When I was a second-year resident, one of my co-residents was asked to leave the program. His disappearance angered many of my classmates, and left others of us fearful we might meet the same fate. Recently, as a staff member, I was on the other side of a similar decision. While as a department of clinicians we feel confident we did the right thing, as human beings many of us are still wrestling with feelings of sadness, guilt, and doubt. Did we offer him enough opportunities to improve? Did we give him enough time and attention to learn the knowledge and master the skills? Did we do everything we could have done?

Last June the Journal of Graduate Medical Education published an article on “The Hidden Costs of Failing to Fail Residents.” In it, the authors call attention to residency programs’ widespread unwillingness to fail incompetent or unprofessional residents. They call it “a problem endemic in medical education.” Instead of being asked to leave, these residents are allowed to continue in their programs, and graduate, and are then set free to risk endangering the lives of their patients and the morale of their coworkers.
The authors outline the costs of this failure to fail. They highlight the obvious risks to patient care that occur with incompetence and unprofessionalism, but they also mention the increased workload that co-residents and staff must take in order to cover or make up for the underperforming resident. This increased workload not only leads to the other residents in the program receiving less attention by staff, but also to decreases in overall job satisfaction and workplace morale.

So how should residency programs treat their underperforming residents? How many chances do we give them before we have given them too many?

Vanderbilt University School of Medicine published its approach to this dilemma in Academic Medicine in 2007. In agreement with the article mentioned above, the Vanderbilt authors stress the need for a hospital-wide commitment to recognize and address this kind of behavior since it is associated with “poor adherence to practice guidelines, loss of patients, low staff morale and turnover, medical errors and adverse outcomes, and malpractice suits.”

They outline a three-step process of intervention. One begins with an informal “cup of coffee conversation” where this behavior is first addressed with the underperforming individual. If no improvement is seen, an “awareness intervention” occurs in which a peer or an authority figure shares with the individual what now appears to be a pattern of behavior. Next, if the individual persists in this behavior, disciplinary action with restriction or termination of clinical duties follows.

We are a society that would much rather convey good news than bad, laugh than cry, hire than fire. The decision to terminate a resident from a training program is not made lightly. But occasionally, for the safety of patients and the welfare of the program, it does need to be made. Perhaps Vanderbilt’s thorough and thoughtful approach to managing an underperforming resident is a good place to start ensuring we are doing it right.

Dr. Forner is Medical Director for the Department of Anesthesiology at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio, and a frequent contributor to Anesthesiology News. She blogs at DocBehindTheDrapes.com.
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