

ASSESSOR MARKING TEMPLATE

For the assessment of GPs seeking accreditation as GPwER in Musculoskeletal Medicine with the Faculty of Sports and Exercise Medicine

The assessor should complete this template, assessing that the evidence is both comprehensive and directly aligns (and be annotated as such) with the target level descriptors for speciality Capabilities in Practice. For each of the assessment criteria, the candidate should be marked as follows:

- **SATISFACTORY:** comfortably meets the criterion with robust evidence of understanding the requirements and competency in the role
- **BORDERLINE:** meets some of the criteria; however, minor issues raised where further evidence or clarification is required (explanation of what evidence is needed should be given). The timeline for the resubmission of relevant evidence would be no more than three months.
- **UNSATISFACTORY:** does not meet the criteria, with major issues or clinical concerns identified by the assessor requiring new evidence to be gathered (with explanation given of what is needed). The timeline for the resubmission of relevant evidence would be no more than six months.

It is vital that, in the case of any category being marked borderline or unsatisfactory, clear feedback is given identifying the level of evidence required to aid the resubmission. Should the evidence presented at resubmission be inadequate, it should be marked as unsatisfactory.

Name of assessor Click or tap here to enter text.	
Candidate type	New ☐ Re-submission ☐
Candidate number Click or tap here to enter text.	

1. Medical probity – may include evidence from Forms 1 (sections 1, 2, 11 & 12) and 8

Capabilities in practice: 1.1, 1.7, 1.9

Evidence that the candidate shows evidence of honesty, integrity, trustworthiness and fulfilling their professional responsibilities.

This should include evidence of

- An up-to-date annual appraisal (including a copy of the latest appraisal summary and date for revalidation)
- Being in good standing with the GMC (self-declared in Form 1)
- Description of any relevant complaints and clinical incidents, with reflection

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

2. Theoretical training – may include evidence from Forms 1 (sections 2, 3 & 5) and 8

Capabilities in practice: 1.1, 1.2, 1.8, 2.1, 2.6, 2.7, 2.9, 2.12

The candidate must show that they have completed their training, are registered as a GP in the UK, and are on a performers' list. They must show evidence of having accrued adequate training to cover the curriculum as set out in GPWER Framework, Appendix 1. Evidence should include:

- A CCT in general practice
- Have passed the FSEM Diploma in MSK Medicine
- Evidence of MSK education, to include relevant postgraduate qualifications, attendance on courses, lectures, tutorials and self-directed learning with relevant reflection
- Evidence of up-to-date Basic Life Support training
- Evidence of up-to-date Adult Safeguarding Training

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

3. Previous training in musculoskeletal medicine – may include evidence from Form 1 (sections 4 & 5)

Capabilities in practice: 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.10

The candidate should show evidence of clinical work within the last 5 years to gain sufficient experience in musculoskeletal medicine. This could be from a range of relevant settings, including orthopaedics, rheumatology, pain medicine, and sports and exercise medicine. This may include the following:

- Posts within a recognised training scheme or Foundation Year post
- As part of a GP speciality training scheme
- As a hospital practitioner or a speciality doctor within a specialist field
- Working with an experienced GPwER or another relevant specialist, including any integrated training posts (ITP)
- Any prior accreditation as a GPwER/GPWSI in MSK medicine

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

4. Current practice in MSK Medicine – may include evidence from Form 1

Capabilities in practice: 1.1, 1.2, 1.6, 2.12

Evidence of ongoing, regular work in a specialist MSK setting with evidence of reflection and engagement in formative learning. Includes general adult, adolescent and paediatric MSK clinics (and any other clinics). Evidence should include:

- The candidate has indicated a minimum of 2 general adult MSK clinics per week, including direct supervision (e.g. combined clinics) with their clinical supervisor within the last 12 months.
- There is ongoing supervision of clinical cases and access to senior clinical support.
- The candidate has described referral pathways, including any triage processes, and explained how these pathways integrate with secondary/tertiary care, as well as other services.
- The candidate attends secondary care meetings, e.g. educational or multidisciplinary team meetings/case reviews

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

5. Competencies in musculoskeletal practice – General clinical skills - may include evidence from Forms 1 (sections 6 & 7), 3, 4 and 8

Capabilities in practice: 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.10

Evaluation of clinical performance, including consultation skills, multidisciplinary team working, appropriate use and interpretation of diagnostics, identification of red flags, pharmacological and non-pharmacological approaches to pain management and referral for senior opinions where relevant. This is ideally evaluated by a range of assessors, including supervisory consultants and may include submission of Form 3 (DOPs) where appropriate.

This should include the following:

- 1 completed multi-source feedback report (minimum 12 completed) with evidence of having been discussed with their senior clinical supervisor and suitable reflection, and relevant changes to practice.
- 1 completed patient satisfaction questionnaire report (minimum 25 completed) with evidence of having been discussed with their senior clinical supervisor and suitable reflection, and relevant changes to practice.
- Senior clinical supervisor confirms candidate is meeting or exceeding expectations (the capabilities in practice), and no significant concerns are raised.
- Evidence of a range of case-based discussions, direct observed procedural skills, reflection on learning to cover the capabilities listed above, identify what has changed in their practice as a result and identification of future learning needs and how they plan to achieve them.
-

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

6. Competencies in musculoskeletal practice – Soft tissue and joint injection competencies – may include evidence primarily from Form 2

Capabilities in practice: 2.11

The candidate has evidence of relevant postgraduate skills training and has submitted a logbook of joint and soft tissue injections from within the last 5 years in sufficient numbers and variety, including a suitable number of injections under direct observation (Submitted as Form 3 – DOPs) to suggest adequate experience in administering injections safely.

These should include the following:

- Large joint injections: Knee/shoulder
- Medium joint injections: Wrist, elbow, and ankle
- Small joint injections: MCPJ, MTPJ, PIPJ
- Soft tissue injections: e.g. Bursa, tendon sheath, plantar fascia, epicondylitis, carpal tunnel

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

7. Teaching/training – may include evidence from Forms 1 and 3

Capabilities in practice: 1.1, 1.5, 1.7, 2.2

Evidence of participation in teaching of medical students, junior doctors and other AHPs in clinical and non-clinical settings. Evidence may include: teaching observations, attendance at teaching courses, and a qualification in medical education.

This should include positive feedback from delegates/participants in the delivered education.

Grade awarded:	SATISFACTORY ☐	BORDERLINE ☐	UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.			
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):			
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Resubmission Grade:	SATISFACTORY ☐	BORDERLINE ☐	UNSATISFACTORY ☐

7. Audit/Quality improvement project – may include evidence from Forms 1 and 8

Capabilities in practice: 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2

An audit of clinical practice should relate to clinical practice and provide an opportunity to identify how a candidate's clinical performance compares to any local, national, and international standards.

There is no definitive number of cases required, but it should be at least 20.

Standards set and comparison: Every criterion should have a set standard against which results are measured. The standards should be justified against national or locally agreed standards and expressed as a percentage.

Audit results should be discussed with the clinical supervisor, and reflection should be included.

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

8. Management, leadership and service development – may include evidence from Forms 1, 4 & 7.

Capabilities in practice: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 2.2, 2.7

The candidate should show evidence of participation and awareness of management structure and function within the NHS and leadership principles.

This should include evidence/reflections to suggest being actively involved in service development or quality improvement activities this may include reflection and/or audit.

Grade awarded:	SATISFACTORY ☐	BORDERLINE ☐	UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.			
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):			
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Resubmission Grade:	SATISFACTORY ☐	BORDERLINE ☐	UNSATISFACTORY ☐

9. Research, critical appraisal and evidence-based practice – may include evidence from Forms 1, 4 & 7

Capabilities in practice: 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 2.2

Desirable to demonstrate incorporating evidence-based practice in the candidate's practice, keeping up to date with research and the ability to appraise research critically. This may include research, reflections, audit and quality improvement projects.

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

10. Patient satisfaction questionnaire – should include evidence from Forms 1, 5a & 5b

Candidates should submit a minimum of 25 returns with evidence in section 9 of Form 1 of reflection on the scores and comments linking them to their day-to-day work and reflect on what they do well and where things could be improved.

The feedback and reflections should be discussed with the clinical supervisor. It is this analysis and reflection that assessors will mark candidates on, and not the scores and comments.

Grade awarded:	SATISFACTORY ☐	BORDERLINE ☐	UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.			
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):			
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.			
Resubmission Grade:	SATISFACTORY ☐	BORDERLINE ☐	UNSATISFACTORY ☐

11. Multisource feedback (MSF) – evidence from Form 1 (section 10) and 6

Capabilities in practice: 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 2.2, 2.7,

This is intended to gather both quantitative and qualitative feedback from peers. This should be completed by at least 12 colleagues (both clinical and non-clinical) who are working with the candidate regularly or have done so in the recent past. It should then be discussed with their educational supervisor and reflected on within the relevant section in Form 1.

Grade awarded: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Borderline/unsatisfactory: if the initial assessment was borderline/unsatisfactory please describe why, what actions may be required to address this.
Assessors' comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Feedback from resubmitted information (if applicable):
Assessor's comments: Click or tap here to enter text.
Resubmission Grade: SATISFACTORY ☐ BORDERLINE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY ☐

Outcome/assessor's recommendation

Original submission outcome

I recommend this candidate for accreditation as a GP with extended role in MSK Medicine ☐

OR

I do not recommend this candidate for accreditation ☐

(state reasons below and suggested actions)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Resubmission (if required)

I recommend this candidate for accreditation as a GP with extended role ☐

OR

I do not recommend this candidate for accreditation ☐

(state reasons below and suggested actions)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Assessors sign off

This application has been completed by myself and the information which I have provided is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Assessor 1's full name:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Moderator/Co-chair sign off

I agree with the assessors' recommendation ☐

I do not agree to recommend this candidate for accreditation ☐ (state reasons below and suggested actions)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Full name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Feedback on assessment (to be completed by moderator/Co-chair)

GOOD ☐

SATISFACTORY ☐

BORDERLINE ☐

UNSATISFACTORY ☐

Additional comments for assessors:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Additional comments/feedback to candidate:

Click or tap to enter a date.