

54 Allenby Road
London
SE28 0BN

Ref: W01

Dr C Lacy
Health Education South London
Shared Services
Stewart House
32 Russell Square
London
WC1B 5DN

Thursday 12th June 2014

Dear Dr Lacy

RE: Dr Chris Day ARCP 3rd June 2014

Thank you very much indeed for meeting me on 6th June 2014. Although we could not agree on some key issues, I got a clear sense that you cared about my situation and that you were concerned about my welfare.

I am progressing well at fulfilling the ARCP panel's requirements for converting the outcome 5 to an outcome 1.

This letter follows an email that I sent on June 5th 2014 expressing serious concerns about the way the ARCP is recorded on my ePortfolio. This letter follows a similar theme.

For the purposes of this letter, I am going to refer to the Deanery and Health Education Authority (HEA) interchangeably.

The context of this letter

The patient safety issues and my unfair treatment by management at the Queen Elizabeth are not the subject of this letter.

I attended the ARCP on the 3rd June 2014. I found the panel pleasant and considered my ARCP routine, there was no disagreement between myself and the panel and I accepted an "unsatisfactory outcome 5" for lack of evidence. I was receptive to the suggestion that I should be more organised with my ePortfolio.

At the end of my ARCP I offered my concerns surrounding the ICU night time staffing at the Queen Elizabeth and one particular night on-call for ICU which I thought was incredibly unsafe. This was on night of the 10/1/14. As usual, I was put on-call alone as an SHO with no registrar for 18 ICU beds, A&E and ward ICU assessment. On this particular night, I was in addition to the above expected to cover the medical wards as the two medical ward doctors were absent. I raised my concerns verbally and in writing to management and was treated unfairly as a result.

I am confident that at my ARCP I demonstrated reasonable evidence based concerns and presented them in terms of verifiable facts. I found the panel receptive to my concerns and one member compared the staffing with their own hospital.

I then left the room assuring the panel I would do more e-learning and get the relevant assessments on my ePortfolio.

On trying to leave the building I was told by the receptionist that I should not leave and that the panel wanted to see me again. 50 minutes then elapsed before I was invited back into the room.

At the second meeting you were present in the room and you asked me to consider outlining mitigating factors for my ARCP outcome. I said that I didn't have any, other than that I had an exceptionally busy ICU job and that I accepted I could improve my ePortfolio management. You offered some leaflets about various Deanery services and the second meeting ended with no significant conversations or differences of opinion.

I was told that my educational supervisor was in the building and could meet me if I wanted a meeting that day, I declined as I had my MCEM exam the following day and the ARCP process had already taken longer than I was expecting (approx. 2 hours). I did not review the ARCP document whilst in the building as I was keen to get home to revise and did not feel the need as the panel's conclusions verbally to myself seemed reasonable and straightforward.

My educational supervisor Duncan Brooke has confirmed that he and a Deanery HR advisor were asked to speak to the panel during the 50 minutes between my two meetings. I also note that the ARCP document was completed 2 hours after my 1430 ARCP appointment at 1634.

My concerns surrounding the ARCP document

I am writing to challenge the record of the ARCP that has been placed on my ePortfolio. It should be noted that I do not disagree with the outcome 5 nor do I have a problem with the way the panel interacted with me. There was no disagreement of any kind between myself and the panel during the ARCP.

The ARCP document explicitly states a link between the "reason for unsatisfactory outcome at ARCP" with "issues with personal and professional skills including behaviour/conduct/attitude/confidence/time keeping/communication skills" and with "Non or no engagement with supervision".

The reason for my unsatisfactory outcome was clearly stated by the panel as being related to a deficit in 3 work based assessments and the fact a recent successful anaesthetic meeting was not entered on ePortfolio. My attendance record at Deanery days was also an issue but I tried to explain that with the staff situation on ITU and as agreed by the panel was going to be rectified by e-learning. I accepted an outcome 5 for these reasons in the meeting and for these reasons alone. At no point was personal professional conduct or engagement with supervision stated as a reason for unsatisfactory ARCP outcome. The ARCP document clearly states the evidence that the ARCP panel considered in order to make its decisions. In my case this included work based assessments and supervisor reports. My supervisor reports and multisource feedback are very strong and do not support in any way concerns regarding engagement with supervision or concerns about personal/professional conduct. I would even suggest that they directly contradict such statements.

The ARCP document in its current form will explicitly mislead future educational and clinical supervisors regarding my engagement with supervision and my personal/professional skills during my CT2 year in Woolwich. It will also disadvantage me in future recruitment processes should I leave the programme as ePortfolio in general, and ARCP records in particular are used as evidence of my career progression.

I must insist that the Health Education Authority takes full responsibility for the way the ARCP is recorded on my ePortfolio. It is unfair and inaccurate.

I feel I am being quite reasonable and given the situation I have had to endure in Woolwich have been very patient with the Deanery as an organisation by giving them space to handle the situation over the last 8 months. Please note that I informed the deanery via Duncan Brooke in January about the unsafe night and the unfair management treatment.

I have had to handle this difficult situation at the Queen Elizabeth delicately and have managed to preserve good professional relationships as my multisource feedback and supervisor reports clearly indicate. I am very annoyed at the heavy handed way the Deanery has managed this situation, especially given the fact they have offered minimal help up until this point. I have now lost confidence in the Deanery's ability to act in my best interest.

Please can I ask that the following be actioned within the next 7 working days.

1. The ARCP document be removed from my ePortfolio and replaced with a more accurate representation of the meeting (I accept the outcome 5).
2. The chair of the panel to take responsibility for providing a written statement accounting for his linking of the reason for my "unsatisfactory outcome at ARCP" to "non-engagement with supervision" and "personal professional issues including behaviour/conduct/attitude/confidence/timekeeping/communication skills."
3. To provide the names of people and nature of evidence submitted to the panel for the ARCP including the 50 minutes when I was not in the room. I.e. Duncan Brooke, Deanery HR advisor, etc

Kind Regards

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Chris Day', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dr Chris Day

ACCS CT2 South London