



Confederation of Postgraduate Medical Education Councils

External Report on the Outcome of the National Audit of Internship Acceptances Pilot Project - Clinical Year 2011

A. Background

Over recent years there has been greater national cooperation regarding intern allocation and recruitment through the setting of shared dates for the process and more discussion regarding common issues with the allocation and recruitment processes.

A national meeting on Intern Allocation was convened by the Confederation of Postgraduate Medical Education Councils (CPMEC) at the November 2009 National Forum. Subsequently a working party was established under the oversight of the CPMEC to further articulate and develop opportunities for the sharing of relevant information related to multiple acceptances¹ of intern offers across jurisdictions.

Professor Geoffrey Thompson, Chair SAIMET, was appointed Chair of the working party with project management provided by SAIMET and by CETI.. Membership of the working party consisted of nominated representatives from each of the jurisdictions who were responsible for intern recruitment policy and/or the allocation process, junior doctors and a medical undergraduate. The Terms of Reference for the working party are attached at Appendix 1 and a list of the representatives is attached at Appendix 2.

The working party met five times, twice face to face and three times by teleconference. At its initial meeting in February the working party discussed the objectives in the Terms of Reference, listed below.

- Jurisdictions sharing summary information on the number of positions, number of acceptances, timing of their offer process etc
- Jurisdictions sharing applicant details including multiple acceptances (national wash up)
- Having a single application point and tracking individual acceptances and intentions.

Whilst a few members felt their jurisdictions could meet all three objectives the majority felt that they could not because of the vast differences between jurisdictional processes and the short time frame. Intern applicant information sessions were being held soon and online applications opened in some jurisdictions in April and there was insufficient time available for consultation on a major change in process.

Consensus was reached that the working party would look at how the second objective, a national wash up (subsequently renamed the National Audit of intern acceptances) process could be implemented which would include the sharing of data, objective one. The third objective would be revisited later in the year.

¹ An acceptance was defined as confirmation in writing from an applicant either by e-mail, letter, returned proforma or on-line notification that they intend to take up a position.

B. Goals of the process

The working party reached agreement that the goals of the National Audit process should be to provide jurisdictions with a greater understanding of:

1. The nature and extent of applicants holding multiple acceptances; through quantifying the extent of the problem across jurisdictions.
2. The resources required for a National Audit process in order to establish the costs and benefits of the process
3. The opportunities and risks that may be involved with any extension of the initial pilot.

and agreed that the benefits of the process should be to:

4. Raise the awareness of applicants to the identified problems associated with holding multiple acceptances for an extended period.
5. Minimise the number of vacant intern positions across jurisdictions at the start of the clinical year
6. Adhere to privacy legislation and keep the use of, and access to, identifiable information to a minimum.
7. Enhance collaboration to support the national priority of providing Australian trained resident graduates with an intern year in light of the expansion of medical graduates.
8. Enable consideration of the benefits and risks of other models or modifications to the process.
9. To provide a clear and transparent process for managing applicants who have accepted multiple positions.

C. Hurdles addressed as part of the process

Through discussions it became apparent that there were a number of issues that needed to be addressed in order to design and implement an acceptable process for auditing acceptances. These issues were addressed by the project team as follows:

1) Buy-In

There are a variety of organisations with responsibility for recruiting to intern positions including hospitals, postgraduate medical councils and health departments.

One of the major issues that the working party faced therefore was reaching consensus on the process to be implemented and how to get buy-in from the relevant stakeholders.

How this was overcome

Jurisdictional representatives were very committed to the goals of the process and worked hard in collaboration with the project team on the design of a process that could fit with the local variants and would be acceptable to stakeholders. Representatives also ensured that there was an extensive communication process with those involved in recruitment and also with potential applicants.

2) Process

The process by which intern positions are filled by jurisdictions is complex. Some jurisdictions allocate, some use merit based recruitment, some use merit ranking and others use a mixture of these. In addition, the way in which jurisdictions communicate with applicants about the process varies and the timing of the opening and closing of applications differs.

Trying to design an audit process that fitted within the timeframes of the various processes was complex.

How this was overcome

Again, jurisdictional representatives were committed to working with the project team to design a mutually acceptable process which met their individual requirements. The process was kept simple in order to avoid any conflict with local processes and agreement was reached to run the audit at the end of August, as outlined in the timetable at Appendix 3. Whilst it was recognised that jurisdictions would be at different stages of their recruitment process it was felt that the majority of positions would have been filled by this time.

3) Communication about the impact of applicants accepting multiple positions

There was a great deal of sensitivity around the issue of applicants receiving multiple offers and accepting multiple positions and it was felt that any attempt to minimise this may be viewed as a restriction of trade. However, on the other hand applicants who had accepted multiple positions were often either providing late notification of their withdrawal or providing no notification at all – i.e. being a no show. This led to vacancies at the start of the clinical year which could not be filled.

How this was overcome

Following consultation, it was agreed that the process should not in any way try to restrict the number of positions that an applicant applied for nor restrict the number of offers that an applicant received. In relation to acceptances, it was agreed that whilst an applicant could accept multiple positions they should be encouraged to make a decision about which of these positions they wished to take up as soon as possible.

Historically, there had been no communication to applicants about the impact that accepting multiple positions had on their colleagues and on the hospitals that were left with vacancies to fill. Jurisdictions agreed to undertake a communication strategy informing applicants about the impact of accepting multiple positions in university presentations, application booklets and on websites. Jurisdictions would also communicate to potential applicants that there would be an audit of acceptances which would be looking at multiple acceptances for the clinical year 2011.

4) Privacy

The only way to identify applicants who had accepted multiple positions was for all jurisdictions to provide a list of applicants who had accepted a position in their state or territory. Concerns were raised about the legal and privacy concerns of sharing intern application data with a third party.

Jurisdictions sought advice from their legal departments on this issue and differing advice in relation to how applicants were notified about the process was received. Advice also differed on how applicant data could be included within the pilot with some jurisdictions requiring applicants to “opt-out” if they didn’t want their data to be shared whilst others required applicants to ‘opt-in’.

The draft process for the audit suggested that applicants identified as having multiple acceptances should be followed up and requested to decide which position they would be taking up in 2011. Advice was also sought on this issue by jurisdictions and in some cases complex advice was received on what privacy concerns would need to be satisfied in order to implement this.

How this was overcome

Agreement was reached that to minimise the handling of personal data jurisdictions would send their data to a central administrator appointed by the working party. The central administrator would work within a strict protocol, when handling the data and would only discuss the data with the relevant jurisdiction. This protocol is attached at Appendix 4.

It was agreed that each of the jurisdictions would need to ensure that communication with applicants about the audit process met their own jurisdictional privacy requirements. Jurisdictions requiring “opt-in” by applicants would ensure that communication about the audit and participation in it allowed for this and those requiring an “opt-out” would do the same.

The complexity of the privacy concerns in following up applicants with multiple acceptances and the operational requirements relating to it were unable to be addressed by all jurisdictions within the necessary timeframe. In order to maximise the benefits of the project, the working party therefore agreed that the pilot should be split into two parts. All jurisdictions would participate in Part 1 which was the sharing of applicant data. The Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Territory and South Australia, would participate in an extended pilot (Part 2) which would support the management and resolution of applicants holding multiple acceptances.

5) Common dataset

Having reached agreement on the ability for jurisdictions to share applicant data, the next hurdle that needed to be addressed was what format the applicant data should take in order to a) identify that the applicant was a duplicate and b) provide further analysis of the data and whether any trends could be identified.

On examination, intern application forms were found to be very different reflecting the difference in process across the jurisdictions and one jurisdiction did not collect dates of birth which made identification difficult. In particular, different jurisdictions use different applicant type definitions and give these applicant types different priority in terms of recruitment to a position.

How this was overcome

It was agreed that a simplified data set would be used which respected privacy concerns but still allowed for the identification of applicants. This would include applicant first name, surname, University at which studying, and residency status (definitions are included at Appendix 5). In addition, it was agreed that applicants would be classified according to the MTRP definitions, with the exception of Temporary Residents (TR) which are combined in the MTRP reports but have been separated into TR local and interstate for the purposes of this pilot.

Jurisdictions would also include within the report the number of applicants who did not consent to their information being sent to the central administrator.

Jurisdictions agreed to appoint a Primary Liaison Officer (PLO) with responsibility for providing the data to the central administrator and for answering any queries or providing further information to help in the identification of duplicates.

6) Confidentiality

It was proposed that the project manager from CETI, Medical Division (IMET) should be the central administrator for the audit. Concern was raised from the working party about the perceived conflict of interest of the proposed central administrator given that CETI, Medical Division (IMET) was responsible for the allocation of applicants to intern positions in NSW. Concern was also raised that applicants may feel undue pressure to accept a position in NSW if the central administrator was based there.

How this was overcome

Members discussed the fact that all working party members had a potential conflict of interest and the issues would be the same if the central administration was provided elsewhere. It was agreed therefore that how this conflict was managed was important. Assurances were given that the central administrator would not be located in the division

within CETI responsible for the allocation process. In addition, a confidentiality statement was signed by the central administrator which was acceptable to the majority of jurisdictions, attached at Appendix 6.

This confidentiality statement alone was insufficient to address the privacy requirements of Queensland Health and so a separate confidentiality agreement was signed by the central administrator and also CETI.

D. National Audit of Intern Acceptances Process

Once all of the hurdles had been addressed the Working Group agreed that the audit process could be implemented for the clinical year 2011 and that it should be known as the National Audit of Internship Acceptances Clinical Year 2011.

It was agreed that it would comprise two parts and would take place at the end of August.

Part 1

All jurisdictions, ACT, NSW, NT, QLD, SA, TAS, VIC and WA would participate in Part 1 of the audit.

Jurisdictions would send the central administrator a list of their intern acceptances in the format of the agreed dataset. This would exclude any applicants who did not consent to their data being shared – but jurisdictions would separately provide the central administrator with the number who had not consented.

The central administrator would then examine all of the acceptances and identify how many applicants had accepted duplicate positions. Following this the central administrator would then send each jurisdiction a summary report containing de-identified information, attached at Appendix 7.

Part 2 – Extended Pilot

ACT, NSW, NT and SA agreed to participate in the extended pilot which involved following up applicants identified as having accepted multiple positions providing they fitted within the protocol at Appendix 4.

Eligible applicants were contacted using the agreed e-mail, attached at Appendix 8, and asked to confirm their intentions by the given date. If they did not respond by the date required they were then followed up by phone.

E. Outcome of the August Audit

All of the information was sent through to the central administrator by the due date in the format requested. Six of the eight jurisdictions were contacted by the central administrator with minor points of clarification about the data which were easily resolved.

Listed below is how far through their priority list jurisdictions were at the time that information was sent to the central administrator i.e. 27 August.

ACT - Priority list only used for ANU CSP graduates then merit based selection occurred for remaining positions. All ANU graduates placed, some Interstate applicants and IMGs appointed.

NSW- NSW was part-way through the Temporary Resident Australian trained (local) group.

NT- NT had recruited the Temporary Resident Australian trained (local) group.

QLD - QLD had got part-way through P5 the Temporary Resident Australian trained (interstate group)

SA - SA had got to the Temporary Resident Australian trained (interstate group)

TAS - TAS had recruited some of the Temporary Resident Australian trained (local) group

VIC - All applicants and priority groups had been considered as part of the match

WA - WA was part-way through the Temporary Resident Australian trained (local) group.

Analysis of the data on duplicate acceptances in Parts 1 and 2 (August Audit)

Part 1

The table attached at Appendix 9 provides a summary of the number of acceptances considered by the audit and the number of duplicate acceptances.

- The total number of acceptances reported by jurisdictions by 27 August was **2697**.
- **384** applicants did not agree to their information being sent to the central administrator, or in the case of Queensland did not respond to the e-mail asking them to “opt-in”.
 - **374** of these applicants were from Queensland and if these were excluded there would have only been **10** applicants who did not agree to participate.
- In total the audit examined **2313** intern acceptances (2697-374).
- Of the **2313** acceptances **83** duplicate acceptances (**41** applicants) were identified.
 - **40** individual applicants accepted **2** positions
 - **1** applicant accepted **3** positions.
- **4%** of the acceptances audited were duplicate acceptances
- At the time of the audit, there were potentially **42** positions which could have been freed up if all of the duplicate acceptances were resolved.

Part 2

Of the **83** duplicate acceptances, **12** (6 applicants) were in jurisdictions who had agreed to participate in Part 2 of the pilot. These applicants were therefore contacted to request that they made a decision as to which position they would be accepting in January 2011.

Of the 6 applicants, 3 responded by the deadline of 10 September. On 13 September the central administrator called the 3 remaining applicants. One answered and gave a verbal decision on which position they were accepting, another e-mailed by the end of the day with their decision. The final applicant did not respond but was followed up by the jurisdictions concerned.

Additional analysis of the data

The table at Appendix 10 shows the number of duplicate acceptances that occurred between each of the jurisdictions.

The highest number of duplicate acceptances occurred between WA and NSW - **6** and SA and VIC - **5**. It is interesting that not every jurisdiction shared duplicate acceptances with every other jurisdiction.

In further examining the **41** applicants who had accepted duplicate positions, **7** applicants were Temporary Residents, **1** was a NZ graduate and **33** were Australian Citizens/Permanent Residents.

Also to note is that 7 of these applicants did not apply for a position where they had trained.

All data was correct at the time provided but may have changed subsequently.

E. Outcome of the November Audit

Given the success of the audit in August members agreed that it would be useful to conduct a further audit in November to see if the number of duplicate acceptances had changed. A subsequent audit following the same format as the one in August was conducted. The results of which were as follows:

Analysis of the data on duplicate acceptances in Parts 1 and 2 (November Audit)

Part 1

The table attached at Appendix 11 provides a summary of the number of acceptances considered by the audit and the number of duplicate acceptances.

- The total number of acceptances reported by jurisdictions by 26 November was **2703**.
- **382** applicants did not agree to their information being sent to the central administrator. **373** of these were from Queensland
- In total the audit examined **2321** intern acceptances.
- **14** Duplicate acceptances were identified.
 - **7** individual applicants accepted **2** positions
- **Less than 1% (0.6%)** of the acceptances audited were duplicate acceptances
- At the time of the audit, there were potentially **7** positions which could have been freed up if all of the duplicate acceptances were resolved.
- **3** applicants identified with duplicate acceptances had also been identified as a duplicate in the first audit. **1** applicant was a new duplicate but the other **2** applicants are still holding acceptances in the jurisdictions identified in the first audit.

Part 2

Of the **14** duplicate acceptances, **4** (**2** applicants) were in jurisdictions who had agreed to participate in Part 2 of the pilot. These applicants were therefore contacted to request that they made a decision as to which position they would be accepting in January 2011

Additional Analysis of the data

The table at Appendix 12 shows the number of duplicate acceptances between each of the jurisdictions.

The highest number of duplicate acceptances occurred between VIC and NSW 3, and SA and NSW, 2. ACT, NT, TAS and WA did not have any duplicate acceptances identified.

In further examining the **7** applicants who had accepted duplicate positions, **3** were Australian Citizens/Permanent Residents and 4 applicants were Temporary Residents, Also to note is that **1** applicant did not apply for a position in the jurisdiction in which they had trained.

All data was correct at the time provided but may have changed subsequently.

F: Conclusions

Following the audits the working party met to discuss the process and the outcomes. Jurisdictions were happy with the way in which the audits had been implemented and felt the process had run smoothly.

The audits had been successful and although it could not be quantified, due to data not having been kept in the past, jurisdictions felt that applicants had been deterred from accepting multiple positions and/or from holding on to acceptances for a long time. This

was felt to be due to enhanced communication about the impact of multiple acceptances and about the fact that acceptances were being monitored.

The audit had also achieved its objective of minimising the number of vacant positions at the commencement of the clinical year.

Jurisdictions were keen to progress the audit further and for all of the jurisdictions to participate fully in the process, i.e. in Part 2. Jurisdictions that had only participated in Part 1 indicated that they would like to enhance their participation for 2012.

G: Next Steps

Due to the success of the audit in identifying duplicate acceptances and helping to reduce the number of vacancies at the commencement of the clinical year the audit will be continued and extended for 2012. The National Working Party for Intern Allocation will therefore be looking at:

- Conducting additional audits in February and June;
- Consolidating the existing audit mechanism for 2012;
- Building on the work undertaken in 2011 and enhancing participation for 2012;
- Whether further harmonisation of State and Territory based intern recruitment processes is possible; and
- Aligning its work with Health Workforce Australia and the Health Workforce Principal Committee.

Terms of Reference for a National Working Party on Intern Allocation (at Feb 2010)

Background

Over recent years there has been greater national cooperation regarding intern allocation and recruitment through the setting of shared dates for the process and more discussion regarding common issues with the allocation and recruitment processes. The National Allocation Meeting on 15 November 2009 (see notes from the meeting for more information) progressed this issue by giving broad agreement to further articulate and develop opportunities for greater sharing of relevant information related to intern allocation. It was also broadly acknowledged that there could be an opportunity for greater harmonisation of the state-based intern allocation processes in the future, with the possible development of a national process. Consideration of a national process would need to include careful analysis of benefits and risks.

Title

National Working Party on Intern Allocation

Purpose

This working party is not a decision making group. Its purpose is to provide advice to the National Health Workforce Principals Committee, the Jurisdictions and the CPMEC, on the information that can be shared to enhance the process of allocation and the workforce planning for each state.

Membership

Nominee from the organisation in each State that is responsible for intern recruitment policy and/or the allocation process (Jurisdiction and / or PMC representative)
Representative from Australian Medical Students' Association
Representative from the National JMO Forum
Other members at the discretion of the Chair.

The Working Party will be chaired by Prof Geoff Thompson and will be advised by a larger reference group which will include all the invitees to the National Allocation Meeting (and others at the discretion of the Chair).

Objectives

- a) To explore the options or components of a nationally consistent model for information sharing on matters relating to intern allocation and recruitment and to facilitate the more timely notification of intern intentions for commencement of internship for 2011. The three options or components for this model could include:
 - Jurisdictions sharing summary information on the number of positions, number of acceptances, timing of their offer process etc
 - Jurisdictions sharing applicant details including multiple acceptances (national wash up)
 - Having a single application point and tracking individual acceptances and intentions.
- b) To provide timely advice to the Health Workforce Principals' Committee and the Jurisdictions on:
 - The benefits, opportunities and risks for jurisdictions of greater information sharing on intern allocation / recruitment for 2011

- A nationally consistent model for information sharing on matters relating to intern allocation and recruitment for 2011.
- c) To provide advice to the Health Workforce Principals' Committee, the State and Territory Jurisdictions and the Commonwealth on a longer term concept for national allocation of interns which takes into account jurisdictional structures and decision making processes and facilitates the more equitable distribution of workforce.

In undertaking these functions the Working Party will take into account:

- Privacy Legislation
- Possible ACCC implications
- Industrial issues
- The current policy and processes of jurisdictions and other stakeholders
- The increasing number and needs of medical graduates.
- The timing of the allocation process for 2011 allocation / recruitment
- Funding implications of any proposed national process

Reporting

The Working Party will provide update reports to the CPMEC and an initial recommendation to the Health Workforce Principals Committee and the Jurisdictions by March 2010.

Members of the National Working Party on Intern Allocation – June 2010

| Name | Jurisdictional Representative | Email |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Prof Geoff Thompson (Chair) | SA | Geoff.Thompson@health.sa.gov.au |
| Sheree Keech | WA | sheree.keech@health.wa.gov.au |
| Dr Linda McPherson / Vanessa Evans | NSW | lmACP@doh.health.nsw.gov.au vevans@imet.health.nsw.gov.au |
| Nick Lord/Tamara Ward | QLD | Tamara_ward@health.qld.gov.au |
| Dr Peter Renshaw | TAS | peter.renshaw@dhhs.tas.gov.au |
| Dr Jo Burnand | ACT | jo.burnand@act.gov.au |
| Sue Stanway | NT | sue.stanway@nt.gov.au |
| Carol Jordon | VIC | cjordon@pmcv.com.au |
| Dr Jennifer Roy | JMO Rep | jennifer.roy@health.sa.gov.au |
| Ross Roberts-Thompson | AMSA | ross.rt@gmail.com |
| Kylie Ward | SA IMET | Kylie.Ward@health.sa.gov.au |
| Dr Andrew Perry | AMA DIT | andrewwalterperry@gmail.com |
| Jag Singh | CPMEC | jsingh@cpmec.org.au |
| Louise Rice / Kirsten Campbell | Project Team | lrice@imet.health.nsw.gov.au kcampbell@imet.health.nsw.gov.au |

Note: Representation was not sought from the HWA when the working party commenced due to the fact that HWA had just been established.

Timetable for the Process

Parts 1 and 2

| 2010 | Description of Activity |
|-----------------------------|--|
| By application opening date | Participating States/Territories ensure that applicants are informed about the National Audit process (e.g. Intern Application Guide, website), that privacy concerns have been addressed and that there is a process to enable applicants to consent to the transfer of the agreed data or to opt out if they wish. |
| By 27 Aug | Notification of at least first round offers and acceptances to applicants to have been completed. |
| 27 Aug | State/Territory contact sends agreed data set to independent central administrator. Applicants who have not consented to the process are excluded from the data set but the number of non-consenters will be recorded and sent to the central administrator. |
| 30/31 Aug | The independent central administrator reviews information received and resolves any queries with the relevant State/Territory contact. |
| 1 Sep | The independent central administrator informs State/Territory contact of the number of applicants who have accepted an offer in that State or Territory who have also accepted an offer in another State/Territory. |

Part 2 only

| | |
|--------|--|
| 2 Sep | The independent central administrator contacts applicants with multiple acceptances informing them that they have been identified as having accepted multiple offers. Applicants are then asked to confirm which of the positions they wish to accept by an agreed date. |
| 10 Sep | Applicants to confirm their intentions to the independent central administrator and relevant primary liaison contacts. |
| 13 Sep | Independent central administrator telephones applicants who have still not responded and asks them to confirm their intentions by the end of the day. |
| 13 Sep | Independent central administrator informs State/Territory contact which applicants have accepted a position in their jurisdiction and applicants who have failed to respond who require follow up by the State/Territory contact. |

Parts 1 and 2

| | |
|--------------|---|
| End of Sept. | Independent central administrator drafts summary report on outcome of the process for discussion and agreement by the Working Party prior to wider release. |
| Nov | Evaluation of the outcome of the Audit is undertaken and presented to the National Working Party on Intern Allocation at the National Forum |

Protocol for contacting applicants with multiple acceptances in jurisdictions participating in the extended pilot for Managing Multiple Acceptances

Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia are participating in Part 1 of the pilot project. Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Territory and South Australia are also participating in an extended pilot which involves contacting applicants with multiple acceptances to resolve which position an applicant wishes to take up in the 2011 Clinical Year.

On receipt of the applicant data from the jurisdictions the independent central administrator will:

1. Tidy the data and resolve any individual issues with the data set with the relevant primary liaison officer
2. Enter all data into one central spreadsheet
3. Sort the data to identify where there are duplicate applicants, recording the relevant information to produce the required reports
4. The data will then be separated into two spreadsheets as follows:
 - a. Applicants in jurisdictions that are only participating in Part 1 of the pilot i.e. Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia ; and
 - b. Applicants in jurisdictions that are participating in the extended pilot i.e. the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Territory and South Australia

Part 1

5. A summary report will be produced which will provide states/jurisdictions with the number of applicants identified as having accepted internship in more than one state. No names or state data will be divulged in this report.
6. All identifying data, documents and back-up will be destroyed once the audit has been completed to the satisfaction of the working party and no later than the commencement of the 2011 clinical year.

Part 2

7. The independent central administrator will commence the process of contacting applicants who fall into the extended project i.e. those in the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Territory and South Australia.

In contacting applicants the following process would be followed for each of the possible applicant scenarios:

| | Multiple acceptances of offers from | Do they receive an email from central admin? |
|--------------|---|---|
| Applicant 1 | NT (or ACT or SA) and VIC (or QLD or TAS or WA) | X No – as VIC (or QLD or TAS or WA) are not participating in the management component, nothing else will be done with the multiple acceptance information and the applicant will not receive an e-mail. |
| Applicant 2 | NSW and NT (or ACT or SA) | √ Yes - because NSW and NT (or ACT or SA) are participating |
| Applicant 3* | NSW and NT (or ACT or SA) VIC (or QLD or TAS or WA) | √ Yes – because NSW and NT (or ACT or SA) are participating, the email would say, that it has come to our attention that you are holding multiple acceptances in NSW and NT (or ACT or SA). |

* In this scenario it is possible that an applicant will confirm that they are accepting the position in NSW but may still also be holding an acceptance in Victoria. Although the central administrator may be aware of this, this information will not be disclosed to any of the parties involved.

8. A summary report will be produced which will provide states/jurisdictions with the number of applicants identified as having accepted internship in more than one state. No names or state data will be divulged in this report. The names of applicants with multiple acceptances will not be disclosed to states/jurisdictions during the Audit process but will be held by the independent central administrator.
9. At the completion of the audit process each state/jurisdiction participating in Part 2 of the audit pilot will be sent a list of applicants and whether or not they have accepted a position in that state/jurisdiction.
10. All identifying data, documents and back-up will be destroyed once the audit has been completed to the satisfaction of the working party and no later than the commencement of the 2011 clinical year.

National Audit of Intern Acceptances for the Clinical Year 2011 Minimum Data Set Parts 1 and 2

(Columns 1-4 for completion by all jurisdictions, Columns 5-6 to be completed by Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Territory and South Australia)

| Surname | First Name | University at which applicant is currently studying or where studied | Residency Status* | E-mail address | Phone or Mobile No |
|---------|------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| Smith | Wendy | Flinders University | Australian trained local (own state) | wsmith@hotmail.com | 0111 222222 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Number of Applicants who have not consented to the transfer of their information | 2 |
|--|---|

*Residency status should be defined as one of the following groups:

1) Australian trained local (own state)

Australian Citizen/Permanent Resident graduates from a University in the state of application for PGY1 (includes FFP and CS graduates). Also includes NZ Citizens and Permanent Residents.

2) Australian trained local (interstate)

Australian Citizen/ Permanent Resident graduates from an Interstate University (includes FFP and CS graduates). Also includes NZ citizens and Permanent Residents.

3) Temporary Resident Australian trained (local)

Temporary Resident graduates from a University in the state of application for PGY1.

4) Temporary Resident Australian trained (interstate)

Temporary Resident graduates from an Interstate University.

5) NZ Medical school graduate

NZ medical school graduates including Australian Citizens/Permanent Residents and NZ Citizens/Permanent Residents.

6) Australian Medical Council graduate

These definitions are those used by the Medical Training Review Panel (MTRP) with the exception of Temporary Residents (TR) which are combined in the MTRP reports but have been separated into TR local and interstate for the purposes of this pilot.

NATIONAL AUDIT OF INTERN ACCEPTANCES FOR CLINICAL YEAR 2011

CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

For completion by the Central Administrator

I, name.....understand that, as the independent central administrator for the National Audit of Intern Acceptances pilot project, I may have access to personal information collected for administrative, statistical and other purposes. Such personal information includes the identity of, and personal information about, individual persons. This information is strictly confidential and is not to be discussed in the workplace or elsewhere.

I undertake to discuss only matters relevant to the function of the National Audit of Intern Acceptances Audit with other authorised staff within the project and that I will only discuss the specifics about any data that is sent with the relevant jurisdiction that it was sent from.

I undertake not to knowingly access any personal information unless such information is essential for me to properly and efficiently perform my duties.

I undertake to ensure that as far as possible, any confidential information, whether in the form of paper documents, computerised data or in any other form, cannot be viewed by unauthorised persons and that the information is stored in a secure and orderly manner which prevents unauthorised access. I also undertake to ensure that any confidential information is disposed of appropriately at the end of the project.

I understand that failure to observe these instructions is viewed very seriously as it breaches the individual's privacy. I understand that this may constitute grounds for dismissal and places the organisations concerned and the employee at risk of legal action and its consequences.

I further undertake to inform the Chair of the Working Party immediately if I become aware of any breach of privacy or security relating to the information which I access in the course of my duties.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| SIGNATURE | |
| DATE | |

Completed forms should be sent to the Chair of the National Allocation Working Group at SAIMET, PO Box 287 Rundle Mall, ADELAIDE SA 5000

Summary report outlining the number of multiple acceptances by individual Jurisdiction

State/Territory

| | Total No. of Acceptances | Total No. of Duplicate Acceptances | No. of applicants with Acceptances from 2 States | No. of applicants with Acceptances from 3 States | No. of applicants with Acceptances from more than 3 States |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Australian trained local (own state) | | | | | |
| Australian trained local (interstate) | | | | | |
| Temporary Resident Australian trained (local) | | | | | |
| Temporary Resident Australian trained (interstate) | | | | | |
| NZ Medical school graduate | | | | | |
| Australian Medical Council graduates | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | |

E-mail to be sent to applicants who have multiple acceptances

2 September 2010

Dear XXXX

We are writing to you to ask you to clarify your choice of internship position for 2011. Our records show that you have accepted an internship position in the following States or Territories (Australian Capital Territory/New South Wales/Northern Territory/South Australia). We would encourage you to decide as soon as possible which position you wish to take up and to advise us by e-mail by no later than **10 September 2010**. Please also advise the primary liaison officers in the relevant States and/or Territories of your intentions (insert contact details here of the primary liaison officers).

Holding on to multiple positions for extended periods of time may impact on the ability of your colleagues to secure a position in the jurisdiction of their choice. If you require further information about the details of positions you may have accepted to aid your decision making please contact the relevant State/Territory contact.

You have received this email as, for the first time this year, a National Audit of Intern Acceptances for the Clinical Year 2011 is taking place. The aim of this Audit is to ensure that applicants have the most equitable and timely opportunity to obtain a PGY1 position in Australia and to minimise the number of vacancies at the start of the Clinical year. All States and Territories are participating in the project.

Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia are not participating in the notification component of the project and it is therefore possible that you may have accepted a position in these States or Territories which is not documented in this email. If this is the case we would still ask that you decide as soon as possible which position you will be taking up and to notify those States and Territories, where you have decided not to take up a position, accordingly.

If you have any queries in relation to this e-mail please contact the Central Administrator on 02 9844 6535 or 02 9844 6536.

Yours sincerely,

Central Administrator

Summary Table showing the outcome of the August National Audit by Jurisdiction

| | Acceptances considered in the Audit | Applicants who did not agree to information being sent* | Total Acceptances | Total Duplicate Acceptances | % of Duplicate Applicants against acceptances considered | Applicants with 2 acceptances | Applicants with 3 acceptances | Applicants with more than 3 acceptances |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| ACT | 69 | 1 | 70 | 7 | 10% | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| NSW | 756 | 0 | 756 | 18 | 2% | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| NT | 35 | 0 | 35 | 2 | 6% | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| QLD | 268 | 374 | 642 | 5 | 2% | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| SA | 245 | 2 | 247 | 15 | 6% | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| TAS | 66 | 0 | 66 | 5 | 8% | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| VIC | 609 | 7 | 616 | 17 | 3% | 16 | 1 | 0 |
| WA | 265 | 0 | 265 | 14 | 5% | 13 | 1 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 2313 | 384 | 2697 | 83 | 4% | 80 | 3 | 0 |

All data was correct at the time provided but may have changed subsequently.

Table showing which Jurisdictions shared duplicate acceptances in August

| | ACT | NSW | NT | QLD | SA | TAS | VIC | WA |
|-----|-----|----------|----|-----|----------|-----|----------|----------|
| ACT | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| NSW | 2 | | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| NT | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| QLD | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| SA | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| TAS | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 0 | 0 |
| VIC | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | | 4 |
| WA | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | |

Note: One applicant applied to NT, VIC and WA. Therefore the number of duplicate acceptances appears to be one more in these jurisdictions.

All data was correct at the time provided but may have changed subsequently.

Summary Table showing the results of the November National Audit by Jurisdiction

| | Acceptances considered in the Audit | Applicants who did not agree to information being sent* | Total Acceptances | Total Duplicate Acceptances | % of Duplicate Applicants against acceptances considered | Applicants with 2 acceptances | Applicants with 3 acceptances | Applicants with more than 3 acceptances |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| ACT | 70 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NSW | 767 | 0 | 767 | 6 | 0.8 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| NT | 35 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| QLD | 265 | 373 | 638 | 2 | 0.8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| SA | 245 | 2 | 247 | 3 | 1.2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| TAS | 66 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| VIC | 609 | 7 | 616 | 3 | 0.5 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| WA | 264 | 0 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 2321 | 382 | 2703 | 14 | 0.6 | 14 | 0 | 0 |

All data was correct at the time provided but may have changed subsequently.

Table showing which Jurisdictions shared duplicate acceptances in November

| | ACT | NSW | NT | QLD | SA | TAS | VIC | WA |
|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|
| ACT | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NSW | 0 | | 0 | 1* | 2** | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| NT | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| QLD | 0 | 1* | 0 | | 1* | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SA | 0 | 2** | 0 | 1* | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TAS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| VIC | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| WA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

* Identifies the two applicants that were identified in the previous audit as duplicate applicants.

** One of these applicants was identified in the previous audit as a duplicate applicant between NT and SA but is now a duplicate between NSW and SA.

All data was correct at the time provided but may have changed subsequently.