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Session outline

- Introduction
- Opportunity to demonstrate skills and abilities
- Fairness
  - Comparing specialties
  - Comparing selection methods/stations
Part One:

Introduction
Data sources

- Questionnaires distributed and completed at the selection days in 5 deaneries and for national selection systems administered in a single deanery.
  - Response rate in excess of 90%.
  - Questionnaires for GP applicants were distributed by post.
- 4,453 candidate questionnaires were completed across 11 specialties.
- 711 assessor questionnaires were completed from the same specialties.
The questions

Questions covered:
- skills and abilities;
- fairness;
- familiarity with the type of assessment;
- whether it allowed a demonstration of excellence;
- whether prior experience in the specialty would have improved performance; and
- personal assessment of performance.
Scope for further analysis

- Today
  - comparison of specialties as a whole; and
  - comparison of types of selection methods/stations.

- Further analysis will address:
  - Gender, age and ethnicity
  - Current job (e.g. CT2 in Surgery)
  - N selection days attended in this specialty in previous years
  - Place of initial medical training: UK/other EU/non-EU country
  - Medical School attended for initial medical training
  - Deanery or country of current training in ‘this’ specialty.
  - FTE years of postgraduate experience
Part Two:
‘Skills and abilities’
by specialty and station
Skills and abilities

1. ‘This selection process enabled me to show how my skills and abilities make me suitable for specialty training’.

2. ‘This selection method/station enabled me to show how my skills and abilities make me suitable for specialty training’.

Rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Number of responses

### Specialty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N candidates</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>MMT</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Clinical Interview</th>
<th>Non-clinical mixed interview</th>
<th>Practical skill</th>
<th>Role play: Doctor</th>
<th>Role play: patient/relative</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Written exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N candidates</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>3484</td>
<td>3316</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean ratings for "enabled me to show how my skills and abilities make me suitable for specialty training" by specialty; candidates only

Mean rating. 1 = strongly disagree, up to 6 = strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G*</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This specialty was not included in this analysis
‘Skills and abilities’ by specialty

- Mean rating ranges from 4.3 to 5 (‘slightly agree’ [4] to ‘agree’ [5]). The difference is statistically significant and is a large substantive difference.

- Specialties H and I score 4.3 and D scores 5. Two others, A and J score 4.4.
Mean ratings for "enabled me to show how my skills and abilities make me suitable for specialty training" by station category; candidates only

- MMT: 3.6
- Portfolio/commitment to specialty: 4.5
- Clinical interview: 4.7
- Non-clin/mixed int: 4.5
- Practical skills: 4.5
- Role play: doctor: 4.8
- Role play: patient/rel: 4.7
- Presentation: 4.4
- Written exercise: 4.1
‘Skills and abilities’ by station

- Mean rating ranges from 3.6 to 4.8. The difference is statistically significant and is a very large substantive difference.

- The MMT (3.6) is rated lowest. Responses on MMT by country of initial training shows mean scores for UK graduates (3.3), other EU (3.8) and non-EU (4.2).

- Mean rating for a written exercise is also low at 4.1 with responses by country of initial training showing UK and other EU graduates at 3.8 and non-EU at 4.6.
Part Three:
‘Fairness’ by specialty and station
Fairness

1. ‘This selection process was fair’.

2. ‘This selection method/station was fair’.
## Number of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N candidates</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N assessors</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>MMT</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Clinical Interview</th>
<th>Non-clinical mixed interview</th>
<th>Practical skill</th>
<th>Role play: Doctor</th>
<th>Role play: patient/relative</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Written exercise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N candidates</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>3536</td>
<td>3334</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N assessors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean ratings for "was fair" by specialty

*This specialty only had assessors included in this analysis
‘Fairness’ by specialty

- Mean ratings by candidates ranged from 4.2 to 5.1.
- Differences between specialties were statistically significant and substantively very large.
- Across all specialties, assessors were more positive than candidates, mean scores ranging from 4.8 to 5.4 showing a modest difference.
- Specialty H had the lowest rating by candidates (4.2) and highest by assessors (5.4).
Mean ratings for "was fair" by station category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Category</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Assessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMT</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio/commitment to specialty</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical interview</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-clin/mixed int</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical skills</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role play: doctor</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role play: patient/rel</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written exercise</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean rating, 1 = strongly disagree, up to 6 = strongly agree
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‘Fairness’ by station

- Candidates rated the MMT (4.2) and written exercise (4.1) as lowest in terms of fairness but the overall range of mean scores is modest.

- Excluding the MMT and written exercise, ratings of all other stations are virtually the same, 4.6 to 4.8.

- Assessors also rated the MMT lowest (4.4).

- Excluding the MMT, the range of scores is modest.

- Clinical interviews and role plays scored 5 and above.
Conclusion

- These data are from initial and preliminary analysis.
- Further analysis is needed before we begin to draw any conclusions from these and other data.
- What is important and exciting is the range, scale and quality of data available for analysis.
Questions for ‘Breakout’ session

- What is your assessment of the profession’s view of current systems of selection?

- What is your view of how selection should develop?

- How readily would any changes be accepted by key stakeholders?