

## 2.9 Selection of Trainees

### 2.9.1 Current Selection Policy

The College's selection policy is documented on pages 54 to 58 of the *2006 Training Program Handbook*.

The policy covers the principles of the selection system, criteria for selection, the selection process and the procedure for the final selection of applicants for accredited training positions.

The College aims to select into the training program individuals who are able to demonstrate that they have the abilities, qualifications, experience, standard of work performance and personal qualities which will enable them to satisfactorily perform the required duties of a dermatology trainee, achieve all the objectives of the training scheme as outlined in the College's *Training Program Handbook* and become a skilled and competent clinical dermatologist.

The selection process aims to assess the extent to which each applicant has the desired attributes of a dermatology trainee. The desired attributes are:

- To have a sound academic record, acceptable training (as defined) in general medicine, general surgery, the medical and surgical sub-specialties and psychiatry, and involvement, a history of involvement or a willingness to be involved in research projects;
- To demonstrate sound clinical ability and judgement in a wide range of clinical settings;
- To show a willingness to work hard and an ability to learn, assimilate, assess and evaluate knowledge in order to apply this to the care of patients with dermatological conditions;
- To demonstrate evidence of physical and mental capability to fulfill and complete all aspects of the training program, including the performance of the dermatological procedures and treatment modalities outlined in the curriculum;
- To perform all the duties associated with a training program conscientiously; to take responsibility for patient management whilst always being aware of personal limitations; and to recognise when to seek help and guidance from more experienced colleagues;
- To demonstrate an ability to have good rapport with peers and other health professionals; and the ability to show respect for others' opinions;
- To show initiative and responsibility in the performance of all duties and in personal study programs and an ability to carry out realistic self-assessment, in order to recognize personal levels of competence and ability to perform specific tasks;
- To be punctual and readily available at all times during working hours and after hours, as required by roster;

- To demonstrate a commitment to ongoing, self-directed learning and self-improvement;
- To show continued support of a participation in the training of health care professionals, especially medical students, nurses and dermatology trainees;
- To show evidence of interests and activities in the broader community (page 55, *2006 Training Program Handbook*).

## **2.9.2 Adherence to MTRP Principles for Selection**

The ACD selection policy and process adheres to the MTRP principles for selection.

### **2.9.2.1 Statement of Principles**

*There should be a clear statement of principles which underpin the selection process.*

The statement of principles which underpin the selection process is made publicly available on page 54 of the *2006 Training Program Handbook*, which states:

The Australasian College of Dermatologists selects into its training program individuals who are able to demonstrate that they have the abilities, qualifications, experience, standard of work performance and personal qualities which will enable them to satisfactorily perform all the required duties of a dermatology trainee, achieve all the objectives of the training scheme as outlined in the College's *Training Program Handbook* and become a skilled and competent clinical dermatologist.

The principle of equal opportunity will apply.

Discrimination against any applicant on the grounds of age, gender, race, religion, marital status or pregnancy will be avoided. Applicants from all states will be given equal consideration. The selection process will be standardised and involve examination of curriculum vitae and referees reports and in some cases an interview. Interviews will be granted after assessment of curriculum vitae and referee reports. Normally at least twice as many interviews will be granted as the number of training positions available in a particular State. No trainee will be selected into a training program without an interview. The sole aim of all questions during the selection process is to select the best (and most appropriate) candidates for training programs in dermatology.

Questions will have no reference to any personal or domestic circumstances of the candidate unless they are relevant, or any other matters not directly relevant to the stated aim. The entire selection process will be open, transparent and accountable.

### **2.9.2.2 Eligibility Criteria**

*There should be a clear statement of eligibility to apply for, and be selected for, training.*

The statement of eligibility requirements for selection into the dermatology training program is made publicly available on page 54 of the *2006 Training Program Handbook*, which states:

The minimum requirements for selection as a dermatology trainee into the training program of the Australasian College of Dermatologists are:

- Possession of a medical degree registerable in Australia;
- Satisfactory completion, since graduation, of a minimum of two years of acceptable training, as defined in the *Training Program Handbook*, in a teaching hospital or equivalent recognised by the College;
- Commitment to participate in, and complete, any accredited training position of the College as directed by the appropriate State Faculty committee during the training program.

### **2.9.2.3 Advertising**

*There should be a national awareness of opportunity for all eligible candidates.*

The College invites applications for dermatology registrar training positions through advertising on its website [www.dermcoll.asn.au](http://www.dermcoll.asn.au), in the *Medical Journal of Australia* and in the “Medical and Hospital Appointments” section of *The Australian*. The advertisement is attached (Attachment 28).

### **2.9.2.4 Limits to the Number of Training Positions**

*Quotas, if applicable, and limits relating to other factors, such as the number of training positions, should be explicit and openly declared.*

The factors that determine the number of training positions are outside of the control of the College and it would therefore be inappropriate for the College to advertise the number of training positions. The factors that determine the number of training positions are:

- The availability of Government funding for accredited training positions in Australian teaching hospitals;
- The continuation of funding by overseas governments of overseas training positions;
- The number of trainees in each state who agree to work in, or continue to work in, or who propose to return from, overseas training positions;
- The number of trainees in each state who take approved leave, or who are working part time or in shared training positions;

- The continuation of training positions made available by the Skin and Cancer Foundations in NSW, Victoria and Queensland, which are privately funded;
- Government funding being available to support training in private practice;
- The number of fourth year trainees who complete the requirements of the training program in the minimum time (four years).

Applicants are offered training positions for which funding has been confirmed. The number of confirmed training positions is made known at interview to applicants who ask for this information. If an additional funded training position becomes available in a state after the selection process has been completed, then the position is offered to the highest ranked applicant in that state who has not yet been appointed to a position.

### **2.9.2.5 References**

*Referees' reports should be Proforma with a view to achieving, objectivity, comparability and quantification.*

Applicants are asked to submit the names of two primary medical referees with their application. Applicants must have had close contact with both of these referees, and contact with at least one them within the preceding 12 months. The College asks referees to use a proforma referee report (Attachment 29). The College emails the proforma to each primary referee and asks them to complete it and return it by email to the College by the closing date (31 May in 2006).

Applicants are also required to submit the names of a further three secondary referees, including the medical administrator of a hospital at which they have worked. These referees may be contacted for a report at a later date in the selection process.

In 2004, a human resources consultant was employed to advise the Victorian state faculty on selection policies and procedures. The consultant was responsible for obtaining verbal references using a structured interview. In 2005 the consultant provided this service for the selection committees in all state faculties.

In 2006 the College's external human resources (HR) consultant conducted verbal reference checks of all applicants who were shortlisted for interview by all of the State Faculties. The Consultant read the written references submitted by the Primary referees.

The HR consultant also conducted a minimum of two verbal reference checks by telephone with either the "Other Referees" or superiors that applicants had had recently worked with that were listed in their CV. One state provided the HR consultant with a list of "Other Referees" and requested that they specifically be contacted. The consultant contacted referees to schedule a time to telephone them to conduct the reference check. The consultant used

a standard form which asked referees to score (out of 10 points) the applicant across seven competencies. The competencies were derived from the attributes outlined in the National Selection Guidelines, and in a survey in which randomly selected Fellows of the College were asked to identify competencies typical of outstanding dermatologists. Referees were asked to answer a comprehensive list of general questions, many of which are designed to gather information to assess an applicant's skills and abilities against the selection criteria outlined in the selection guidelines. Soft skills eg patient skills, interpersonal skills, were specifically addressed. The consultant spoke to each referee on average between ten and twenty minutes.

The consultant prepared a written reference check report for each applicant and this report was sent to the Selection Committee in each state where the applicant applied.

The College policy is that applicants will be made aware of any adverse comments in any referees' reports, although they are not told specifically which particular referee made the adverse comments or whether adverse comments were made by more than one referee. In 2006 an alternative approach was adopted. When adverse comments were raised by one referee, the consultant conducted one or more additional verbal reference checks and raised the areas of concern. If a second referee concurred with the adverse comments, then an additional reference was obtained to confirm if the comment was justified. This was considered to be a more effective way of gathering information about the issue.

The external HR consultant and Chair of the interview panel then designed general, applicant-specific questions around the issue to pose to the applicant at the selection interview. This was considered to be a more effective way of gathering information about the issue: the consensus was that if applicants were made aware of adverse comments they may worry about the selection panel being preoccupied with adverse feedback unnecessarily when in fact this might be only a very minor point – afterall, no-one is perfect.

### **2.9.2.6 The Selection Committee**

*The Committee should have the confidence of the candidate, the profession and the community. It should be prepared to be held accountable for their decisions with the size of the Committee proportional to the task. They should be prepared for their processes and decisions to be reviewed in other forums. The selection process should be valid, reliable and feasible with evaluation built into the process.*

The College policy for selection committees is on page 57 of the 2006 *Training Program Handbook* and states:

Each State Faculty will determine the size and composition of its Selection Committee. However, this committee will include the Heads of Departments (or their nominees) of the training institutions in that State, the State Director of Training, an independent representative

from another medical specialty or training institution and a layperson, as well as the Chairperson of the Faculty who will act as the Chair of the committee. A representative of local health jurisdictions will also be involved.

If a potential conflict of interest exists between a committee member and a candidate, then the committee member will declare this and absent himself/herself from the committee. In situations where there is some doubt as to whether a real conflict of interest exists, then the State Faculty Chairperson, as Chair of the Selection Committee, will make a decision as to whether that committee member should absent himself/herself from the committee.

If a committee member is excluded from the Selection Committee for any reason, the Chair has the prerogative to select a replacement on the committee. This person, however, will be as near equivalent as possible to the person being replaced and should have the full confidence and approval of all members of the Selection Committee.

Guidelines for Selection Committee members have been developed and are provided to all committee members by the Chairperson of the State Faculty (Attachment 30).

The Selection Committee will meet and consider all applications with reference to the candidates' curriculum vitae and reports, both written and verbal, from referees and other persons if applicable<sup>1</sup>. The committee will decide which candidates are selected for interview. All applications will be considered purely on merit.

The Interview Committee will include a layperson who will have the right to vote. The Interview Committee will usually be chaired by the State Faculty Chairperson. The interview will be conducted in a manner that is objective and free of bias. Interviews will be of approximately the same duration for each candidate.

Further information is provided to Selection Committee members in the *National Trainee Selection Guide: Information for Faculties* (Attachment 31) which states:

....It is preferable that, where possible, there is a gender balance on the committee approximately consistent with the gender balance of the applicants<sup>2</sup>.

In 2004, a human resources consultant was employed for the first time to advise the Victorian state faculty on selection procedures. This consultant

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2006 each state established a CV assessment panel to assess the CVs of applicants who applied in that state. The full selection committees considered the CV score of each applicant who applied in that state, not the applicant's actual CV. The CV scoring process is explained in section 2.9.2.9.

<sup>2</sup> The selection committees convened in 2006 had a gender balance.

obtained verbal references using a structured interview. She was also part of the interview panel and asked each trainee a number of behaviourally-based questions. In 2005 and 2006 the consultant was employed to provide this service for all state faculty selection committees. In addition, in 2004 in Victoria, and in 2005 in all states, the consultant was employed to provide feedback to unsuccessful candidates who requested it. In 2006 the process described in section 2.9.2.12 of this submission was used to provide feedback to unsuccessful candidates.

The *National Trainee Selection Guide: Information for Faculties* has been updated to include the following information about the employment of a human resources consultant to assist in the selection process:

....College will appoint a human relations consultant to advise and assist the (Selection) Committee, in particular with referees' reports and the interview. The consultant will be a member of the interview committee....

In addition, these guidelines also state that:

....It is desirable that the Interview Committee be smaller than the Selection Committee where the number sitting on the Selection Committee is greater than six. In general, in the smaller States, the Selection and Interview Committees will be the same whilst in the larger States an Interview Committee with an optimal maximum of six persons plus the Chairperson of the committee, will be selected from the Selection Committee by that committee each year. If practical, the Interview Committee will include a layperson who will have the right to vote. The Interview Committee will usually be chaired by the State Faculty Chairperson....

#### **2.9.2.7 Selection Criteria**

*The selection criteria should be documented and published. To the greatest extent possible they should be objective and quantifiable.*

The selection criteria (attributes) are published in the *2006 Training Program Handbook* (page 55) and listed on the application form. These attributes are also listed in section 2.9.1 of this submission.

Information about each applicant's claims for selection against these attributes is gathered from the applicant's CV, referees' reports and at the interview. These processes are explained in the following sections of this document.

#### **2.9.2.8 Conduct of the Interview**

*The interview should be objective and free of bias.*

The College issues guidelines and instructions to interview panels to ensure the interviews are objective and free of bias. The lay person and HR consultant also actively ensure interviews are objective and free of bias.

The guidelines for selection interviews are on page 57 of the *2006 Training Program Handbook* and state that:

The Interview Committee will include a layperson who will have the right to vote. The Interview Committee will usually be chaired by the State Faculty Chairperson. The interview will be conducted in a manner that is objective and free of bias. Interviews will be of approximately the same duration for each candidate.

Any matter covered in the candidates' curriculum vitae, referees' reports or reports from other persons (if applicable) is subject to review during the interview. In general, the interview will aim to establish the candidates':

- Academic abilities and cognitive skills
- Qualities of self motivation, social responsibility and ethics
- Clinical and practical skills
- Patient communication and care skills
- Communication skills with colleagues and ancillary staff
- General communication skills
- Future potential in dermatology

Each State Selection Committee will prepare a set of questions each year as the basis for each interview. However, each interview will be structured in such a way as to allow the candidate to demonstrate any personal or academic quality which might influence the decision as to their suitability for a dermatology training program.

Written records are kept of the interviews. The proceedings of each meeting of the Selection and Interview Committees are minuted with a record of decisions made, with appropriate reasons for those decisions. At the end of the interview, each candidate will be given the opportunity to ask questions and to express an opinion as to whether he/she is satisfied with the selection and interview process. These responses will be recorded.

In addition the *National Trainee Selection Guide: Information for Faculties* (Attachment 31) recommends that the Interview Committee should have no more than six members plus the Chairman (see section 2.9.2.6 of this submission for more information about the College policies for the Interview Committee).

Further guidance on the conduct of interviews was provided in a memorandum to State Faculty Chairs dated 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2006. This memorandum stated that:

- The interviews will be conducted if at all possible by the 31<sup>st</sup> August;
- The College's HR consultant will attend all interviews;
- The constitution of the interview committee will not change from previous years;
- Where a large number of applicants are short listed then a state may elect to split its interview committee and run parallel interviews so long as:
  - Each applicant is interviewed by all the committee members;
  - Each subcommittee has a defined role in the interview process that remains the same throughout the entire process;
  - The committee meets as a whole at the completion of interviews to collate scores.
- The interviews will be semi-structured:
  - Guidelines and questions will be prepared by the Training Committee and forwarded closer to the dates for interviews;
  - The HR consultant will act to ensure that questions are not duplicated between states where such duplication may afford some applicants unfair advantage;
  - Competency questioning and scenario questioning will be from a selection of pre-prepared questions;
  - Clarification of CVs is permitted;
  - General questioning will be limited;
  - The results of interviews are not to be communicated to applicants; this will be performed by the College delegates after a preference matching meeting between the state faculty chairs.

In 2006, all state interview panels asked general questions and competency/behavioural based questions. The HR consultant worked with the Chair of the committee to design interview questions. The external HR consultant designed and led the competency/behavioural part of the interview and is specially trained in this type of interviewing. All states except NSW had one interview panel. In NSW the interview panel was divided into two parts one part asked the general questions and the other part asked the competency/behavioural based questions. Each part of the panel had four interviewers. Both parts of the panel interviewed each applicant so each applicant was interviewed by a total of eight interviewers.

All applicants were asked a set of standard (same) questions and then three to four applicant specific questions to gain further information about comments made by referees during verbal reference checking. These questions were asked at the end of the interview.

Interview panel members in all states used a scoring guideline for the general questions and benchmark scores and descriptions of behaviours outlined for competency questions, which were provided by the College's HR consultant. Interview panel members gave their scores to the College's HR consultant. The consulting firm entered the scores into a pre programmed spreadsheet which automatically calculated the scores and ranked applicants according to

these scores to ensure no errors in additions. These results were double checked before being acted upon.

A time keeper ensured that each person had the same amount of time at interview.

To facilitate the selection interview process an administration liaison person was appointed in each state prior to interview. The liaison person explained the process to the applicant, debriefed the applicant, dealt with questions and sought feedback on the process.

#### **2.9.2.9 Selection**

*The selection process should be based on the published criteria and the principles of the College concerned whilst also being capable of standing up to external scrutiny.*

The following information, which the College provided to members of the 2006 Selection Committees, describes the selection process used in 2006:

#### **1 CV Assessment**

##### **i Faculties must nominate CV assessment panel by 31/05/06**

Panel consists of:

- State Director of Training (DOT);
- Head of Dermatology Department/s (HOD) or their nominee;
- Plus 1 other nominated by the chairman.

There must be attention to potential conflicts of interest

Members of the BOC may serve on the panel

##### **ii CVs forwarded directly to panel members by ACD secretariat for all applicants for that state by the end of 1<sup>st</sup> week of June.**

##### **iii ACD secretariat will not contact applicants who have failed to correctly complete applications. Contact will only be made in regard to referees. Late applications will not be accepted; amended applications will not be accepted after closing date:**

Packs sent to CV panel members will contain:

- CVs for all applicants for that state;
- Instructions (Attachment 30);
- CV assessment legend (Attachment 30);
- Excel worksheet for return to ACD with final scores;
- Conflict of interest declaration;
- Instructions to contact ACD secretariat immediately if deadlines cannot be met.

Panel members will be blinded with regard to the state preferences/applications to other states.

Completed CV scores to be returned by individual panel members direct to ACD secretariat by 30/06/06.

State faculties will receive CV scores and rankings for ACD secretariat as soon as processed after 30/06/06 (within 48 hrs):

- CV mean score for each applicant for that state's panel;
- CV mean score for all states to which each applicant has applied (calculated using the mean of the means for each state);
- Ranked lists using each of above methods.

State faculties prepare short lists for interview and return to ACD by COB 10/07/06:

- States to interview twice the number of vacancies;
- Short list details must include instructions for any special referees ARC is to contact including nurse referees and non-listed referees;
- States may elect to interview more than this number;
- Some states may wish to review referee reports before finalizing short list but will still need to submit a provisional list as above and may subsequently amend the list. This would need to be done as expeditiously as possible<sup>3</sup>.

## 2 Reference Checks

ARC will conduct referee checks on pooled lists supplied by states and report via ACD secretariat to faculties. All states will receive the same referee report for each applicant<sup>4</sup>.

## 3 Interviews

- i Panels as in previous years
- ii Interviews will be semi-structured with:
  - General;
  - Situational, and
  - Competency questions.

---

<sup>3</sup> In 2006 there was some differences concerning whether a short list for interview could be changed on the basis of verbal referees' reports. Some states changed their shortlists on this basis. Others did not because the applicant/s had a high CV score.

<sup>4</sup> In 2006 ARC conducted verbal reference checks. If a referee provided a reference this reference was provided to all states in which the applicant applied, provided interviews had not been conducted in that state. The interview panels in some states that conducted interviews later in this stage of the process, requested references from additional referees. These referee reports were not available to interview committees which had conducted interviews earlier in the process.

- iii Each state may have more than one panel; but each panel must see every applicant and be responsible for the same delegated section of the interview process for every applicant.
- iv Interview panels will be blinded to the state preferences and status of applications to other states for applicants and may not enquire of these.
- v ACD secretariat/delegate will notify applicants regarding interview offers:
  - Applicants will be asked to submit a state preference list to be due 5 days after the last interviews are timetabled.
- vi Interviews are to be conducted in August. State chairs are to co-ordinate and notify ACD secretariat of dates ASAP.

#### **4 Notification of Outcomes**

- i State faculties notify ACD secretariat of successful applicants.

There must be no contact between faculty and applicants before all state interviews are completed.

- ii Chairs to meet:
  - All successful applicants for all states are to be discussed and applicant preference matching performed;
  - This may occasionally result in changes to some state lists if this is in the interests of successful applicants.
- iii ACD secretariat/delegate (not faculties) will notify interviewees of outcomes.

##### **2.9.2.10 Ranking**

*The Selection Committee should score and rank candidates using the tools presented earlier.*

The applicants to each state training program are ranked by the Selection Committee in that state according to their combined scores for their CV, referees' reports and interview. Selection is based on absolute scores only. The applicant who receives the highest score in that state is ranked first, the applicant who receives the second highest score is ranked second and so on. The full selection committee in each state meets as soon as possible after the interviews to determine the committee's recommendations for appointment according to this ranked list.

In 2006 the final selection recommendations were made by State Faculty Chairs at a preference matching teleconference. At this meeting successful applicants' written preferences regarding the state in which they would prefer train, were formally considered and matched to the positions offered.

The final selections may be made by a Hospital Committee/Administrator or Health Authority (employing authority).

#### **2.9.2.11 Documentation**

*Adequate documentation enables external scrutiny, audit and evaluation of the selection process. It should enable accurate reconstruction of the original detail and process.*

The College requires state Selection Committees to keep minutes of the proceedings of all meetings of the full Selection Committee and Interview Committee. The minutes must record the decisions made and the reasons for the decisions. The minutes are kept at the College premises for a minimum of six years. The College policy states that:

Written records are kept of the interviews. The proceedings of each meeting of the Selection and Interview Committees are minuted with a record of decisions made, with appropriate reasons for those decisions. At the end of the interview, each candidate will be given the opportunity to ask questions and to express an opinion as to whether he/she is satisfied with the selection and interview process. These responses will be recorded (page 57, *2006 Training Program Handbook*).

Further the policy states that:

A record of proceedings of both the Selection and Interview Committee will be kept for a minimum period of six years in a secure manner at the College premises, with access only by the President, Censor in Chief or the Honorary Secretary of the College (page 58, *2006 Training Program Handbook*).

#### **2.9.2.12 Feedback**

*The principle to be followed is that candidates should be given or at least offered a frank appraisal of their standing in the eyes of those conducting the selection process.*

The College does not have a firm policy on providing feedback to unsuccessful applicants. However, a standard feedback letter is sent back to applicants who request feedback.

#### **2.9.2.13 Evaluation**

*The principle is that there should be a formal, regular inclusive review of the process.*

The human resources consultant engaged by the College has provided feedback reports on the selection processes conducted in 2005 and 2006. These reports will be provided to the accreditation team.

The report on the 2005 selection process included a suggested model. The College's Training Committee considered the recommended model. The following changes were made to the selection process in 2006 in line with these recommendations:

- Applicants submitted one application to the College. The College forwarded each application to the CV assessment panel in each state in which the applicant was applying. In previous years applicants sent applications to the Selection Committee in each state to which they applied;
- CV assessment panels were formed in each state to assess applicants' CVs. These panels comprised the Director of Training, Head of Dermatology Department/s and one other member nominated by the Chair of the State Selection Committee;
- Each CV assessor used the same CV assessment instrument (Attachment 30);
- Completed CV scores were returned by individual CV assessors directly to the College's external HR consultant, who entered the data into an excel spreadsheet. After all the scores for each applicant were entered, the mean was calculated. Any score for an applicant that fell outside two standard deviations from the mean was excluded to avoid skewing of results;
- The HR Consultant sent the final scores to the Chair of the College Training Committee, who sent these to the Chair of the selection panel in each state where the applicant applied. Two scores were provided, the mean CV score given to that applicant by the selection panel in that state, and the mean CV score for all states in which that applicant applied. Rank lists of applicants using both of these CV scores were also provided;
- The College's HR consultant conducted all telephone referee checks of applicants. The consultant used a standard form and prepared a written referee report (see section 2.9.2.5 of this submission for more information). This referee report was provided to each state in which an applicant applied, provided the interviews in that state had not been conducted before the reference was requested by a selection committee in another state. For each applicant a minimum of two verbal reference checks were obtained. States that conducted interviews at a later date may have received more referees' reports on an applicant. This was because additional references had been requested by one or more selection committees and were available at the time the interviews were conducted;
- The College notified all applicants of interview offers;

- State Faculty Chairs made the final selection recommendations at a preference matching teleconference. At this meeting successful applicants' written preferences regarding the state in which they would prefer to undertake training, were formally considered and matched to the positions offered;
- The College's HR consultant notified applicants of the selection decisions.

The College's HR consultant reviewed the selection process conducted in 2006 and made a number of recommendations concerning the selection process to be conducted in future years. The Training Committee will consider these recommendations.

### **2.9.3 Number of Applicants Selected to Enter the Training Program in the Last Three Years**

The number of training positions available each year is dependent on:

- The availability of Government funding for accredited training positions in Australian teaching hospitals;
- The continuation of funding by overseas governments of overseas training positions;
- The number of trainees in each state who agree to work in, or continue to work in, or who propose to return from, overseas training positions;
- The number of trainees in each state who take approved leave, or who are working part time or in shared training positions;
- The continuation of training positions made available by the Skin and Cancer Foundations in NSW, Victoria and Queensland, which are privately funded;
- Government funding being available to support training in private practice;
- The number of fourth year trainees who complete the requirements of the training program by the end of their fourth year of training.

A change in any of these factors changes the number of first year training positions available the following year.

The number of applicants selected to enter the training program in the last four years is reported in Tables 8, 9 and 10 below.

**Table 8  
Number of Applicants Selected in 2003 to Enter the Training Program in 2004**

<b>Queensland</b>	<b>NSW</b>	<b>Victoria</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>WA</b>	<b>Total</b>
4	4	4	0	1	13

**Table 9**  
**Number of Applicants Selected in 2004 to Enter the Training Program in 2005**

Queensland	NSW	Victoria	SA	WA	Total
1	1 <sup>1</sup>	4	0	1	7

1 One NSW trainee worked in the training position in Singapore in 2004 and returned to work in a position in NSW in 2005. (The Singapore position is under the auspice of the Victorian training program and is usually occupied by a Victorian trainee). One NSW trainee was awarded a scholarship position in 2004 (Roche scholarship at St John's Institute of Dermatology) and returned to work in NSW in 2005. Two trainees undertook shared training. Funding from the Network Training Project was no longer available for one position at the Skin and Cancer Foundation NSW (Network Training Project).

**Table 10**  
**Number of Applicants Selected in 2005 to Enter the Training Program in 2006**

Queensland	NSW	Victoria	SA	WA	Total
4	8 <sup>1</sup>	7 <sup>2</sup>	3	1	23

1 Eight fourth year trainees exited the program in 2005.

2 The Roche Travelling Scholarship and the Novartis Travelling Fellowship were both awarded to Victorian Trainees to undertake training in overseas positions in 2006. In addition, one trainee had a once off, one year training program accredited at the Churchill Hospital UK.

**Table 11**  
**Number of Applicants Selected in 2006 to Enter the Training Program in 2007**

Queensland	NSW	Victoria	SA	WA	Total
2	6	6 + 1 deferred <sup>1</sup>	0	1	15

1 One applicant in Victoria deferred their training for one year and will commence training in 2008.

#### **2.9.4 ACD Compliance with AMWAC Recommendations for the Number of Training Positions**

The ACD complies with the AMWAC recommendations for the number of training positions.

AMWAC recommended in its report, *Specialist Medical Workforce Planning in Australia*, (released in May 2003), that 52 trainees should be in training by

2002<sup>5</sup>. Table 11 below provides information about the number of full time equivalent trainees in training from 2002 to 2006.

**Table 11**  
**Number of Full Time Equivalent Trainees in Training From 2002 to 2006**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of Full Time Equivalent Trainees</b>
2002	58 (includes one research position accredited for 2002 only)
2003	59
2004	60
2005	60
2006	64 (includes one research position accredited for 2006 only)

### **2.9.5 Implications of an Increase in the Number of Accredited Training Positions For the Quality of the Training Program**

The College believes that the quality of the training program could be maintained if the number of accredited training positions increased.

All new positions proposed are inspected by the BOC to ensure they meet the College accreditation standards. All positions which meet the accreditation standards are accredited.

### **2.9.6 Mechanisms to Respond to the Repeated Oversupply of Applicants**

Each year more applicants apply for training positions than the number of training positions available.

The College manages this by designing a selection policy, and designing and running a selection process, which enables state Selection Committees to select the applicants for training positions who have the best claims against the selection criteria.

### **2.9.7 Primary Responsibility for Selection**

The College has the primary responsibility for selection of dermatology trainees and the process is explained in section 2.9.2.9 of this submission.

Employers are represented in the process:

---

<sup>5</sup> P 86, Australian Medical Workforce Advisory Committee (AMWAC), *Specialist Medical Workforce Planning in Australia: A Guide to the Planning Process Used by the Australian Medical Workforce Advisory Committee*, AMWAC, Sydney, Australia.

- During the CV assessment phase by having Heads of Dermatology Departments as members of CV Assessment Panels;
- During the Interview phase by having members of staff from Dermatology Departments and representatives from jurisdictions or, human resources or medical administration departments of hospitals, as a member of Interview Committees.

### **2.9.8 Employer Responsibility For Selection**

The College is primarily responsible for selection and this is explained in section 2.9.7 of this submission. The College recommends to employing authorities the applicants who have the best claims against the selection criteria for selection into accredited training positions. The successful applicant then applies to the hospital who considers their application.

### **2.9.9 Appeals Process**

Applicants are able to use the College appeals process to appeal selection decisions (Attachment 22).

### **2.9.10 Number of Appeals Heard Within the Last Three Years**

The College Appeals Committee has not yet been required to consider any appeals concerning selection.

One person lodged applications for hearings of two separate appeals in 2004 relating to unsuccessful applications to enter the training program, but withdrew them, after a preliminary meeting, before the Appeals Committee could meet to hear them. This person decided instead to pursue a case against the College in the Federal Court of Australia, which she had lodged separately from her appeal. This matter is still before the Court.

### **2.9.11 Recognition of Prior Training**

The College does not have a policy for recognition of prior training.

To date the College has not given formal recognition of prior training for training undertaken in another postgraduate training program. However, the selection and interview committees will be aware of this prior to training, and in conjunction with assessment of all other desired attributes, make a decision as to the candidate's suitability to undertake training in dermatology.