![The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust logo]

The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust & The University of East London
Review & Enhancement Process
Overview Report for 2012-13 & Action Plan for Implementation in 2013-14

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

   1.1. The organisational context of the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust (The Trust) is one of both continuity and change. The Trust's commitment to improving mental health and emotional wellbeing and to providing high quality mental health services to all who need them, remains constant. Equally, the Trust's work is distinctive in attaching importance 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. However the Trust is engaging in new and different ways of extending its approach and influence.

   1.2. 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, and a modest research directorate. Clinically the Trust is developing more community based services and services for more hard to reach populations; examples include the Family Drug and Alcohol Court (FDAC), Young People Drug and Alcohol services and the specialist primary care service provided in the City and Hackney. These services have been recognised for their innovation: the City and Hackney service was named Psychiatric Team of the Year in 2013 and FDAC has received a number of awards for innovation and partnership working. Increasingly the Trust is working in collaboration with partners to develop services. For example in 2012, we, in collaboration with the Social Research Unit and Impetus, a venture philanthropist enterprise, successfully bid to manage the Family Nurse Partnership National Unit. These developments increase the opportunities for the Trust to shape and influence practice in areas of complex social and mental health practice.

1.3. Located within the NHS, the Trust is subject to the changes taking place in the wider landscape of health and social care. Significantly the Trust is required to engage in a 4% efficiency saving year on year. Following a period of restructuring, the loss of some long-standing staff and reinvestment in a new generation of staff, the Trust is responding to the efficiency targets through a strategy for growth in our clinical and training activities.

As part of the changes brought about by the new Health and Social Care Act 2012, Health Education contract provision is managed via Local Education and Training Boards (LETBs). Responsibility for London educational contract provision is divided across three LETBs, and managed on their behalf by Shared Services. Shared Services have developed an enhanced performance tool measuring education providers against an agreed performance indicators. These focus on value for money and the fitness for purpose of the training and education offered and include measures such as recruitment rates, selection, attrition, completion and the experience of the commissioning organisation. The process is used to ensure the Trust's educational output is aligned with workforce development priorities for employers whilst linking with national and regional priorities.

1.4. Another significant change for the Trust has been the resignation of Matthew Patrick the Trust CEO who left in October 2013. The Trust has appointed Paul Jenkins OBE, CEO Rethink Mental Illness the leading mental health charity, and he will be taking up his post in February 2014. This represents an exciting opportunity as Paul will be bringing extensive knowledge of the mental health sector, including third sector and government experience.

1.5. Within this shifting landscape the Trust remains committed to the development of a resilient, reflective national workforce that is 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 health and social care. The training and education offered is largely M Level, multi-disciplinary, professional development programmes complemented by eight 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 clinician–teacher model ensures that all those teaching are actively engaged in the practice issues, debates and complexities. 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. Trust 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.

1.6. The Trust is keen to ensure the continued robustness of its portfolio of learning opportunities and will consider new and different ways of providing training. The Training Executive has been working closely with a team of consultants from the Higher Education Academy Associates (HEA). The HEA team has worked with us to review the Trust's portfolio and provided a range of recommendations. The Training Executive has now prioritised these and developed an action plan, phased over 2013/14 and 2014/15.

1.7. In parallel with the Portfolio Review, the Trust is undertaking a review of its Associate Centre relationships and course provision. The Trust has written to all the Associate Centres about the review and the rationale was discussed in an Associate Centre meeting in November 2013. All Associate Centres will shortly be advised of the detail and timescale of the project which will be completed by June 2014.

1.8. A further change to be implemented in 2013/14 is the recruitment of an Associate Dean who will hold the academic governance portfolio. Currently key governance roles are distributed across the Trust: Chair of the AGQA Committee, Chair UEL School Research Degrees Sub Committee and Chair of the Trust Research Ethics Committee. The new Associate Dean, will chair all of these committees and be part of the Training Executive; the intention is to ensure a coherent overview of all governance activity, provide a single point of contact for these issues within the Trust and with academic partners and ensure a consistent representation of governance issues at the Training Executive.

2. **Structure of the Report**
   2.1. Having outlined the organisational context of the Trust the report addresses 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 2011-2012   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.
- Addressing the aims of the review and enhancement process as outlined in the University of East London's Quality Manual.

3. Review Process

3.1. The Trust has a long-established devolved responsibility for managing its quality assurance process and reporting its annual 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 (CMSC). This year we have made two changes to this established process. Firstly we have reorganised the cluster meetings as follows: Professional Doctorate cluster, M level cluster and a dedicated Associate Centre cluster, the latter including the Trust parent course. This is the first time there has been a cluster dedicated to the experience of the Associate Centres. Secondly, following feedback from the CMSC, we have build into the process a peer review of all REP reports. The review group consists of the Associate Deans, a representative group of Cluster Leads, the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Manager (AGQA) and the UEL Quality Assurance Manager Collaborations.

3.2. 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, 2012-13. A list of all current programmes is attached to this report (see Appendix 11). 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. 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.

4. Preparation for the REP Overview Report Methodology

4.1. 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.

4.2. Specific themes this year have been:

4.2.1. M level:

- We are implementing confidentiality and anonymity policy in relation to assessed work. Can you indicate how you have been interpreting this issue on your course in recent years?
- What do you consider the strengths and weaknesses of the quality of feedback to students on academic assessment?

4.2.2. D level:

- In relation to the research and intellectual environment within which students are studying in the Trust, what are the course team doing to enhance the environment and what other ideas do you have about this aspect of our training and research work?
- What do you consider the strengths and weaknesses of the quality of feedback to students on academic assessment?

5. REP Methodology

5.1. There are now four stages. Stage 1 ensures the submission of fully completed documentary evidence for individual courses; Stage 2 aims to provide a qualitative and learning dimension to the process for course tutors; Stage 3 aims to ensure compliance and identification of issues arising, and; Stage 4 is the presentation of the overview report to the Trust's Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee.

5.2. **Stage 1**

5.2.1. 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.

5.3. **Stage 2**

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

5.3.2"Cluster" meetings are held in October/November, facilitated by two designated members of the Trust's Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee. The meetings provide the opportunity for disseminating good practice and support the opportunity for collective reflection on common issues.

5.4. 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.

5.5. Detailed minutes are taken by the Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance (see Appendix 5) 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.

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

5.7. **Stage 3**

5.7.1. 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.

5.7.2. All reports are then reviewed by a REP Peer Review Group (See Individual Course Quality Review Tracker Document in our submitted documentation). This is a new stage in the process, as indicated above, and our first experience would suggest an important and valuable new addition to the process. It enabled general issues and themes to be identified. This included common areas of strength and weakness in the REP submissions, of particular note is the dislocation of the action plan from the identified source and analysis in the body of the REP. The group also recommended modifications to the REP template and data representation, which will be discussed and implemented by the AGQA Unit. It also generated specific feedback for some REP reports and identified an exemplar for circulation to all course tutors. A fuller report of the Peer Review Group can be found in Appendix 4.

5.8. **Stage 4**
5.8.1. 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 10th December 2013.

The same committee received details of all but two Course Reps at its meeting on 12th November 2013 and the final two Course REPs at its meeting on 10th December.

6. **Update of progress made on the action plans identified for implementation in 2012-2013**

Item	Action point	Responsibility for Implementation	Outcome
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 will work with the Trust's Communication Unit to ensure completeness and accuracy of information.	Designated in Directorate of Education and Training.	The Trust website is currently being redesigned and will be launched in early spring. The redesign is providing an opportunity to review all aspects of DET public information. Staff and students are being consulted about the design and the content of the DET pages. We are also reviewing the designated lead role in DET.
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	This has been undertaken with a Trust wide approach to the material contained in course handbooks and the range of material to be posted on Moodle (also see below).

To establish a corporate audit process to verify the accuracy and completeness of the information that goes out to employers	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.	A brochure for employers is in the final stages of completion.
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	This was undertaken and completed in September 2013. The Trust adopted a fresh approach to course handbooks, working with an agreed slim line template enabling a more course specific focus and an agreed approach as to the material posted on Moodle. This process included ensuring consistency of content, and accuracy, of unit specifications. The process was managed by the AGQA unit and was confirmed as satisfactory by the UEL Quality Manager Collaborations. It is also worth noting that the work that had already been undertaken in respect of course handbooks elicited a 72% positive rating from students in the annual feedback exercise , an increase of 8% on the previous year.

To approve, publish and implement the Trust`s Teaching and Learning strategy.	For dissemination and implementation in 2012-13	Dean of Postgraduate Studies	The Trust's Teaching and Learning Strategy was approved by the Trust Board in January 2013. It has been disseminated to all staff and is available on the Trust website.
To publish an annual overall action plan for external examiners' reports, which will 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	Completed. The overview report and action plan was presented to the AGQA committee and sent to all Trust External Examiners. This is now an on-going practice.
To support the development of staff through the scheme for Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy .	Implementation of the workshops underpinned by the Professional Standards Framework and assessment of staff via the UEL accreditation scheme as a collaborative partner.	Chair Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee	Completed. Ten staff participated in the process. Five staff were accredited as Principal Fellows and 5 as Senior Fellows. A further 4 staff are currently engaged in the process. The intention is to support a rolling programme of participation.
Develop a common set of criteria and processes for double-marking and verification, which could be included in	The Trust will develop in agreement and in accordance with our awarding bodies, a Trust wide approach to internal verification	Chair Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee	This was included in the Learning & Teaching Strategy approved by the Trust Board in January 2013. We have agreed the criteria with our awarding bodies. A Trust statement

the proposed Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy.	and double marking and include this in our Teaching and Learning Strategy		reminding staff will be circulated in January 2014.
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	The Trust Main Student Feedback Action Plan published in the autumn of 2012 was completed in May 2013.

The Trust Postgraduate Research Degrees Student Feedback Exercise published in autumn 2012 was completed in July 2013 save for one item that it was agreed to carry forward to the 2013 Action Plan. |
| 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 2011-2012 and within four weeks by the end of academic year 2012-13. | 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 | Trust Training Executive | This piece of work is progressing but there is still more to achieve. In 2012/13 there was a 60% successful feedback within 4 weeks. The most significant difficulty is for our largest programme, which manages over 500 pieces of written assessment, including submissions from Associate centres, and is logistically a complex task. However this will be assisted further by electronic submission this year and the implementation of the revised timetable in 2014/15. Following the portfolio review (1.6) the |

	and Student Experience and Quality Assurance Unit to take forward this process.		Trust anticipates the introduction of a more modular approach to course design which should also facilitate a more staggered submission of assessed work, however given the nature of the assessment tasks this will have some limitations.
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	This is the item referred to above under the PGR Student Feedback Action Plan 2012 that has been carried forward into the 2013 Action Plan.
To develop an Admissions Policy	Develop a Trust wide admissions policy.	Head of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance	This task is in process; it is involving reconciliation of the positions of our university partners and the QAA Quality Code. It has been presented to the AGQA committee in draft form and should be represented in early spring 2014.

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

7.1. As identified in section 1 the Trust has engaged in a review of its provision following a process of consultation with the Higher Education Academy (HEA) which will lead to a number of strategic changes in 2014/15. These includes the introduction of Customer Relations Management processes to enhance the student experience, phased changes in the design and delivery of courses to increase flexibility and access, and structural changes in the management of the activity in the Department of Education and Training(DET).

7.2. Review and enhancement of Postgraduate Research Degree Trust and Trust / UEL systems and system interfaces have been a major focus in 2012/13. This work has been a response to the discovery of a range of flaws and administrative loopholes in both Trust based systems and c management processes, and at the interface between the Trust and the University's own data and decision making systems, some of which the

University acknowledges have been less than completely robust or efficient. The work that has been undertaken to date, and which continues, includes afull data reconciliation on PGR student registrations and enrolments between the Trust and UEL Graduate School. The consolidation of central PGR student Information systems that track enrolment, registration, changes of status, annual review progression, and ethical approval status and documentation within a unified framework. The completion of Root Cause Analysis of PGR management problems and consolidated agreement of solutions to ensure failsafe future practices. accompanied by staff training

7.3. In order as a higher education provider to be in closer alignment with the relevant section of the UK Quality Code, the Trust has finalised and is close to finalising a number of student facing policies and procedures. These include a Professional Suitability for Training Procedure, a Student Management of Student Placements Policy, a   Student Admissions Policy and   Student Engagement in Quality Assurance Policy. The drafting of these documents has and will involve our awarding bodies including the University of East London

8. Comment on major issues relating to collaborative provision

8.1.1 The MA/PG Dip/PG Cert course in Working with People with Eating Disorders
delivered in Bologna, Italy, was suspended during academic year 2012-13.

8.1.2   During the first term of academic year 2012-13, the Scottish Institute of Human
Relations   which had received a Collaborative Review in March 2012 ceased
to operate. The organisation had delivered the Professional Doctorate in
Child Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy since 2006. A new charitable organisation,
Human Development Scotland, came into being early in 2013. It was subject to
Institutional Approval by the university in two stages: in March 2013 the
organisation was required to forward governance and financial information, and; on
17th September the university Trust staff in attendance undertook a site visit to the
new centre of delivery for the course in Fife as well as undertaking a revalidation of
the programme through appropriate revised documentation – course handbook,
programme specification. The university set five conditions to the reapproval of the
delivery of the course.

9. Student progression and achievement

For the progression data available at the time of compiling the REP, 49 % of students progressed to Year 2 of the course and 29% continued. These figures reflect some difference with the 2011-12 figures of 47% and 15% respectively. Taken together, the progression and continuation percentages mean that in 2012-13, 78% of Year 1 students continued in the general meaning of the word on the course programmes (65% in 2011-12).

Less than 1% of Year 1 students failed.

There is one Assessment Board that meets in December 2013 to consider 2012-13 work and therefore the final data for 2012-13 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 – MA in Child Protection and Complex Child Care, , MA I n Psychological Therapies for Children, Young People and Families, and MA in Child and Adolescent Primary Mental Health Care Work: all students who progress onto these courses do so from the common first year pathway of course PG Cert in Child, Adolescent and Family Mental Well-being: Multidisciplinary Practice which is included in the above progression statistics.

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.

10. Issues arising from student feedback exercise

10.1.   Student feedback is obtained via a number of sources: course committees, reviews at individual course level and the Trust Annual Student Feedback Exercises. The Student Feedback Exercises 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 2012-13 see Appendix 7). 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 7). The combined response rate from the Trust and Associate Centres was for Masters courses 59%, an increase on last year. And 55% for Research Degrees including professional doctorates validated by UEL and by the University of Essex.

10.2.   The Masters Student Feedback Exercise demonstrated that key aspects of the students experience continue to elicit a very positive response and 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. Positive ratings include: quality of teaching 94%, professional currency 86%, course administration 85%, expectations of the Trust and course met 85% and 85% would recommend the course to a friend. There was a noticeable improvement in satisfaction with Moodle 76% and the website. There was an improved level of satisfaction with course handbooks 72% and given further changes made to course handbooks this issue will be kept under review.

10.3.   The promptness and quality of feedback elicited an improved rating of 49% and 43% respectively, both responses showing improvement 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. However the External Examiners have commented on variation in the quality of feedback so given this correlation the issue will be addressed via further standardisation of double marking and verification plus the development and introduction of a new assessment feedback template to enhance consistency of feedback

10.4.   Student satisfaction with facilities and resources has improved, 64% compared to 56% in 2011-12 and is likely to reflect Trust investment to improve the facilities however this issue will be kept under review as relatively it is not a strong area of performance. The satisfaction with IT facilities remains comparatively low at 50%. The dissatisfaction with IT facilities has been brought to the attention of the Trust Chief Executive and a meeting is being convened to discuss the issues and identify possible solutions.

10.5.   Post Graduate Research Degree Student Feedback is gathered via the Trust's participation in PRES 2013 and the Trust's internal PGR survey. Participation in PRES was 20% and 55% for the internal Trust survey. The overall satisfaction rate generated by PRES was 56%, which comparatively suggested a lower level of satisfaction than other UEL schools however the Trust exercise generated a satisfaction rate of 84%, indicating a comparatively strong performance. In the Trust's view PRES is not well adapted to the needs and circumstances of Professional Doctorate Programmes and students. In particular, the survey is ill-attuned to the circumstances and experience of pre-registration PD students, who constitute a majority of Trust enrolled PGR students at any one point in time. Additionally programme level analysis of PRES showed a high proportion of respondents based in one PD programme and this further compromised the reliability of the findings, but once again the Trust's internal survey provided a corrective response. Once the Trust has assimilated the disaggregated findings for specific programmes further tailored enhancement work can be undertaken.

10.6.   The internal survey identified the following areas of strength: 90% positive rating for research supervision, 87% positive rating in respect of programmes developing professional skills, 93% positive rating for the taught element of programmes, 83% satisfaction with clinical/practice supervision and 80% and 86% respective satisfaction rates for the website and library.

10.7.   However key areas of comparatively lower levels of satisfaction include: the process of annual reviews 52% and only a 58% positive rating in respect of accessing a wider research culture in the Trust, which is in contrast to the positive rating in respect of individual programmes offering a stimulating intellectual and research climate. Information and training in respect of the Code of Practice will be addressed via the action plan and while there may be limitations for our mostly part-time students to access activities within the Trust the action plan includes exploration of ways in which access to the research activities of the Trust can be developed and facilitated. For a full account of the PGDR Student Action Plan and PGRD Student Survey Overview Report see Appendix 7.

10.8.   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

Masters Student Feedback Exercise Action Plan							
Recommendation	Source	Priority	Specific Action	Target	Responsibility	Timescale	Status
Course Handbooks: In view of the major restructuring of course handbooks that took place in the summer of 2013 it is proposed that qualitative questions relating to course handbooks be included in the generic form in 2014. Course Handbooks noted by Portfolio Review too.	Main Student Feedback Exercise 2012 and 2013 Quantitative Reports	Medium	To review the new structure and content in light of feedback from course teams and from students through the student feedback exercise in May 2014		Academic Governance & Quality Assurance Unit	By April 2014. More details to be received by Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee in March 2014. Outcome will be	

						available in June 2014.	
Trust website: As the Website undergoes change, a qualitative question needs to be added to the generic student feedback form to elicit a more specific and detailed narrative.	Main Student Feedback Exercise 2013.	Low	To consider feedback received from students		Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Unit	By April 2014. Findings available in June 2014.	
Quality of and satisfaction with Teaching and Audio-visual facilities: In view of significant investment in the summer of 2013 in the improvement of these facilities – to include a qualitative question the generic student feedback form to gather student perspective on the perceived improvements.	Main Student Feedback Exercise 2012 and 2013 Quantitative Reports.	Medium	To ensure we receive in-depth feedback from students and from teaching staff		Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Unit	By April 2014 Findings available in June 2014.	
IT Facilities available to students: This continues to elicit a lower than average level of satisfaction. A qualitative question about the facilities was added to the 2013	Main Student Feedback Exercise 2012 and 2013 Quantitative Reports	Medium	The Trust Education and Training Executive to consider feedback received from students and to respond in appropriate ways		Further consideration by Trust Education and Training Executive of both general response and the specific report	Initial response by January 2014	

					that has analysed a sample of course level responses to the qualitative question.		
Quality of feedback to students on assessed work: Chosen as a Trust REP enhancement theme. The Portfolio Review report picks up how feedback is presented to students. There needs to be a review taking into account the outcome of REP discussions, what our external examiners report.	Main Student Feedback Exercise 2013.	High	To establish a working group consisting of members of the Education and Training Executive and Cluster Leads to agree a common structure and format to be introduced in June 2014		Chair of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Manager.	By February 2014.	
Quality of feedback to students on assessed work: Introduce a new Assessment Feedback Template to ensure consistency and standards across the Tavistock	Main Student Feedback Exercise 2013.	High	Re-design the assessment feedback template Submit to Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee for comment/approval Circulate		Chair of Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee and Academic	By February 2014	

					Governance and Quality Assurance Manager.		

PGRD Student Feedback Exercise Action Plan							
Recommendation	Source	Priority	Specific Action	Target	Responsibility	Timescale	Status
Resources							
1 Discuss with UEL the timeline for updating the Code of Practice and Regulations to ensure availability for Tavistock students at the beginning of term. Once the Code of Practice for 13/14 is approved by UEL committees, ensure that the document is made available as soon as possible online, and ensure all supervisors are sent a copy.	PGRD Internal Student survey overview report (Recommendation 2)	High	Complete the amendments to the 2013/2014 Research Degrees Regulations. Submit amendments to TSRDSC for consideration Submit the amendments to the 2013/2014 Research Degrees Regulations and the Code of Practice to the UEL for approval. Upload the updated code of practice onto the website and circulate to supervisors, students, Course Tutors, Course Administrators and other interested parties. Liaise with the UEL to agree a deadline to receive the updated Research Degrees Regulations and the Code of Practice for 2014/2015. Update the 2014/2015 Code of Practice. Ensure amendments to the code of practice are approved by the UEL Upload the updated code of practice onto the website and circulate to supervisors, students, Course Tutors, Course Administrators and	The Code of Practice is available at the beginning of term.	Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Office (**Lead: Rebecca Bouckley**)	**1-3: By January 2014** **5-8: By March 2014**	

			other interested parties.				
2 Deliver training on the new Moodle site to all course teams, and consider how to encourage course teams to use the resource more consistently and effectively.	PGRD Internal Student survey overview report (RECOMMENDATION 3)	Low		An increase in the use of Moodle (usage statistics?)	TSRDSC / E-Learning	Summer 2013	
Learning, Teaching, Assessment and Academic Support							
3 The Course Tutor Forum (a sub-group of the Trust-School Research Degrees Subcommittee) to: Consider the cross-doctoral research seminars to ensure that the timing of delivery of these are best adapted to student needs. .Discuss and report back on the issue of developing independent research skills with recommendations for improvements (if/where needed).	PGRD Internal Student survey overview report (RECOMMENDATION 5) & (RECOMMENDATION 8)	Medium		A higher rate of satisfaction in the 2013/14 internal student survey Target: 50% (39.3% in the 2012/13 survey)	Trust-School Research Degrees Subcommittee / Course Tutor Forum **(Lead: Rebecca Bouckley)**		
4	PGRD	Low		A higher rate	Academic	11.02.2013	

To help embed the work carried out on the Unit Specifications/Course Handbook, the webpage (for students) on assessment should be revised to explain clearly the relationship between learning outcomes, assessment criteria and other assessment rubric.	Internal Student survey overview report (RECOMMENDATION 6)				of satisfaction in the 2013/14 internal student survey Target: 60% (54.4% in the 2012/13 survey)	Governance and Quality Assurance Office **(Lead: Rebecca Bouckley)**	
5 The Tavistock should look into the 'light touch' re-validation process being developed at the UEL to see whether it might be suitable for revising the Unit Learning Outcomes on courses that are not undergoing full re-validation.	PGRD Internal Student survey overview report (RECOMMENDATION 7)	High			More streamlined, user-friendly Learning Outcomes in 50% of the Unit Specifications in the 2014/15 course handbooks.	Quality Committee (**Lead: Rebecca Bouckley)**	By September 2014 (final deadline)	**Done.** N Makinwa, Quality Manager for UEL (Tavistock Link) responded saying that the 'light touch' process would not be suitable for this project, but that during normal Revalidations and Validations, the learning outcomes should be carefully considered.
Overall Satisfaction							

6 Look into research funding and look into ways of giving students support and advice on the various research funding streams.	PGRD Internal Student survey overview report (RECOMMENDATION 10)	Medium		Relevant information more clearly available.	Trust Education and Training Executive	June 2014	
7 Consider ways in which access to the wider institutional research activities of the Trust can be developed and facilitated.	PGRD Internal Student survey overview report (RECOMMENDATION 4)	High		Seek both greater co-ordination of current relevant activities and ensure students have ready access to information about the activities.	Trust Education and Training Executive	March 2014	

10.9.   Of the recommendations in the PGRD Student Survey Overview Report, Recommendations 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 are included in the 2013-2014 action plan

11. Summary of issues from the External Examiners' Reports

11.1.   The annual review of External Examiner Reports was undertaken by one member of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement

Committee reviewed the reports: The Quality Assurance Officer, with input from the University of East London Quality Assurance Manager Collaborations and the Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Manager. This ensured a consistent review from an objective, quality assurance standpoint.

11.2.   All of the external examiners confirmed that the standards set for the awards were appropriate, that the processes for assessment and the determination of awards were sound and fairly conducted and that the standards of student performance were comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions. In some cases, our externals report that academic standards were higher than in similar institutions. The Examiners also confirmed that they had received sufficient evidence to enable them to carry out their role knowledgably and confidently. There was no discernable difference in responses comparing Masters courses to Professional Doctorate courses. The broad themes identified in External Examiners' reports once again show considerable consistency with previous years, including the responsiveness of course teams to questions and criticisms raised in reports (see Appendix 8).

11.3.   The review of the External Examiner Reports for 2011-12 compliments the following:

- Very high standards of work on the majority of courses, many External Examiners suggesting publication of some essays
- The level of commitment and dedication from course teams
- Uniqueness of the courses on offer in the Trust
- The detailed quality of feedback.

11.4.   Whilst there are no consistent negative themes within the External Examiner Reports the following issues require attention:

- Poor quality work was characterised by problems with literacy, editing and referencing
- Whilst feedback was generally detailed and of good quality there were variations in standards
- External Examiners were not clear as to how the Trust dealt with regulatory issues i.e. late submissions, word count etc.

Recommendation	Priority	Specific Action	Target	Responsibility	Timescale	Status
Ensure that during validation and revalidations, course teams are required to be mindful of literacy and referencing issues and ensure that the entry /selection criteria are written with this issue in mind.	High	Create guidance / checklist for course teams undertaking validation and revalidation Circulate guidance Ensure guidance informs course development by checking the documentation against the checklist/guidance as part of the revalidation/validation process	Newly validated and revalidated courses meet the checklist	Trust Quality Assurance Officer (Rebecca Bouckley)	May 2014	
When looking at improving links between courses and the Trust-wide 'intellectual climate' it may be worth investigating creating an in-house publication to publish the high-quality work that is being produced by students at all levels. However, this would be a significant resource, and would be more appropriate to consider after the completion	Low	Ensure that this recommendation is included on the 2014/2015 action plan	The recommendation is on the 2014/2015 action plan	Author of the next External Examiner Overview Report	September 2014	N/A

of at least the second phase of the portfolio review is completed.						
Introduce a policy which standardises second marking, internal moderation and internal verification.	Medium	Draft policy Consult with interested parties Finalise Submit to UEL/Essex for approval	An approved policy which standardises double-marking and internal modification and verification	Quality Manager (Louis Taussig) / Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee		
Ensure that all external examiners are sent the new Assessment policy. Send the 'concise guide' to assessment to all course teams, and use as a reference point for staff development.	High	Email policy to all course administrators to send to all external examiners Ensure policy is on website Send the 'concise guide' to assessment to all course teams Staff development on the policy (using the 'concise guide' as the main document)	Examiner reports and student survey feedback indicates a stronger understanding of assessment policy/regs	Quality Assurance Officer (Rebecca Bouckley) / Quality Manager (Louis Taussig) / Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee		Some new External examiners have met with QA Officer, who has gone through the new Assessment Policy with them. Course Admin will send out policy with sample of work. New policy is also on the Tavistock

| | | | | | | Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Website

Concise guide in preparation |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

11.5. The action plan developed from the review is tabled below. It will be a standing item on the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee agenda until completed, and thus responsibility for the implementation and addressing of the Action Plan rests with the Trust Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee.

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

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

13. Outcomes from individual course REP Pro-forma Returns.

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

13.2. **M level:**
- We are implementing confidentiality and anonymity policy in relation to assessed work. Can you indicate how you have been interpreting this issue on your course in recent years
- What do you consider the strengths and weaknesses of the quality of feedback to students on academic assessment

13.3. **D level:**

- In relation to the research and intellectual environment within which students are studying in the Trust, what are the course team doing to enhance the environment and what other ideas do you have about this aspect of our training and research work
- What do you consider the strengths and weaknesses of the quality of feedback to students on academic assessment

14. Examples of good practice

14.1. Distinctive ethos of integrated clinical and academic learning and professional currency of our courses.

14.2. The development of ground breaking bi-modal approaches to professional training.

14.3. Successful participation in the Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy accreditation process, particularly at Principal level.

15. Enhancement

15.1. The Trust's programme for enhancement is reflected in the action plan identified below in addition to the specific issues arising from the External Examiners action plan, the Masters and PGRD Student Feedback Exercise action plan and the PGDR action plan, all of which are monitored via the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Committee.

16. Conclusion

16.1. The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust provision offers a unique, original, high quality portfolio of training delivered by experienced clinician/teachers. The distinctiveness and hallmark of out portfolio is its robust roots in clinical practice, which ensure the relevance and liveliness of what we offer to a student's practice realities, combined with a commitment to robust academic standards.

16.2. It has a national and international reputation for the distinctiveness and quality of its   trainings, this reputation requires the Trust to continually ensure its trainings remain fit for purpose and are of excellent quality. The Trust will be implementing the outcomes of the 2012/13 portfolio review, which will not only maintain quality and relevance, but also enhance flexibility and access for the expanding health and social care workforce.

16.3.   To date, according to a wide range of quality indicators the Trust can be confident of its high standards. Of teaching and learning. Furthermore when problems are identified the Trust demonstrates openness and tireless commitment to rectifying difficulties and making changes.

17. Tavistock and Portman Quality and Enhancement Action Plan 2013-14

In addition to the action points arising out of the earlier Action Plans relating to External Examiners and Student Feedback, there are two further action items under a general heading. They are listed below.

Item	Issue	Action Point	Responsibility for Implementation	Timescale for Implementation
Associate Centre Review	Review of provision, quality assurance, centre robustness and opportunities for development	Review of documentation and site visits	**Trust Training Executive**	**Completed June 2014**
Appointment of Associate Dean Academic Governance	Coordination and overview of academic governance activity	Complete appointment process	**Dean**	**December 13/January 14**