

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RE DISTRIBUTION OF REGISTRARS IN BRISTOL AREA:

(arising from discussion at Bristol Trainers AGM 27.1.05)

Should system should remain as it is now ie determined by 'market forces' (GPRs having freedom to choose where they go):

YES: 8 **Abstain: 1**

NO: 21

"I think both GPR AND Trainer should have both freedom and choice and the system should be flexible. Should a managed system be instigated, the freedom and choice is diluted but is undoubtedly fairer to the "less attractive" (for whatever reason) Training practice. I think the answer you get here will very much depend on whether the Trainer has had any forced fallow years as apposed to voluntary fallow years".
"No - I have never had a registrar! I was an approved trainer for three years and GPRs were scarce so I went into PRHO teaching - I don't feel I want to now have GPRs and am happy with F1"

Change to managed system whereby all trainers have registrars in turn:

YES: 21

NO:8 **Abstain: 1**

"My main objection to a managed system would be being potentially allocated a GPR that I would normally not have chosen just because it was my turn to Train"

If a majority vote favoured a managed system of distribution, do you feel that:
New trainers should be prioritised to receive a GPR :

YES: 25

NO: 5

"Yes, but only within the first 2 years (not first year) of approval"

If yes, should they have GPR 2 yrs running to consolidate their skills:

YES: 14

NO: 11

"no firm feelings either way"

"This suggestion flies in the face of the fair distribution that's being debated"

Certain geographical areas should be favoured (eg Weston where there is a shortage of GPs & increasing GPRs there may help to recruit & retain GPs):

YES: 19 **unsure: 1**

NO: 10

"will get GPR anyway in the new system"

"Normally I would say the system has to be standardised across the board or there could be a mutiny if some areas/practices are favoured but WSM tends to be an exception to every rule!"

More challenging GPRs should go to more experienced trainers:

YES: 26

NO: 4

"definitely+++"

"My instinct says Yes, but is there any evidence that less experienced Trainers struggle. Mat Houghton is not experienced. You could ask him what his experience has been"

"Yes but how do you become an experienced trainer when you are having regular fallow years? Part of being an experienced trainer would be I would think being able to manage the routine without effort in order to focus on the problems the registrar has."

Fallow trainers should be prioritised in rotation:

(this would probably mean a registrar 2 years out of 3, or alternate years at worst)

YES: 26

NO: 4

"but fallow training practices"

"No, I think we're all assuming here that fallow Training practices are geographically unlucky. Other factors could be relevant that may need to be addressed."

If so, should all trainers pool their training grants in Bristol, knowing they would get their fair share of GPRs in turn & enjoy the fallow year when it arises (suggested by one trainer):

YES: 7

NO: 20

"don't mind"; "if it's legal"; "perhaps ½ pooled & ½ to practice, has to be some incentive"; "sounds interesting but not sure I really understood it"; "too difficult should someone resign before they did their year"

"No, because some Training practices distribute their Training grant as apposed to putting it in the income pot"

Should F1/2 docs (when funded!) slot into fallow practices:

YES: 24

NO: 4

*"not sure"; "not sure what is required – trainers should have choice & not be obliged to accept"; "only if requested by practice"; "those that want to"; "with practice agreement"; "but not compulsory & not lose share of GPRs"
"Yes, with the Practices' agreement"*

"No - The F1 is funded already. There do not seem to be any plans to extend the F1s as far as UBHT are concerned. When funded F2s will be appointed in the January BEFORE they qualify – the practices would have to be able to confirm this at that time – probably even before this in the autumn before the appointments are made as the rotations will need to be advertised then to the final year students. The alternative is to have practices that accept that they are doing F1/2s and don't have registrars so often. Personally I am happy to stick with the F1s we have and would be sad to stop doing it."

Registrars should be distributed per training place (may be more than one in a practice):

YES: 19

"No, especially if the purpose of this exercise is fair distribution; per training practice – yes"

or per training practice:

YES: 10

"difficult"

What about registrar choice...is it OK that we restrict it to a priority list of practices who we, as the trainers group, feel should be available to them:

YES: 21

NO: 8

"No - other Registrars e.g. SPRs have a choice in where they apply and work. Also, it wouldn't be fair to give Trainer choice and freedom but not GPRs"

"Yes - the registrars could always vote with their feet!"

Other replies sent as e-mail messages:

"Hi Mary, here are my views,

1. Regs should have free choice of where they go...after a lot of thought I don't think it's fair that Adult Registrars who are in their 9th or later year of training and may have families and mortgages and other

responsibilities, should be forced away from their chosen practices to suit us trainers better!..sorry that sounds a bit forthright but thats what I now believe!.Thanks Mary..very best wishes”

“I know I haven't completed a questionnaire.

My view is that training should be in a 3 yr cycle with one year of that fallow.

All practices with a space should get a registrar BEFORE considering larger practices that may have 2 or more spaces for registrars.

If I need to answer formally, please e mail me another questionnaire”

Mary

If there are fewer GPRs than Trainers why don't you ask Trainers if any of them would like to take a *voluntary* fallow year? In addition to this, I think it would be much more sensible if each Trainer who had trained e.g.5 consecutive GPRs, took a compulsory fallow year. These 2 groups of Trainers opting out for a year may mean that ALL Trainers who *want* a GPR could be accommodated. There are many of us Trainers who have been Training for years without a break but who e.g. would really enjoy a year supporting another Trainer who had a struggling/failing GPR. This would be a change/ challenge for them which could only help to keep their Training flame burning AS WELL AS make them feel that they still have control over what they do (as apposed to dictum from above)