

The Tavistock and Portman

NHS Foundation Trust

The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust & The University of East London

Review & Enhancement Process

Overview Report for 2011-12 & Action Plan for Implementation in 2012-13

1. The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust: The Organisational Context of the Trust's Quality and Enhancement Activity

- 1.1 The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust is committed to improving mental health and emotional wellbeing and to providing high quality mental health services to all who need them. The Trust's contribution is distinctive in the importance attached to social experience at all stages of people's lives, and in our focus on psychological and developmental approaches to the promotion of health and the prevention and treatment of mental ill health. We believe this contribution to be closely aligned with current and developing policy in mental health and social care, containing as it does a strong focus on primary prevention, early years, psychological therapies and the social and interpersonal determinants of mental health.
- 1.2 The Trust is committed to core professional training and the continuing personal and professional development of a resilient, reflective national workforce who are able to contribute effective clinical services, sound leadership, relevant and scholarly research and consultancy. The Trust believes that its transformational and value based training programmes are particularly well designed to equip people to meet the increasingly complex challenges in the current health and social care landscape. The training and education offered is largely M Level, multi-disciplinary, professional development programmes which is complemented by six Professional doctorate programmes. Its training is based on the experience and understanding of current clinical practitioners; all the Trust's teaching staff are also practising clinicians. The Trust provides clinical services from its two directorates, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and Specialist, Adolescent and Adult Mental Health Services (SAMHS). It also includes the Tavistock Consultancy Service, a separate unit and a modest research directorate. The clinician – teacher model ensures that all teaching staff are actively engaged in the practice issues, debates and complexities which they are teaching. This lively engagement with practice and academic activity ensures staff do not lose sight of the integrated teaching task and are aligned with real world practice. The staff also make regular scholarly contributions through books and peer reviewed journals to develop the knowledge base in their subject area, some being leaders in their field. Tavistock and Portman staff also contribute significantly to the mental health discourse through conferences, policy debates, and membership of national bodies, working parties and staff representation at senior levels in professional organisations.
- 1.3 Whilst our commitment and distinctiveness remains constant the Trust has some experienced some significant change during the year since the last report. The Trust appointed a new Dean, Malcolm Allen, who took up his appointment in January and he has played a significant role in leading the Trust through a period of restructuring and staff changes in response to the NHS productivity requirements. Whilst the Trust has lost some longstanding members of staff there is a commitment to reinvestment and this represents an opportunity for recruiting new staff and in terms of succession planning a new generation of ideas. The Dean is leading on the development of a teaching and learning strategy aligned to the Trust's vision and ambitions for the future (due for approval at the Trust's Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee on 10th December

Appendix 6

2012) as well as a review of the Trust's portfolio of courses which currently consists of 21 UEL courses at M level, 6 at D Level and one joint M level programme, a review which will include planning for modularisation, restructuring of the timetable and extending our international reach.

- 1.4 A further change has been the reorganisation of the management of our training courses. The reorganisation introduced Training Clusters each of which is led by a Training Cluster Lead (TCL). This has replaced the large number of Organising Tutors with eleven Training Cluster Leads each of whom is responsible for a portfolio of courses. The TCL is authorised to manage the group strategically, ensuring that there is a clear sense of what each individual course and the overall portfolio is seeking to achieve in terms of training provision. The TCL is responsible for the day to day management of the cluster to ensure the courses are run efficiently providing a high quality student experience. The cluster team consists of staff that represent the individual courses within the portfolio and are the identifiable course tutor. The development of portfolio teams has created smaller, less unwieldy staff teams and makes the dissemination of information and coordination of activity a little easier. In parallel there has been a reorganisation of course administration which has aligned course administration with the course portfolios.
- 1.5 In recognition of the range of activity undertaken in relation to Quality Assurance the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Unit and Committee have been re-designated The Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Unit and Committee. The committee has redrafted its terms of reference to reflect this change.
- 1.6 During this period the Trust has engaged in three external inspections of our academic provision: in January the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education undertook a Review for Educational Oversight; in February UEL undertook a Periodic Academic Review and in October Essex University undertook an Institutional Review of the Tavistock Partnership. It has therefore been an extremely busy year in planning and preparing for these inspection processes and staff engagement was excellent. We were pleased with the outcomes of these external measures of our standards: the QAA identified 5 areas of good practice and 6 desired recommendations, UEL made 4 commendations, set 3 conditions and 3 recommendations and Essex University made 3 commendations and 5 recommendations and set no conditions. This external and benchmarked endorsement of our teaching activity and standards has given the Trust renewed confidence in the quality of our provision.
- 1.7 We continue to work closely with NHS London, the Strategic Health Authority for London (SHA) the local and national commissioner and regulator for our *national training contract* (which includes London health education and training). There are two separate contracts for specialist medical and child psychotherapy training. There is a further significant commission from the Teaching Agency for the provision of Educational Psychology training and this year the Trust as part of a consortium of providers for London, East and Southern England successfully rebid for a further 5 years of funding.
- 1.8 NHS London has become increasingly rigorous in its requirements that we use contract (key) performance indicators (CPI) to demonstrate the relevance of its training to the development of a world-class NHS workforce, delivering value for money and quality-assured training. The CPIs give high priority to completion and attrition rates, student and external examiner feedback and senior NHS professional commentary on student selection and the relevance of the curricula. This process contributes to ensuring that the Trust's education and training is linked with national priorities, policies, employer need and involves service users. **In parallel we are preparing for the changes in the commissioning and monitoring of educational provision in the NHS. 2014 will see the introduction of Education and Training Boards and in London there will be three LETBs and these structures are in the process of development. The Trust's Chief Executive and the Dean are working closely with these emerging organisations....**

Appendix 6

1.9 The Trust is in partnership with the North Central London Research Consortium (NoCLoR), to manage research governance. NoCLoR is a partnership between Camden, Islington, Barnet, Enfield, and Haringey PCTs Camden & Islington Foundation Trust, the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, North East London Foundation Trust, and Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Mental Health Trust. This partnership provides externality and expertise in relation to the NHS research governance process and a further mechanism for assuring, and benchmarking, the quality of our health-related research activity. With partners, we established during 2010/11 the mental health stream of UCL Partners (UCLP) Academic Health Science Centre (AHSC) and remain very actively involved in its work and in the research and development that flows from it. We view research and innovation as key to the quality of our work and to our continued development. We are also a part of the Health Innovation and Education Cluster (HIEC) for North East London.

2. Review Process

2.1 The Trust has a long-established devolved responsibility for managing its quality assurance process and reporting its Review and Enhancement Process. This process has proved effective for a number of years. We have continued to refine the model each year based on a feedback loop within the Trust itself, and from the Collaborations Monitoring Sub-Committee.

2.2 As in previous reports what follows is an outline of the review and enhancement process (REP) of all the Trust's UEL validated postgraduate programmes in the academic year, 2011-12. A list of all current programmes is attached to this report. The Trust's own REP includes programmes validated by the University of Essex and Middlesex University as well as those courses accredited by the Trust itself. Cluster Lead and Course Lead participation in the REP cluster meetings for peer review continues to be a lively and well-attended event within the REP process (please note the REP clusters are not coterminous with the cluster groups discussed above which allows for greater cross fertilisation of ideas and experiences) . This year Associate Centre representation dipped and appears to represent the pressures on NHS staff to be released for their workplace given that the distance involved can mean a whole day away from the agency. We will be looking at the possibility of Skype participation next year. The 'cluster 'stage of the process encourages dialogue about different experiences. It also offers some externality within the Trust, given regional and partner university differences. It is frequently an opportunity for staff to take away new ideas and best practice for enhancing the quality of their course provision. Only two **Trust-validated courses were not represented at the cluster meetings although review and enhancement reports had been submitted, as required.**

2.3 *This report sets out the following:*

- Explanation of the preparation for the REP Overview Report methodology in the Trust
- Update of progress made on the action plans developed in the 2010-2011 report.
- Summary of major issues arising in relation to the Trust's programmes, including issues requiring institutional attention.
- Comment on major issues relating to collaborative provision.
- Student progression and achievement.
- Issues arising from student feedback exercise.
- Summary of issues from the External Examiners' reports.
- Comment on any special issues referred by Quality and Standards Committee.
- Examples of good practice.

Appendix 6

- Addressing the aims of the review and enhancement process as outlined in the University of East London's Quality Manual.

3 Preparation for the REP Overview Report Methodology

3.1 The Trust has carried out the REP and written this report with reference to UEL QAE Guidance. We continue to use the Trust REP pro-forma to gather and audit information on additional specific themes for the academic year in question. In this way there is an opportunity to discuss and address the issues and we can monitor actions and progress on specific enhancement or quality issues.

3.2 Specific themes this year have been:

3.2.1 **M level:**

- The use of Moodle and plans for the development of its use.
- The experience of Peer Review of teaching and the identification of any arising benefits

3.2.2 **D level:**

- The use of Moodle and plans for the development of its use.
- Identification of mechanisms to enhance professional doctorate completion rates.

(see section 10.2 for a concise narrative of comments provided in the Course REPs and Cluster meetings on the enhancement themes)

3.3 REP Methodology

3.4 There are three stages. Stage 1 ensures the submission of fully completed documentary evidence per individual course, Stage 2 aims to provide a qualitative and learning dimension to the process for organising tutors. Stage 3 aims to ensure compliance and identification of issues arising and includes the presentation of the overview report to the Trust's Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee.

3.5 Stage 1

3.5.1 At the individual course level, course organising tutors complete a REP pro-forma in which they identify and comment on progress on last year's action points, identify action points for this year and provide a commentary on: student characteristics; data on student progression and achievement; the external examiner report and the course team response and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data from student feedback.

3.5.2 Each REP is read by the Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance to identify examples of good practice, good reports and any courses that have failed sufficiently to meet the requirements. The outcomes of this review process are discussed with the Chair of the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and follow up action is agreed at this meeting. (See Individual Course Quality Review Tracker Document in our submitted documentation).

3.6 Stage 2

3.6.1 Cluster meetings are part of peer evaluation, sharing best practice and working together to discuss the year's specific REP topics.

3.6.2 "Cluster" meetings are held in October/November, facilitated by two designated members of the Trust's Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee. Cluster meetings, in an NHS Foundation Trust Education Provider bring together, in groups, a number of the broad portfolio of, specialised postgraduate professional trainings in mental

Appendix 6

health. The meetings provide the opportunity for disseminating good practice and support opportunities for collective reflection on common issues.

3.6.3 The agenda for the meetings agreed at the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee ensures that all areas of the review and enhancement process are discussed. The Agenda always includes:

- Compliance.
- Progress /issues arising from Trust quality improvement agenda.
- Good practice.
- Common issues and themes arising across courses.

3.6.4 Detailed minutes are taken by the Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance (see Appendix 4) and circulated to course tutors for comment. Course team representation from all programmes is invited. When staff have clinical or other commitments which prevent attendance they are asked to send written comments and the minute of REP Cluster meetings provides assurance that discussions are disseminated fully across all courses in the Trust.

3.6.5 Specific issues are fed back into individual courses, providing a feedback loop', integrating the written/cluster meeting levels of evidence into future course development.

3.7 Stage 3

3.7.1 The REP documentation and the final overview report for the year's REP are submitted to the Trust's Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee to assess for (a) compliance and (b) issues arising and (c) comparison of issues arising across courses. This report was received and considered by the Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee on 11th December 2012.

3.8 Update of progress made on the action plans identified in the 2010 – 2011 report:

Issue	Action Point	Responsibility for implementation	Outcome
National (non Trust Centres)	To embed two partner protocol informing the relationship between the Trust and national centres and continue to strengthen tripartite processes.	Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance	The protocol is active and there will be an opportunity to test out its application in a forthcoming development in Manchester. There is a plan to provide a seminar for the Trust and Associate Centres to consolidate the understanding of the respective responsibilities of the tripartite partners; this has not yet happened and will now take place during the current academic year.
Postgraduate Research Degrees	To develop a pool of teaching staff with expertise in quantitative research methods.	Chair of Post Graduate Research Degrees Sub Committee	The Chair of the Tavistock School Research Degrees Sub-committee in liaison with Professional Doctorate Programme Leaders has identified a pool of staff in the Trust with expertise in quantitative research methodologies. This pool can be

Appendix 6

			accessed for the purposes of consultation on specific projects, advisory roles on supervisor teams, and teaching input.
Postgraduate Research Degrees	A cross doctoral initiative to establish a resource allocation for supervision of professional doctorates.	Chair of Post Graduate Research Degrees Sub Committee	The Chair of the Tavistock School Research Degrees Sub-committee has initiated discussions with the Dean, the two Associate Deans and Programme Leaders of the Professional Doctorates to develop a standard resource allocation model for Doctoral Supervision including the Director of Studies role.
Postgraduate Research Degrees	Review Postgraduate Research Degree Student Feedback documentation	Chair of Post Graduate Research Degrees Sub Committee	The Tavistock School Research Degrees Sub-committee will be reviewing the outcomes this year's PGR Survey with a view to refining and improving the questionnaire for next year. Considerable improvements were made to the format of the survey as a result of feedback on last year's document.
Promptness of Student Feedback	To review the requirement for feedback on assessed work to be available within a 4 week period.	Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance	The Training Executive is engaging Cluster Leads to implement this requirement. However the Trust is about to engage in a process to explore the restructuring of the timetable to provide more opportunity for non-teaching development, planning and assessment time. A meeting is planned with the UEL Director of Academic Practice and Student Experience and Quality Assurance Unit to take forward this process. See Action Plan 2012-13
Peer Review	To review the implementation of Peer Review and consider any emerging issues	Chair of Quality Assurance and Enhancement.	The process of peer review has been evaluated by the peer reviewers and, via the REP process, with Cluster Leads and Course Leads. The model and process has been positively received and will take place on an annual basis. The outcomes of the peer review process and feedback from External Examiners will inform the annual training event for teaching staff. Completed

Appendix 6

Staff Appointments	To review compliance with new procedure for approval of new teaching appointments on courses	Chair of Quality Assurance and Enhancement.	Completed
Student and Public Information	Revision of teaching staff handbook and revision and redesign of Trust website	Head of Communications in Association with Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance and DET project group	The task of creating a new teaching staff handbook is in progress and it is hoped it will be available in February 2013. Over the last year the Trust's Communications Unit and the Directorate of education and Training have worked to redesign the training pages of the Trust website.

4 Summary of major issues arising in relation to the Trust's programmes, including issues requiring institutional attention.

4.1 As identified in section 3 a number of strategic institutional issues continue to be addressed within the Trust. In addition please note the following:

- To review the UEL Assessment and Feedback Policy and to work with the Director of Academic Practice and Student Experience to map the requirements to the Tavistock Assessment Policy and develop a response that integrates the changes with the uniqueness of the Tavistock model.
- To implement the Trust's Learning and Teaching Policy, as identified above.
- To work with UEL in incorporating the new QAA Quality Code into all aspects of our teaching activity, particularly Part C, the management of public information, see Action Plan 2012-13.

5 Comment on major issues relating to collaborative provision

The following UEL *Periodic Collaborative Reviews* have taken place in 2011-12:

- Trust Associate Centres in Italy – Associazione Italiana Di Psicoterapia Psicoanalitica Infantile Milan-Genoa (AIPPI) May 2012; Centro Studi Martha Harris Florence-Bologna (CSMH), May 2012
- Collaborative Review of Scottish Institute of Human Relations (SIHR), March 2012

Conditions

There were no conditions set for the re-approval of either the AIPPI or CSMH centres in Italy. The Collaborative Review Panel set three conditions to re-approval of the SIHR delivery-

- The panel requested that the team draft a set of 'suitability procedures' and publish these to students by 9 July 2012.

Appendix 6

- The panel determined that the team should formalise and clarify the process of readiness for 'clinical qualification' and this should be made clear by expanding appendix 4a in the student handbook by 1 May 2012 (paragraphs 4.3 and 10.1);
- The team should clarify its systems for closing the feedback loop in terms of action taken in response to feedback from students by 1 May 2012 (paragraph 12.1).

Recommendations

Milan-Genoa delivery, the Review Panel made four recommendations

- Continue to consider ways of strengthening support mechanisms for students when finding a baby to observe
- Consider ways to move the e-learning agenda forward
- Continue to explore ways to support students pre-entry particularly in regard to psychoanalytic theory
- Review arrangements for the provision of reading lists in the handbook and in particular as part of the unit specifications

Florence-Bologna delivery, the Review Panel made four recommendations

- To seriously and urgently review strategies to either boost recruitment to the M9 course or to consider suspension or revision of the course delivery to incorporate the M9 course content in to the M7 course
- Feedback on the MA / PGDip Working with People with Eating Disorders – Consider existing and future opportunities for formative feedback and make these explicit to students
- To create more formal opportunities to enhance practice being shared between the two Italian centres with the Tavistock academic link tutor supporting the Italian teams in their efforts to do this
- To consider methods for enhancing participation of Italian students in a graduation ceremony

SIHR, the Review panel made five recommendations

- It was recommended that student induction be strengthened to emphasise the support available from the Trust and UEL and that the team provide students with a further induction during transition to write-up stage.
- The panel recommend the use of 'Turnitin' for the first essay for the Research Methodologies unit.
- The panel recommended the strengthening of the link with local tutors to relieve the staffing situation
- The panel recommended that the team considering raising the profile of the SIHR Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy alumni.
- The panel recommended that the team provide an information pack for service clinical supervisors

Commendations

Milan-Genoa -

- The high level of commitment demonstrated by both staff and students on the courses in both locations
- The existence of a strong collaborative relationship between AIPPI and the Tavistock
- The M7 staff development day that takes place after the Assessment Board in London and which brings together staff from the Tavistock and the different associate centres

Appendix 6

- The work undertaken in relation to evaluating the student achievement data to enable a better understanding of the apparent higher pass rates at the Italian centres

Florence-Bologna -

- The high level of commitment and passion demonstrated by the staff which frequently saw them going above and beyond usual expectations of practice
- The engagement, commitment, enthusiasm and pride of the students for their courses
- The staff development day that takes place after the Assessment Board in London and which brings together staff from the Tavistock and the different associate centres
- The use of technology to support and enhance student learning such as blogs, Moodle, websites and e-mail submission
- The exemplary embedding of translation within the courses such as translation of student feedback questionnaire, student translation of a seminal text and different methods of interpretation utilised
- The evidence of a mature relationship and partnership between CSMH and the Tavistock which was multilayered and which clearly broadened both staff and student experience and was valued by all parties
- The initiatives taken to widen participation including outreach in to schools and the planning of second generation participation

SIHR

- The level of 1-2-1 access to tutors
- The extended use of external supervisors for the intensive cases
- The team's lobbying on behalf of the child psychotherapy profession and contextualising the course within the NHS Scotland CAMHS. For example achieving the first fully funded course in Scotland
- The active encouragement given to students regarding the development of their professional identity.
- The support from, and access to, the Trusts library resources
- The activities and steps taken to strengthen and continue to develop the relationship with the Trust.

6 Student progression and achievement

For the progression data available at the time of compiling the REP, 47 % of students progressed to Year 2 of the course and 15% continued. These figures reflect some difference with the 2010-11 figures of 64% and 13% respectively. Taken together, the progression and continuation percentages mean that in 2011-12, 62% of Year 1 students continued in the general meaning of the word on the course programmes (77% in 2010-11).

The percentage of deferrals - 6.9% in 11-12 compared to 5% in 10-11. More students were referred- 10% in 11-12 in contrast with 2% in 10-11. Only 1% of Year 1 students failed. The percentage of students who withdraw increased to 6.4%.

There is one Assessment Board that meets in December 2012 to consider 2011-12 work and therefore the final data for 2011-12 might change fractionally to take account of the progression decisions taken in December.

Note the course D30 – Postgraduate Certificate in Therapeutic Communication with Children - is a one-year programme so there is no progression from Year 1. Note also there are no first year students as such on the following courses – M22, M34 and M42: all students

Appendix 6

who progress onto these courses do so from the common first year pathway of course D24 which is included in the above progression statistics.

The non- completion rates i.e. withdrawal has doubled to 6%. There are no courses with significant drop out or non-completion issues. Professional Doctorates continue to review the length of time students are taking to complete their studies.

7 Issues arising from student feedback exercise

7.1 Student feedback is obtained via a number of sources: course committees, reviews at individual course level and the Trust Annual Student Feedback Exercise. The Student Feedback Exercise is administered centrally by the Trust and the outcomes available for analysis at institutional and course level (for full information on the process and outcomes for 2011-12 see Appendix 6). The Trust administers separate feedback processes for Masters and Professional Doctorate courses enabling us to capture the different experiences of the students and to make some comparisons, where congruence allows, with the Higher Education Academy's Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) and the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) (see Appendix 6). The combined response rate from the Trust and Associate Centres was 54% a drop from 60%. It is difficult to understand the reasons for this dip as the process of administration remains the same however in Associate Centres and alternative centres of delivery it is less straightforward to make precise comments as responsibility for circulating hard copy forms rested with the centre itself.

7.2 Key aspects of the students experience continue to elicit a very positive response, in some areas there has been a small decrease in satisfaction which we will carefully monitor but overall the level of satisfaction is robust and consistent. Further the findings largely coincide with the feedback we receive on an annual basis from external examiners, and the last academic review of UEL-Trust courses conducted in early 2012.

- 94% positively rated the quality of teaching, an increase of 1% on the previous year;
- 87% positively rated the course as meeting their learning needs;
- 82% of being relevant to their work , a 1% drop on the previous year;
- 71% gave a positive rating for satisfaction with tutorial guidance , a slight decrease on the previous year.
- 81% positively rated course administration, a small decrease on the previous year .
- 82%, reported positively that their expectations of the course and the Trust have been met and
- 83% have either recommended the course to a friend or colleague or would definitely do so.

7.3 The promptness and quality of feedback elicited an improved rating of 45% and 40% respectively, both responses up on the previous year. However, there was a significant no response for both questions as many students would be completing the feedback exercise before submitting assignments. In this context if we exclude the not applicable response or "blank" then of those who responded to the question 77% of respondents provide a positive response on promptness and 73% on quality of feedback.

7.4 The least satisfactory aspects of the student experience related to teaching facilities and resources, including audio-visual resources the positive response indicating a 15% decrease on the previous year. This finding has been identified by the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and the Dean as a key issue requiring attention in 2012-13 subject to available resources. Equally whilst satisfaction with course handbooks is a healthy 65% there has been a 10% decrease in satisfaction; the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee have agreed a redesign of the handbook template which will

Appendix 6

provide a shorter and student friendly document containing key information and the policy and regulatory material accessed via *Moodle*

- 7.5 Following the 2011 professional doctorate feedback exercise it was identified that further work was required to make the form more relevant to the student's experience and to improve participation rate of 41%. In 2012 there was a response of 56.5% for the survey directed at taught students, overall this is an improvement but the figure disguises some variation in response at the course level. For the survey directed at students on the research element there was an overall response rate of 39%.
- 7.6 The responses from postgraduate research students is mixed with some very pleasing ratings and others that require the attention of the UEL-Tavistock School Research Degrees Committee. The committee has identified an action plan to address the issues identified and to undertake further work on the feedback form to continue refining its utility.
- 89% of taught students rated the quality of teaching in the positive category.
 - 70% gave a positive rating on the quality of feedback to students on assessed work.
 - 90% of taught students positively rated the course for enabling them to further develop the skills they use within their profession.
 - 75% of research students who responded gave a positive rating that they had received adequate research supervision on their course. There was a higher positive rating from research students as to being satisfied with the regularity and level of contact with their supervisors.
 - 87% positive rating as to open access to supervisors on areas of concern.
 - 76% would recommend the course to a friend and 16% responded that they 'might do'.
 - 43% responded positively that they were familiar with the Annual Review Process but 22% not at all.
 - 46% positively rated the intellectual climate for research students and 32% to some extent
 - 46% positively rated the Research Degrees Code of Practice and 19% considering it adequate
- 7.7 Following the recommendation of the QAA REO inspection the Trust will produce an annual Student Feedback Action Plan for each exercise which will identify key reported issues and the strategy for response. The action plan will be considered by the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and circulated to Cluster Leads and students, see Action Plan 2012-13

8 Summary of issues from the External Examiners' Reports

- 8.1 The broad themes identified in External Examiners' reports once again show considerable consistency with previous years (see Appendix 7). The review of the External Examiner Reports for 2010-11 is complimentary on the standards of achievement, quality of teaching and feedback given to students. There is also a general view that the academic and administrative management of the assessment board process has improved markedly
- 8.2 Whilst there are no consistent negative themes within the External Examiner Reports it is noted that on some courses there needs to be a clearer link between the allocated mark and the feedback given, also of students names appearing in the assignment. However other comments are cannot be generalised and will be taken up at specific course level.
- 8.3 There is much clear evidence from External Examiners' reports that course teams respond fully to questions and criticisms in the reports.
- 8.4 Following the recommendation of the QAA REO inspection the Trust will produce an annual External Examiner Report Action Plan which will identify key reported issues and the strategy

Appendix 6

for response. The action plan will be considered by the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and circulated to External Examiners, Cluster Leads and students, see Action Plan 2012-13

9 Comment on any special issues referred by Quality and Standards Committee:

There were no special issues referred by the UEL Quality and Standards Committee.

10 Outcomes from individual course REP Proforma Returns.

10.1 There continue to be a positive engagement by Cluster and Course Leads with the REP process and a growing standardisation in terms of quality.

10.2 M level:

- The use of Moodle and plans for the development of its use. There was evidence of interest and use of Moodle. To assist with a more consistent engagement with Moodle the Trust is developing guidance on baseline expectations of Moodle use. This process will include Course Administrators and Cluster Leads and be disseminated via a practice workshop.
- The experience of Peer Review and the identification of any arising benefits. Although not all courses have yet engaged in the process of peer review it has been positively received both in practice but also conceptually as an important learning tool for staff, which represents a significant shift in the teaching culture in the Trust. The number of courses engaging in this second phase of review in 2012-13 will be an increase on the first year of implementation.

D level:

- The use of Moodle and plans for the development of its use. See above
- Identification of mechanisms to enhance professional doctorate completion rate. Analysis by Course Leads would suggest a complex set of possibilities influencing outcomes, these include: seniority of the student's professional role combined with family commitments, lack of appreciation by students of time commitment required, the need for a more pragmatic and task orientated culture, more detailed attention to APEL. However to obtain a more detailed and specific picture a PGRD Course Lead and the Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance will review completion rates across programmes and publish a paper for consideration by the UEL-Tavistock School Research Degrees Sub-committee and the Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee.

Examples of good practice

- Distinctive ethos of integrated clinical and academic learning; warmly regarded by students and praised by employers; in particular the small group work and tutorial support.
- The library's extensive, highly regarded collection as well as the innovative and welcoming approach in terms of providing access to the Trust's Library resources, especially the use of study packs via Moodle, social media and blogging.
- Commitment and investment into procedures and policies for public information, see also Action Plan 2012-13
- Supporting staff through the scheme for Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy, see also Action Plan 2012-13

Appendix 6

Enhancement

This year much of our action plan is being informed by the joint outcomes of the REP and the external audits undertaken during the year. Given we are a small organisation we are working on an integrated action plan with priority given to conditions/desirable recommendations arising from the audits: please see Action Plan for 2012-2013

11 Conclusion

- 11.1 The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust provision offers a unique, original, high quality and very well tried and tested range of approaches to mental health education and training. A central strength is the close integration of NHS and social care clinical and practice perspectives with rigorous academic frameworks.
- 11.2 It has a national and international reputation for its distinctive trainings, this reputation requires the Trust to continually ensure its trainings are not only distinctive and fit for purpose but of excellent quality. In 2012-13 it will be implementing a Learning and Teaching Policy to shape and guide the direction of training in the Trust and to inform the review of our training portfolio to ensure the relevance and excellence of our trainings for the needs of the contemporary workforce.
- 11.3 To this end the Trust is fully engaged with a series of processes to ensure consistently high quality training provision. To date, according to a wide range of quality indicators the Trust can be confident that these high standards are being achieved and in 2011-12 this was endorsed by three external reviews
- 11.4 The Trust continues to embed the quality agenda across all the Trust's courses and is engaged in a process of ongoing strategic enhancement.

Appendix 6

Tavistock and Portman Quality and Enhancement Action Plan 2012-13

Item	Issue	Action Point	Responsibility for Implementation	Timescale for Implementation
1	To ensure that the website is regularly checked for completeness as it is being developed further	In line with the Directorate of Education and Training (DET) Standard Operating Procedure for public information, the designated lead in DET with work with the Trust's Communication Unit to ensure completeness and accuracy of information.	Designated in Directorate of Education and Training.	June 2013
2	Develop a more consistent approach to the use of Moodle.	To assist with a more consistent engagement with Moodle the Trust is developing guidance on baseline expectations of Moodle use. This process will include Course Administrators and Cluster Leads and the Trust's E-Learning Unit and be disseminated via a practice workshop.	Dean of Postgraduate Studies	April 2013
3	To establish a corporate audit process to verify the accuracy and completeness of the information that goes out to employers	This process will include review by the Associate Deans of the information sent to employers in relation to courses commissioned by employers. A document will be developed for all other employers, to ensure consistency and accuracy of information about the work of the Trust and its training activity and distributed to employers by students.	Chair Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and Head of Communications.	March 2013
4	To review course handbooks to ensure that existing shortcomings such as inconsistent entries and sequencing of materials etc are fully addressed	Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Chair to work with Cluster Leads to review consistency of information in terms of unit specifications. Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Unit to review reading lists and need or otherwise to make other generic changes	Chair Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee	June 2013
5	To approve, publish and implement the Trust's Teaching and Learning strategy.	For dissemination and implementation in 2012-13	Dean of Postgraduate Studies	February 2013

Appendix 6

6	To publish an annual overall action plan for external examiners' reports, which would identify the Trust-wide issues and propose coherent solutions	The Trust proposes in relation to Trust -wide or generic issues raised by External Examiners to produce an action plan. Arising actions will be monitored and approved by the Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and the Trust-UEL School Research Degrees Committee and fed back to students through course committees and Moodle	Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance	April 2013
7	To support the development of staff through the scheme for Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy .	Implementation of the workshop s underpinned by the PSF and assessment of staff via the UEL accreditation scheme as a collaborative partner.	Chair Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee	Jan- April 2013
8	Develop a common set of criteria and processes for double-marking and verification, which could be included in the proposed Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy	The Trust will develop in agreement and in accordance with our awarding bodies, a Trust wide approach to internal verification and double marking and include this in our Teaching and Learning Strategy	Chair Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee	March 2013
9	To publish an annual action plan for both student feedback exercises which would identify the Trust-wide issues and propose coherent solutions	The Trust proposes in relation to Trust -wide or generic issues raised by students to produce an action plan Arising actions will be monitored and approved by the Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and the Trust-UEL School Research Degrees Committee and fed back to students through course committees and Moodle	Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance	April 2013
10	Develop an action plan in relation to the promptness of feedback to students on assessed work that indicates how the Trust will deliver feedback within 6 weeks by the end of academic year	The Training Executive is engaging Cluster Leads to implement this requirement. However the Trust is about to engage in a process to explore the restructuring of the timetable to provide more opportunity for non-teaching development, planning and assessment time. A meeting is planned with the UEL Director of	Trust Training Executive	June 2013

Appendix 6

	2011-2012 and within four weeks by the end of academic year 2012-13.	Academic Practice and Student Experience and Quality Assurance Unit to take forward this process.		
11	To address PGRD student's experience in relation to the intellectual climate of the Trust and the Annual Review Process	The UEL-Tavistock School Research Degrees Committee to consider how these issues will be addressed in 2012-13	Chair UEL-Tavistock School Research Degrees Committee	April 2013
12	To develop an Admissions Policy	Develop a Trust wide admissions policy.	Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance	February 2013