

Progression reports – annual review of competence progression – undergraduate

These reports show percentages of unsatisfactory annual review of competence progression (ARCP) outcomes for various groups of doctors in postgraduate training, based on which medical school awarded their primary medical qualification (PMQ).

To create the reports we have used data collected from deaneries and Health Education England (HEE), along with data from the medical register and Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA).

In these reports, you can explore ARCP outcomes by:

- Specialty
- Medical school
- Educational performance measure

Technical notes

GMC confidentiality rules	To protect the confidentiality of doctors, we do not report on any group smaller than three people.				
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. The year a student commenced medical school is taken from data provided by HESA and the HESA confidentiality rules will apply when the 'Year(s) commenced medical school' filter is used.				
Confidence intervals	All our confidence intervals (CI) are calculated to the 95% confidence level using the recommended method 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 (below outlier: coloured purple), or where the lower confidence limit of the report group is more than the upper confidence limit of the benchmark group (above outlier: coloured dark blue).				
Reporting period/year	These reports include data from 2010 onwards, excluding Foundation programme outcomes, which are reported from 2013 onwards. Each year of this report includes reviews awarded in a given academic year, running from 1 August to 31 July. The label refers to the 2nd calendar year in that period. For example '2015' refers to the academic year starting on 1 August 2014 and finishing on 31 July 2015.				
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. <table border="1" data-bbox="375 2011 1481 2105"> <tr> <td>Unsatisfactory outcome:</td> <td>Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsatisfactory outcome</td> <td>Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E, excluding those</td> </tr> </table>	Unsatisfactory outcome:	Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E.	Unsatisfactory outcome	Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E, excluding those
Unsatisfactory outcome:	Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E.				
Unsatisfactory outcome	Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7.2, 7.3, RITA D or E, excluding those				

	(excluding exam failures):	associated with exam failure.
	Outcome 5s:	Outcome 5 and 7.4.
	Outcomes 2 and D:	Outcomes ARCP 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.
	Outcomes 3 and E:	Outcomes ARCP 3, 7.3 and RITA E.
	Outcome 4s:	Note that there is no equivalent RITA outcome.
Educational Performance Measure (EPM)	Educational Performance Measure is taken from the Foundation School Application Process (FPAS) from 2012 onwards.	