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Overview

1. What is it?
2. What does it look like?
3. What do we know about causal factors?
4. So what can we do about it? (discussion)
5. What are we doing next?
Discussion questions

1. What are the key challenges that you face in supporting trainees to progress in EOE?

2. What forms of support are working well in the EOE?

3. What tools could the GMC provide you with to help you tackle DA in your patch?
Thinking about differential attainment
Our goal: Fair training pathways

- That any hurdles in the way of a doctor’s progression (tests, assessments, selection criteria) are valid, fair and are justifiable in terms of necessary knowledge, skills, experience and expected standards of conduct.

- That individuals wishing to enter and progress within the profession have opportunities to achieve their potential.

- That evidence of actual or potential bias or unfair treatment is addressed.
Public sector equality duty - 3 aspects

Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.

Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
What does it look like?
A framework that promotes fairness

Promoting excellence: standards for medical education and training

Standards for curricula and assessment systems

Working with doctors Working for patients
Differences by qualification and ethnicity

Pass rates by primary medical qualification and ethnic group for 2013/14 and 2014/15 (Includes candidates sitting exams whilst in foundation programmes and candidates not in a training programme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College / Faculty</th>
<th>PMQ World Region</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal College of General Practitioners</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMG</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pass Rate 0% to 100%
Differences by socio-economic status

Pass rates for UK graduates by deprivation quintile for 2013/14 and 2014/15 (Includes candidates sitting exams whilst in foundation programmes and candidates not in a training programme)
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Socio-economic status does not explain BME performance

Pass rate: all colleges all years (2014 and 2015)

- White
- BME
And some by gender and age

Pass rates by gender and age group for 2013/14 and 2014/15 (Includes candidates sitting exams whilst in foundation programmes and candidates not in a training programme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>Over 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do we know about causes?
What do we know about the causes?

- BME students less well qualified/able?
- Language issues?
- Examiner bias?

- Woolf et al., Brit J Ed Psych 2012
- McManus et al BMC Med Ed 2013
- Denney et al Brit J Gen Prac 2013
Relationships and belonging matter
Environmental, support and individual factors matter

Causality operates at each level and also across/between levels

Training environments and support structures can be barriers or protective processes

An individualised learning plan and a holistic discussion can help identify challenges

S. Regan de Bere et al (2015)
Insights from qualitative research
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Training is tougher for some groups

- Postgraduate medical training can be tough for many trainees.
- But BME UK Graduates and International Medical Graduates face additional barriers to their progression compared to white UKGs.

→ The hill is steep and BME UKGs and IMGs are given extra bags to carry.
Key findings from qualitative research

*UK BME and IMG trainees face increased risks to progression compared to white peers*

1. Relationships with seniors crucial to learning but these were more problematic for BME UKGs & IMGs.
2. Perceived bias in recruitment & assessments.
3. Lack of autonomy about geographical location of work, separation from personal support networks & poor work-life balance compounds risks.
What can we do about it?
What can be done to tackle differential attainment?

4 main findings
What can be done to tackle differential attainment?

1. Building positive trainee-trainer relationships.
Building positive trainee-trainer relationships

- Time for trainers and trainees to get to know one another can increase trust, understanding, and confidence, especially if cultural differences impede relationships forming quickly.

- Remind trainers how important they are to trainees’ leaning.
What can be done to tackle differential attainment?

1. Building positive trainee-trainer relationships.
2. Building trainee skills & confidence to deal with perceived bias.
Building trainee skills and confidence to combat perceived bias

Trainers can help build skills & confidence by:

- Empathising with difficulties.
- Showing belief in trainees.
- Providing access to learning experiences, including exam or interview practice.
What can be done to tackle differential attainment?

1. Building positive trainee-trainer relationships.
2. Building trainee skills & confidence to deal with perceived bias.
3. Facilitating peer support.
Facilitating peer support

- Peers can help combat fears of bias, especially when peer groups are mixed.
- Peer relationships, and relationships between trainees and trainers can be facilitated by organisations e.g. by organising events.
What can be done to tackle differential attainment?

1. Building positive trainee-trainer relationships.
2. Building trainee skills & confidence to deal with perceived bias.
3. Facilitating mixed support.
4. Improving trainee wellbeing by enabling trainees to gain support outside work & de-stigmatising support in work.
Improving trainee wellbeing

- Allowing trainees to access support from outside work to cope with work stressors but also to deal with home stressors.
- Increase opportunities for trainees to work less than full time.
- Consider how to de-stigmatise support in work.
What can be done to tackle differential attainment?

1. Building positive trainee-trainer relationships.
2. Building trainee skills & confidence to deal with perceived bias.
3. Facilitating mixed support.
4. Improving trainee wellbeing by enabling trainees to gain support outside work & de-stigmatising support in work.
Discussion questions

- 1. What are the key challenges that you face in supporting trainees to progress in EOE?

- 2. What forms of support are working well in the EOE?

- 3. What tools could the GMC provide you with to help you tackle DA in your patch?
So what next from the GMC?
Three themes to our work

A framework that promotes fairness

Working out what works & sharing practice

Developing tools to measure the impact
What we are doing next?

- Continuing to collect and share examples of good practice on our webpages
- Ongoing development of progression data
- Focus on improving data sets and making more accessible/useful to help local level action planning
- Second phase of qualitative research with colleges and employers
- Supplementary E&D guidance to support the new standards
**Sharing positive examples of ways to support doctors through training**

**Case studies**

As we continue our investigations, we're collecting examples of good practice in supporting doctors in training that have been identified locally and may be shared more widely. You can find each case study listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators that may be used for predicting doctors in difficulty</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional support for doctors in training who are identified as at higher risk of failing exams</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for doctors in training who have communication challenges due to language or cultural influences</td>
<td>Foundation, Core, Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A programme to raise educators awareness of clinical communication issues</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tool to codify underperformance issues</td>
<td>Foundation, Core, Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support groups for students at higher risk of failing</td>
<td>Foundation, Core, Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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