**Revalidation checklist**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Revalidation Recommendations** | | |
| Doctor |  | |
| GMC No. |  | |
| Designated body |  | |
| Appraisers |  | |
| Last appraisal date |  | |
| Revalidation due date |  | |
| **Evidence provided once – Information provided by Doctor** | | |
| Advice of names of previous designated bodies in past 5 years or since April 2012 (whichever is least)  DB1 Name:  DB2 Name:  DB3 Name: | | ✓🗶 n/a  ✓🗶 n/a  ✓🗶 n/a |
| Notes: | | |
| **Appraiser – Information collated by revalidation teams** | | |
| Appraisers have been trained | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| No conflict of interest with appraisers | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| Appropriate appraisals conducted (with the five statements completed) reviewing reflective notes and producing summary notes | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| **Annual Appraisal** **– review for each appraisal in the 5 year cycle** **noting any gaps and reasons for them** | | |
| Discussion of last year’s PDP    Notes : | | ✓🗶 |
| Supporting information and CPD matches doctor’s range of practice  Notes: | | ✓🗶 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Review of quality improvement activity (e.g. audit)  Notes: | | ✓🗶 |
| Review of significant events[[1]](#footnote-1) (involving either the individual or their teams)  Notes: | | ✓🗶 |
| Multi source feedback from colleagues reflected on and discussed with appraiser, within last 5 years  Notes: | | ✓🗶 |
| Patient feedback reflected on and discussed with appraiser, within last 5 years  Notes: | | ✓🗶 |
| Review of complaints and compliments  Notes: | | ✓🗶 |
| Completion of their own organisation’s mandatory training  Notes: | | ✓🗶 |
| Health declaration (in GMC format) | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| Probity declaration (in GMC format) | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| Statements/evidence from all other employing organisations confirming that a satisfactory performance review has taken place and any items agreed as development needs | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| New PDP generated | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| **Triangulation to confirm no outstanding concerns – By regional office** | | |
| Confirm no conflict of interest between RO and the doctor | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| Internal HR/Clinical Governance checks satisfactory (of employing organisation confirming: governance, any practicing restrictions and any concerns) | | ✓🗶 n/a |
| Notes: | | |
| Medical director / line manager letter from other places of work satisfactory (confirming: governance, any practicing restrictions and any concerns) | | ✓🗶 n/a |
| Notes: | | |
| GMC conditions or undertakings (on GMC Connect) | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| Details of any personal fitness to practise concerns | | ✓🗶 |
| Notes: | | |
| Any other comments : | | |
| **Review Outcome** | | |
| Recommendation to the GMC to revalidate | | ✓🗶 |
| Deferral Period: | | |
| * The doctor is subject to an on-going process | | ✓🗶 n/a |
| * Insufficient evidence for a positive recommendation   Outstanding issues: | | ✓🗶 n/a |
| * A concern has arisen/responding to concern (RtC), this is being managed in accordance with RtC policy   Notes: | | ✓🗶 n/a |
| Non-engagement | | ✓🗶 n/a |
| Date outcome recorded on GMC Connect | |  |
| **Reviewers** | | |
| Reviewer 1 |  | |
| Reviewer 2 | If applicable | |
| Reviewer 3 | If applicable | |

*“Equality and diversity are at the heart of NHS England’s values. Throughout the development of the policies and processes cited in this document, we have given due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity, and to foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic (as cited in under the Equality Act 2010) and those who do not share it*.”

1. Discuss high level risks if there are no significant events [↑](#footnote-ref-1)