaller than 23 people. And all reported group sizes are rounded up to the nearest multiple of 5. For example, a report including information about 28 people will be reported as including 30 people.
Confidence intervals	All our confidence intervals (CI) are calculated to the 95% confidence level using the recommended method for proportions from Altman, D.G., Machin, D. et al. <i>Statistics with Confidence</i> 2nd edition; BMJ Books. 2000.
Benchmark groups	Benchmark groups are allocated by programme specialty. Click here for our benchmark group table.
Outliers	Outliers in these reports are where the upper confidence limit of the report group is less than the lower confidence limit of the benchmark group (coloured dark blue), or where the lower confidence limit of the report group is more than the upper confidence limit of the benchmark group (coloured purple).
Deanery/LETB/HEE	On 1 April 2013, local education and training boards (LETBs) took over the responsibilities of the deaneries for postgraduate training in England, this meant that some deanery boundaries in England were merged or split to create new boundaries. Those organisations are now known as Health Education England's (HEE) local offices. These reports take account of the boundaries appropriate to the time the data was collected, for example the three HEE London offices are reported as London Deanery from 2013 and earlier. Some of these reports still refer to LETBs rather than HEE local offices.
ARCP reporting periods	ARCP data are collected retrospectively from LETB and Deaneries for the preceding training year. The training year is defined as from the first Wednesday in August to the Tuesday before the first Wednesday in the subsequent year. So, for example, the 2018 collection notice requested: all outcomes awarded between 1 August 2018 and the 6 August 2019. The ARCP year for this period is 2019. The collection notices are published by year here: https://www.gmc-uk.org/education/reports-and-reviews/progression-reports/downloads-resources-and-briefing-notes
ARCP outcome	Every ARCP is awarded a code denoting the outcome (satisfactory or unsatisfactory) and a description that explains the outcome. Click here for our ARCP outcome reference table.

ARCP outcome type	For these reports, ARCP outcomes are grouped together in types as shown in the table below.	
	Unsatisfactory outcome	Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E.
	Unsatisfactory outcome excluding exam failures	Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E, excluding those associated with exam failure.
	Unsatisfactory outcomes excluding incomplete evidence	Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E, excluding outcomes 5 and 7.4 from calculations.
	Incomplete evidence provided	Outcomes 5 and 7.4.
	Extra time required	Outcomes ARCP 3, 7.3 and RITA E.
	Targeted training	Outcomes 2, 7.2 and RITA D. Note that these are not applicable to foundation trainees, so selecting this report type will not yield any results for foundation schools.
Released from training	Note that there is no equivalent RITA outcome.	
Index of multiple deprivation (IMD) quintiles	<p>Each small area within nation (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales) is ranked with a lower score indicating greater deprivation. These scores are put into quintiles</p> <p>1 - Most deprived</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 - Least deprived</p> <p>We link to the index of IMD quintile for the postcode included in the HESA data. This is the postcode on application to medical school.</p> <p>IMD quintiles have been calculated in different years for the period covered by the HESA data. We hold postcode on application to medical school for all cases from 2002 onwards. We hold IMD reference data for the following years:</p> <p>England: 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2015</p> <p>Scotland: 2004, 2006, 2009, 2012 and 2016</p> <p>Northern Ireland: 2005, 2010 and 2017</p> <p>Wales: 2004, 2011 and 2014</p> <p>We use the closest preceding year to the Dr's year of entry to medical school.</p>	
U-codes	<p>U-codes are allocated to denote the reason for an unsatisfactory ARCP outcome.</p> <p>Click here for our U-code reference table.</p>	
N-codes	<p>N-codes are allocated to denote the reason where no ARCP is awarded during the year.</p> <p>Click here for our N-code reference table.</p>	
Less than full time	<p>Whether a doctor is "less than full time" during any part of the period covered by the ARCP (using Period Start and Period End dates)</p>	

For further information and any queries please email the education data and insight team by [clicking here](#).