

Programme Review Findings Form

Section 1: Details of the Visit	
Programme Name:	Academic Foundation
LEP:	HEYH – Regional
Dates of Visits:	14 May 2014 14 July 2014 28 July 2014

Background

Academic programmes, both as part of the Integrated Academic Pathway (NIHR) and the Foundation programme have been in place now for over five years. Although the quality of the current programmes has been reviewed as part of wider Trust visits, this has not permitted an in depth review of the academic components for training or how that sits with the delivery of the specialty component. As these programmes invariably require the trainee to achieve specialty training in less time and meet separate academic targets, it was felt to be appropriate to review in more detail how these programmes are performing.

Therefore, Health Education Yorkshire and the Humber has developed quality management methods to review programmes rather than the traditional Trust visit model, as this does not always capture the range of the posts being reviewed, and in this case, both specialty and academic components. The visiting panels were composed of external Academic Programme Directors and Foundation School Directors (or Deputies) as well as Associate Deans and Dr Peter Taylor, Deputy Postgraduate Dean who chaired all three visits. The Quality Manager and Medical Workforce Manager, who leads on Foundation Training, also attended the three reviews.

A set of dedicated questions were developed to target specific areas at the visits pertinent to ACF and ACF Foundation trainees, for example, questions regarding the ease of accessing relevant research projects.

The evidence from the HEYH trainee survey conducted in autumn 2013 was used to inform the Academic Foundation panels but there were only 12 responses which may mean that Foundation Trainees are not selecting the 'academic trainee' option when completing the survey. There was no data for ACFs in the HEYH survey as the only specific question asked was if they are an ACF trainee. In terms of the GMC survey, there was no data available for either ACF or Foundation Academic trainees, despite the fact that targeted questions are asked. According to the GMC data team this was because there was no standard report available for academics because of the small amount of trainees who are split across all specialities. The GMC have said they will provide Helan Raynor, HEHY Data Analyst, with their plans for the future for academic reporting. It was a valuable finding from the reviews relating to the lack of academic training survey data, both locally and nationally that will need to be addressed.

No	LEP	Area	Findings	Recommendations	
3.	All	Academic Supervision (FY2)	<p>Trainees who have a named academic supervisor felt they often did not know what was involved in the placements. The trainees are not routinely provided with specific academic objectives at the beginning of the post. The Trainees also reported appraisals not always being documented.</p> <p>There were also reports of not all trainees having an allocated academic supervisor. As examples only four of the sixteen trainees interviewed at the West review had a named academic supervisor and in the South trainees said they had to contact a potential supervisor from a list of names depending on their own specialty interests. The trainees suggested a more consistent, structured approach would be of benefit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Foundation School to set standards, to provide a framework for both Trainees and their Supervisors. • Provide training for academic supervisors with regard to the curriculum, objective setting and appraisal documentation. • Develop structured objectives/checklist for the academic part of the rotation linked to the academic foundation programme curriculum. It was recognised these will need to be fairly generic as there will be differences across specialities, Foundation Schools and Trusts • The Trusts to ensure all academic Foundation Trainees have allocated academic supervisors. 	28/2/2015
4.	All	Mentorship	<p>Although some trainees had mentors and found this to be helpful, other trainees highlighted this would be a useful addition to their training experience.</p>	<p>The Foundation School to review the number of Trainees with a mentor and identify those that would like one but have not been able to access one.</p>	31/8/2015
	All	Rotas	<p>Inflexibility of rota coordinators was raised at all three visits as often account was not taken of academic workload. A comment was made that "rota coordinators do not care about our research commitments". There were reports of trainees missing academic study days due to them being rostered for clinical commitments during this time.</p>	<p>Trusts to ensure rota coordinators are aware of the additional commitments that academic foundation trainees are required to undertake and take this into account when drawing up rotas. Trainees to report continuing problems to the FTPD</p>	Ongoing

No	LEP	Area	Findings	Recommendations	
	STH	Teaching commitments	Trainees reported that a significant amount of time is spent teaching and the placements can feel more like 'anatomy demonstrators' than academic foundation posts.	Head of Foundation School/Deputies to review the content of the roles in conjunction with the Trust with the goal of offering a more diverse experience.	31/8/2015
	All	Projects	There were no significant concerns		No timeline
	All	ARCP/eportfolio	<p>Trainees and trainers at all reviews described confusion on how to use the eportfolio for the academic placements. Although they can upload information onto their library, they would prefer something more specific to academic training.</p> <p>There were also problems in relation to ARCP forms and how these should be completed in terms of academic posts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme Support to review how to access the academic component of the eportfolio and inform TPDs, ES, CS and AS of this information. • Programme Support to review the ARCP forms and provide clarification on how these should be completed for academic foundation trainees. 	<p>31/12/2014</p> <p>31/12/2014</p>
	West	Academic Lead for Foundation Trainees.	Trainers requested an academic lead for foundation (as South and East have) to provide more focused support for the academic foundation trainees.	Lead Deputy Dean/Foundation School Director to review this request.	31/08/2015
	South	PG Certificate in Research Methods	Medical Education trainees expressed concern that they had difficulty fitting the Certificate workload into their schedules. The trainees explained they had received an email from the Trust asking them to enrol with no explanation of what was involved. The panel noted that of those interviewed only four trainees from the nine that had commenced the Certificate were still on the course.	The Foundation School Director/Deputy to review the procedures around trainees enrolling on the PG certificate in Research Methods, cost implications of trainees who withdraw, etc.	31/08/2015

Final Comments

Overall, the majority of trainees felt that undertaking an academic foundation placement had given them experience in teaching and research. The trainees find completing the PG certificate worthwhile and value that they receive a formal qualification. They also felt the experience will make a good impression at future interviews and for those who were contemplating ACF roles felt the placement had assisted in their decision to pursue this career pathway. Trainers described trainees as often being of a high calibre, well organised and self-directed and pointed out these qualities are required if the placement was to be successful in balancing the clinical and research commitments. It was apparent that some trainees need to be appraised of realistic expectations within the timeframe and that their research role within the placement may be involvement in a portion of a wider project. It should be reiterated to trainees that they are gaining valuable skills and markers for success regardless of the work they are doing, for example, a literature search to develop the ground work for the next trainee to make further progress.

West

Foundation Trainees generally had enjoyed their experience and found supervisors to be supportive and approachable and around three quarters would undertake the opportunity again if they had the chance to do so. However, only approximately half of the Foundation trainees would recommend the placement to a colleague.

South

Trainees reported the PG Certificate was worthwhile, found supervisors supportive and approachable and all would recommend the placements. Mr Briffa, Mr Chantry, Mr Rochester and Mr Chico were identified for specific praise. The trainers outlined plans for academic trainee induction in September 2014 that will include competencies and expectations of the role. In addition, there will be three follow up meetings with FY1 Trainees to identify projects. The trainees at the South review provided feedback that the academic presentation day was useful as this gave a focus for the production of research material.

HEY

The trainees described their supervisors as 'very good' and that there was a great team atmosphere. The trainees said they were encouraged to undertake some teaching and that the approach to projects was generally flexible and supportive. All trainees would recommend the placement.

Section 3: Outcome (please detail what action is requested following the review)	
No further action required – no issues identified	
Monitoring by School	South and East
Speciality to be included in next round of annual reviews	West
Level 2: Triggered Visit by LETB with externality	
Level 3: Triggered Visit by LETB including regulator involvements	

Section 4: Decision (To be completed by the Quality Team)
All programs should consider the extent to which 'practice sharing' and closer collaboration will raise standards across the Region. An ongoing, formal outcome review of all programs, should be instituted and fed back to the Foundation School Director (Deputies) on at least an annual basis.