

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation Report



Quality Assurance of Local Education and Training Providers

Developing people
for health and
healthcare

www.hee.nhs.uk



The University
Of
Sheffield.

Sheffield
Hallam
University



Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	<u>3</u>
Introduction	<u>7</u>
Evaluation Process	<u>8</u>
Data Feedback	<u>8</u>
HEE YH Quality Team.....	<u>9</u>
Panel Chairs and Panel Members.....	<u>11</u>
Learners and Educators.....	<u>15</u>
Rotherham Staff.....	<u>17</u>
Patient/Public Voice and Learner Representative.....	<u>17</u>
Multi-professional approach: What Went Well? How Could we Improve in the Future?.....	<u>18</u>
Organisation of the Day.....	<u>19</u>
Discussion and Recommendations	<u>20</u>
Discussion.....	<u>20</u>
Recommendations.....	<u>21</u>
Summary	<u>21</u>
Appendix A: HEE YH Quality Team Survey.....	<u>22</u>
Appendix B: Panel Chairs and Panel Members Survey....	<u>24</u>
Appendix C: Learner and Educator Survey.....	<u>26</u>
Appendix D: Trust Management and Staff Involved in Organising and Preparing for the Day Survey	<u>28</u>
Acknowledgements	<u>29</u>

Executive Summary

The Quality Team within Health Education England working across Yorkshire and the Humber (HEE YH) undertook a Multi-Professional Visit (MPV) to The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust on the 15th November 2016. This MPV was the third of its type to be undertaken to a Trust by the team. This visit was facilitated by Deborah Murdoch-Eaton, the Dean of Medical Education at The University of Sheffield. This was the first time that an MPV within Yorkshire and the Humber had been facilitated by a non HEE representative.

All partners involved with the MPV recognised that this was a pilot exercise and acknowledged the importance of evaluating the experience to test whether it is an effective approach to assessing the learning environment.

During the MPV, the tariff and educational infrastructure and following learning environments were reviewed by four separate panels:

- A. Medical Specialties
- B. Acute/Emergency medicine
- C. Women’s and Children’s Health
- D. Educational infrastructure

All participants in the visit were invited to contribute to the evaluation of the MPV. The response rate was 32% (42 out of 132). Four online surveys were developed for the evaluation. Questions focused on “What went well?” and “What improvements could be made in the future?” The surveys provided lots of opportunity to provide free text comments (see Appendices A-D).

Feedback

The feedback from each of the four surveys was analysed separately and comments relating to the multi-professional approach were reviewed together. The following table includes a summary of this data.

	Feedback (Key - Comments, Specific questions)
HEE YH Quality Team (Page 9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large Faculty panels are necessary. • There is a potential in small panels for learners to not want to speak up. • It needs to be established amongst all those involved that the nature of the MPV is to assess multi-professional working and this will not necessarily drill down into profession specific issues with great detail. • ...panels must make sure that all learners/educators have the opportunity to speak. • 3 out of the 3 respondents who completed the survey felt it was possible to review the whole environment in one day
Panel Chairs and Panel Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...very well planned and organised event which succeeded in demonstrating multi-professionalism. • Good to meet with different groups of staff who could answer my questions honestly.

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

<p>(Page 11)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I still don't think we found out what we need from MPVs. We compromise too much in trying to find out about individual groups in order to find out about a hypothetical learning environment for the LEP. • At times, the visit felt very medically led. The proportion of these students was higher than the other groups. Involving a wider representation may enhance the sharing of good practice. • I obtained a good impression of training at Rotherham. • Though an enjoyable experience, the information gleaned was not sufficient to justify the large amount of disruption to the organisation. It was also not a process that could substitute others carried out in UG and post-registration learning apart from post graduate medicine. • Positive and constructive. • I think a mixture of multi-professional and specialty/learner visits are needed. • 8 out of 13 respondents felt that that MPV made a substantial contribution to the understanding of the learning environment. • 10 out of the 13 respondents felt the format of the visit provided the opportunity for a comprehensive exploration of the quality of the learning environment. • 8 out of 13 respondents felt that overall, the MPV was a positive experience for all involved and likely to ensure the continuous improvement of quality.
<p>Learners and Educators (Page 15)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 92% of learners and educators agreed that a discussion alongside other professional colleagues was a positive experience • 89% of learners and educators felt that their views about the quality of the learning environment were communicated to the panels.

All feedback provided some very good positives from the day and some excellent suggestions for improvements in the future. With regard to the multi-professional approach, the following points were made:

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
92% of educators and of learners agreed a discussion alongside other professional colleagues was a positive experience.	Panels had too many people on them. Panel members could have been used better (panel)
Good cross section of staff to interview/discuss issues with (panel)	Some questions were not relevant to all disciplines in the room (learner/educator)
Good forum where everyone was professional and everyone was allowed to speak without being interrupted. It was a good environment to assess the current provision for students (learner/educator)	Either have general student groups that are multi-professional across more areas or only have students in the specialties the group is supposed to be focusing on (panel)
It gave staff the opportunity to share good practice and discuss issues other teams/departments were experiencing (learner/educator)	Better range of learners in each group. Some groups were almost all student nurses and some groups were almost all medical students (panel)

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
Encouraged conversation and contribution from everyone (learner/educator)	No need to have 2 learner sessions with similar groups of attendees (panel)
Being able to express what we provide as a service comparative to other departments (learner/educator)	Focus less on the medics. The majority of the discussion was based around the issues the doctors were experiencing (learner/educator)
The panel were interested to listen to our department and how we work as a team to support trainees which made discussions easy (learner/educator)	Not convinced about the multi-professional nature of visit, so would suggest separate sessions with the key staff for each main discipline who can then feedback to all panel members. This would allow for more in depth & meaningful discussions (learner/educator)
Good non-medical representation and group sizes were manageable (panel)	Better multi-professional mix of students and HCP's (panel)
It was fantastic to see so many individuals committed to education together in the same room (learner/educator)	Could have smaller groups having a discussion with individual panel members and then a plenary to bring everything together (panel)
Good to hear the experiences of other professions (learner/educator)	
It was a good opportunity to hear about education/training in other areas (learner/educator)	
Enough time was allocated to allow everyone to have a say and contribute to the discussions (learner/educator)	
Opportunity to network with other staff (learner/educator)	

Discussion

The visit to The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust was the third pilot multi-professional visit undertaken by HEE YH to a Trust, which was, for the first time, facilitated by a non- HEE YH representative. The visit involved learners and educators from the medical, nursing and allied health professions.

The review of the evaluation feedback indicates many positives from the event whilst also acknowledging that there are a number of areas for improvement. Many of these points can be acted upon without debate as they relate to the organisation of the visit. However, the following questions require more consideration:

- 1) What is the purpose of the MPV?
- 2) What is the anticipated added value of the MPV when compared with previous uni-professional visits and the normal continuous improvement processes in place between stakeholders?

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

- 3) What, if anything, is lost by undertaking an MPV rather than the uni-professional visits and can these aspects be included in the normal continuous improvement processes that are in place between stakeholders?
- 4) Which learners should be included in an MPV, how many should be included and how do we ensure full representation at an appropriate stage of their training for all learners?
- 5) Should all learning environments be included in the MPV?
- 6) What is the best method for obtaining and triangulating the learner and educator feedback during the visit? I.e. small focus groups which come together at the end of the day, or another method?

These questions should be addressed before repeating the exercise in a different organisation.

Recommendations

The recommendations are as follows:

No	Recommendation	Responsibility
A.	Consider questions 1-6 above.	HEE YH Quality Team
B.	Review the areas for improvement highlighted in the Data Feedback section.	HEE YH Quality Team
C.	Review the contents of the data pack and the timeframe of when this is sent to panel members as a result of the comments received.	HEE YH Quality Team
D.	Review the “Key Lines of Enquiry” (KLOE) to determine their effectiveness in assessing the experiences of each learner/educator type.	HEE YH Quality Team
F.	Share the findings of the Evaluation Report with all parties involved	HEE YH Quality Team
G.	Establish the purpose of the MPV to assist in the understanding of those involved in future pilots.	HEE YH Quality Team
H.	Evaluate the outcomes of the next pilot and the effectiveness of the implementation of recommendations from this report.	HEE YH Quality Team

Summary

The positive engagement of all parties involved with this pilot MPV demonstrates a huge commitment to education and training in Yorkshire and the Humber, and a willingness to be innovative.

Whilst there were a number of issues raised during the evaluation of the pilot, many of these can be addressed at the management of future visits. There does however need to be a clearer understanding of the purpose of the multi-professional visit and how this will be achieved which is to be communicated to all parties involved.

Introduction

The Quality Team within Health Education England working across Yorkshire and the Humber (HEE YH) undertook a Multi-Professional Visit (MPV) to The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust on the 15th November 2016. This MPV was the third of its type to be undertaken to a Trust by the team. This visit was facilitated by Deborah Murdoch-Eaton, the Dean of Medical Education at The University of Sheffield. This was the first time that an MPV within Yorkshire and the Humber had been facilitated by a non HEE representative.

All partners involved with the MPV recognised that this was a pilot exercise and acknowledged the importance of evaluating the experience to test whether it is an effective approach to assessing the learning environment.

Currently, The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust is subject to the following healthcare learner visiting/monitoring processes:

- i. HEE YH Postgraduate Quality Management visits
- ii. Sheffield Medical School (SMS) visits
- iii. Library facilities visits
- iv. HEE YH clinical skills visits
- v. Non-medical commissioning reviews

During the MPV, the tariff and educational infrastructure and following learning environments were reviewed by four separate panels:

- A. Medical Specialties
- B. Acute/Emergency medicine
- C. Women's and Children's Health
- D. Educational infrastructure

The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust invited learners from all professions within the above specialties to attend a question and answer session if they were in post, or on placement at the time of the visit. They also invited a representative sample of educators from all professions in these areas to attend a different session, regardless of whether they had a learner at the time of the visit. Panel D assessed the educational infrastructure of the Trust by speaking with Trust representatives, touring the facilities and by undertaking a question and answer session with educators from across the Trust.

One learner representative and one patient/public voice rotated amongst the panels to review the equitability of approach by the Panel Chairs.

The individuals invited to contribute to the evaluation were therefore:

- Visit facilitator
- HEE YH visit support team
- Panel chairs and panel members
- Learners and Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust educators
- A learner representative
- A patient/public voice representative

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

- Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust team involved in organising and preparing the day

The response rate was 32% (42 out of 132).

This report includes:

- The MPR evaluation process
- Data feedback
- Discussion
- Recommendations
- Summary

Evaluation Process

The evaluation process included the following:

- Four online surveys created using the Bristol Online Survey (BOS) software for the following groups:
 - HEE YH Quality Team
 - The Panel Chairs and Panel Members
 - The learners and educators
 - Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust staff involved in organising and preparing for the day
- Questions which focused on “What went well?” and “What improvements could be made in the future?” The surveys included lots of opportunities for respondents to provide free text comments (see Appendices A to D for the detailed surveys).

Invitations to complete the online survey were issued within three weeks of the visit. Surveys remained open for two weeks.

The final evaluation report is due to be issued by the end of March 2017.

Data Feedback

The following data analysis reviews:

- Feedback from the individual groups
- Comments relating to the multi-professional approach
- The organisation of the day

Duplicated responses are not necessarily repeated throughout the analysis unless they add value to the report. Where there have been a number of similar comments made by a group, the data is summarised and the number of separate comments about the issue is included in brackets.

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

HEE YH Quality Team (Response rate was 60% (3 out of 5))

What went well?

Before the day

- Attendance at working group meetings
- Paperwork distribution in advance of the visit
- Communication with the Medical Education Manager at the Trust
- Working group meetings were effective and concise
- Less administration preparation as was able to modify paperwork templates used at a previous MPV

On the day

- Well organised visit (x2)
- Dedicated time for panels to discuss a plan for their questioning
- Panels ran to time
- Transport and parking arrangements for the panel

What could have gone better?

Before the day

- The visit took place just after the Dental MPR so it was a very busy time (x2)

On the day

- Sometimes unclear as to which type of learner/educator was talking due to the seating arrangement and colours used in the colour code (x2)
- Full utilisation of time dedicated for feedback to the Trust to allow all panel chair feedback to be given enabling note takers and the report writer to gather information needed for the report's recommendations

How could we improve in the future? (If not included above)

- Learner/educators belonging to the same profession to sit together to help administrators record comments accurately (x2)
- Ensure only learners/educators concerned with the specialty to be reviewed are present to help note taker distinguish between what comments are relevant

With your experience of undertaking visits and your involvement in the pilot do you think it is possible to review the whole environment in one day?

	Yes	No, there were too many areas to cover	Partially but it is not as robust as separate visits	Don't know at the moment
Total = 3	3 (100%)	0	0	0

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

Comments included the following:

It needs to be established amongst all those involved that the nature of the MPV is to assess multi-professional working and that this will not necessarily drill down into profession specific issues with great detail.

Large Faculty panels are necessary...

...panels must make sure that all learners/educators have the opportunity to speak.

...there is a potential in small panels for learners to not want to speak up.

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

Panel Chairs and Panel Members *(Response rate was 54% (13 out of 24))*

Two panel chairs and eleven panel members completed the survey. All panels were represented with:

- Panel A: 4 responses
- Panel B: 4 responses
- Panel C: 2 responses
- Panel D: 3 responses

There was no significant difference between the panel responses so all panel data is presented together below.

Communication: Did you feel prepared for the day? *(Result = Yes 11, No 2)*

Although there were many positive comments about the content of the data pack and the timeframe in which it was sent to panel members, two respondents felt that they were not given enough time to assess the information within the pack prior to the visit. The data pack was circulated to panel members 1 week before the visit.

Seven respondents acknowledged that the data pack provided a clear overview of what the visit entailed. Two respondents felt that little information was given about the role of panel members and what would be expected of them. They felt that this would have assisted them in their preparations for the day.

Two respondents felt that the panel chairs pre-meeting that took place prior to the visit, helped set a clear direction for the discussions that were to take place on the day. These comments were made by a panel chair and panel member who had not been involved in pre-meeting discussions. One respondent also felt that the full panel brief at the beginning of the visit clarified the purpose, objectives and management of the day.

Data Pack: Please comment on how useful relevant you found the paperwork.

Information	Very Relevant	Relevant	Not Relevant	Comments
Data Pack	7 (56%)	6 (44%)	0	Gave a good oversight of the organisation and key areas. Arrived too late to be effective.
Agenda	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	0	
Panel Handbook	3 (23%)	10 (77%)	0	More information than was needed. Helped to formulate some of the structure for the questioning.
Park and Ride Information	3 (23%)	9 (70%)	1 (7%)	

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

Information	Very Relevant	Relevant	Not Relevant	Comments
Site Map	5 (39%)	7 (54%)	1 (7%)	Out of date.
Who's Who	5 (39%)	8 (61%)	0	More information could have been provided with respect to this.
Pack Contents	6 (46%)	7 (54%)	0	

Additional comments about the paperwork (*not received elsewhere*):

- Keep it focussed on the data. Minimal instructions and general information are all that is needed, especially with a pre-meeting for the chairs.

To what extent did the multi-professional visit make a contribution to the understanding of the learning environment?

	Substantial	Added Little	No new information	Other
Total = 13	8 (61%)	3 (23%)	0	2 (16%)

Other Comments:

- We were trying to assess a multiprofessional learning environment which we know isn't well established anywhere.
- I personally gained substantial insight but I am unsure how it contributed to the overall understanding as I haven't received any feedback.

Did the format of the meeting allow a comprehensive exploration of the quality of the learning environment?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Total = 13	10 (77%)	3 (23%)	0

Comments:

- One respondent felt that the preparation of the panels before the sessions was an excellent idea.
- Some respondents felt that the larger medical groups dominated discussions (x2) which diluted the multi-professional nature of the sessions (x1).
- One respondent commented that they were able to obtain an overview of learning within the Trust but there were too many issues and not enough time to explore the details of these.
- Other respondents felt that the cross disciplinary comparisons were very revealing (x1), that there were lots of staff available to explore the questions with (x1) and that

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

exploration of topics that arose through discussions were more successful than those outlined in the KLOE (x1).

- Two respondents commented that their panel was attended by learners who were not relevant to the learning environment being examined, which inhibited a comprehensive exploration.

Overall was the multi-professional visit a positive experience for learners, educators and teams, likely to ensure continuous improvement of quality?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Total = 13	8 (62%)	0	5 (38%)

Comments:

- There appeared to be a commitment to education at the Trust. The visit was a lot of work for the Trust, but was clearly used to take stock and to re-focus educational enhancement.
- Not sure that the multi professional visit added much to other specialities such as nursing that wasn't already known from other evaluation processes... As a consequence, this seems to be duplicating, rather than reducing resources. Additionally, as the Chair and panel members are aware of the need to make this event multi professional, their questioning reflects this. Consequently, I am not sure that other professions relying on this process for evaluating the quality of the learning experiences will obtain the detail and depth needed to provide this.
- I don't think it was a negative experience, but just not sure how much more was learnt given the number of learners and educators that were brought together.

The panel chairs and panel members were asked what went well during the visit and how improvements could be made in the future. Comments relating to the multi-professional aspect of the visit are included on [page 18](#). Other comments are as follows:

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well organised (x4) • Clear objectives (x3) • Full panel brief at start of day (x2) • Panel chair preparation (x2) • Prepared panel members (x2) • Good attendance numbers (x3) • Engaged participants (x4) • Opportunity to probe issues highlighted by learners (x2) • Positive (x1), open (x1) and relaxed (x1) discussions • Tour of the library (x2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less formal room layout (x3) • Less panel members, too many for adequate discussion • Finance Director to attend Educational Infrastructure panel (x2) • Visit to more clinical skills facilities (x3) rather than accommodation (x2) • More learners • Limit staff to attend just one session • Feed back to panel members on the visit outcomes • Ensure that learners are from environment being assessed and not there to improve attendance figures • Literature made available earlier to attendees

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

General comments from the panel included the following:

...very well planned and organised event which succeeded in demonstrating multi-professionalism.

Good to meet with different groups of staff who could answer my questions honestly.

I still don't think we found out what we need from MPVs. We compromise too much in trying to find out about individual groups in order to find out about a hypothetical learning environment for the LEP.

At times, the visit felt very medically led. The proportion of these students was higher than the other groups. Involving a wider representation may enhance the sharing of good practice.

I obtained a good impression of training at Rotherham.

Though an enjoyable experience, the information gleaned was not sufficient to justify the large amount of disruption to the organisation. It was also not a process that could substitute others carried out in UG and post-registration learning apart from post graduate medicine.

Positive and constructive.

I think a mixture of multi-professional and specialty/learner visits are needed.

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

Learners and Educators *(Response rate was 25% (26 out of 103))*

The learners and educators were asked to indicate their profession.

Learner and Educator Type	Number of Respondents
Medical	11
Nursing	2
Occupational Therapy	4
Operating Department Practice	1
Physiotherapy	2
Other	6

The learners and educators were asked the following questions:

Was a discussion alongside other professional colleagues a positive experience?

	Yes	No	Not multi-professional	Don't know
Learners and Educators (total = 26)	24 (92%)	2 (8%)	0	0

Overall were your views of the quality of the learning environment communicated to the panel?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Learners and Educators (total = 26)	23 (89%)	3 (11%)	0

Comments

- I felt I had the opportunity to share my experiences.
- I didn't feel there was sufficient time to contribute effectively. It almost felt as if there was a competition between the different professions to be heard and get their points across.
- It was helpful...to be able to write comments to be looked at anonymously. I had reservations about the training of some colleagues which I felt uncomfortable raising in front of them. However, in general, the multiprofessional discussion was positive.
- The focus appeared to be very much on simulation when a lot of work is undertaken at the trust in clinical skills.

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

The learners and educators were asked what went well during the visit and what improvements could be made in the future. Comments relating to the multi-professional aspect of the visit are included on [page 18](#). Other comments are as follows:

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Organisation of session (x5) and participants (x1)• Time keeping• Positive environment• Relaxed (x1) and open (x2) atmosphere• Good range of questions (x2)• Equal opportunity to contribute (x2)• Friendly panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Smaller groups (x2)• More informal seating arrangement• Volunteers to attend rather than nominated staff to avoid cancelling clinics• Refreshments• More clarity about nature of visit (x2) and panel members• Time keeping• More contribution from patient/public voice• Clear guidance as to whether visit is about student education or newly qualified staff

Additional comments were as follows:

- Perhaps some of the issues...could be answered by us with a brief PowerPoint presentation ... For example, I was asked about any innovations led by SAS doctors, I have a PowerPoint presentation which could have been used to provide a more detailed and descriptive response than I gave on the day.
- Lots of broad topics which could have benefitted from being reduced and streamed into specific areas (e.g. medicine on its own, AHP as a separate panel).

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust staff *(Response rate was 67% (2 out of 3))*

The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust staff were asked about what went well during the visit what improvements could be made in the future. Comments relating to the multi-professional aspect of the visit are included on [page 18](#). Other comments are as follows:

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Co-ordination of participants (x2)• Organisation of the release of participants from departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not introducing additional requirements at short notice• Sub-divide paperwork into the groups that you require information about

Additional comment:

- We appreciated the positive feedback given at the end of the day. Any proposed changes to staffing, i.e. Gastro F1s, should also be copied to the Head of Medical Workforce who has an overarching responsibility for Medical Staffing & the PGME.

Patient/Public Voice and Learner Representative

The learner representative and the patient/public voice attended all the panels at some stage throughout the day to provide a comparison in the approach between the four panels.

Comments received by the representatives are listed below:

- Both representatives agreed the process was an excellent way to empower all learners within the Trust and to enable them to express concerns or share best practice.
- Clear themes were evident at all sessions and the panels gained a good overview of the learning environment.
- The multi-disciplinary approach worked well, generating discussion between the different learner/educator groups and also highlighting to all the lack of opportunity for multidisciplinary learning environments.
- The process enabled learners to become aware of any existing multi-professional working opportunities within the Trust, albeit mainly within the area of service provision.

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

Multi-professional approach: What went well? How could we improve in the future?

All feedback provided some very good positives from the day and some excellent suggestions for improvements to be made in the future. With regard to the multi-professional approach, the following points were made:

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
92% of educators and learners agreed that a discussion alongside other professional colleagues was a positive experience.	Panels had too many people on them. Panel members could have been used better (panel)
It was fantastic to see so many individuals committed to education together in the same room (learner/educator)	Some questions were not relevant to all disciplines in the room (learner/educator)
Encouraged conversation and contribution from everyone (learner/educator)	Either have general student groups that are multi-professional across more areas or only have students in the specialties the group is supposed to be focusing on (panel)
Good cross section of staff to interview/discuss issues with (panel)	Better range of learners in each group. Some groups were almost all student nurses and some groups were almost all medical students (panel)
It gave staff the opportunity to share good practice and discuss issues other teams/departments were experiencing (learner/educator)	Could have smaller groups having a discussion with individual panel members and then a plenary to bring everything together (panel)
Being able to express what we provide as a service comparative to other departments (learner/educator)	Focus less on the medics. The majority of the discussion was based around the issues the doctors were experiencing (learner/educator)
Good forum where everyone was professional and everyone was allowed to speak without being interrupted. It was a good environment to assess the current provision for students (learner/educator)	Not convinced about the multi-professional nature of visit, so would suggest separate sessions with the key staff for each main discipline who can then feedback to all panel members. This would allow for more in depth & meaningful discussions (learner/educator)
Good non-medical representation and group sizes were manageable (panel)	Better multi-professional mix of students and HCP's (panel)
Good to hear other professions experience (learner/educator)	No need to have 2 learner sessions with similar groups of attendees (panel)
The panel were interested to listen to our department and how we work as a team to support trainees which made discussions easy (learner/educator)	
Opportunity to network with other staff (learner/educator)	

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
Enough time was allocated to allow everyone to have a say and contribute to the discussions (learner/educator)	
It was a good opportunity to hear about education/training in other areas (learner/educator)	

Organisation of the Day

The HEE YH support team, visit facilitator, panel chairs and panel members were asked to indicate how happy they were with the following areas:

KEY	Highest	2 nd Highest				
	Very Happy	Happy	No strong Opinion	Unhappy	Very Unhappy	Comment
Car Parking	31%	44%	25%	0	0	Not used (x2)
Venue	25%	69%	6%	0	0	We were across a desk but this did not appear to inhibit discussion. The size of the room constrained the format of seating to 2 formal rows with panel behind a table. I felt this was too formal and potentially a barrier to establishing effective communication.
Catering	31%	69%	0	0	0	
Timekeeping	38%	62%	0	0	0	
Breaks	31%	69%	0	0	0	
Length of the day	19%	81%	0	0	0	Early start made getting there in time difficult.

The above questions were less relevant for the learners, educators and trust staff involved in organising the day as they were already at their place of work, or were not involved in more than one session.

Discussion and Recommendations

Discussion

The multi-professional review of The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust included learners and educators from the following professions:

- Medical
- Nursing
- Pharmacy
- Physician Associates
- SAS Doctor
- SSLDF (Support Staff Learning & Development Fund)
- SSPRD (Specialist Skills Post Registration Development)
- Allied Health Professionals
- Trust representatives

The review of the evaluation feedback indicates many positives from the event but also acknowledges that there are a number of areas for improvement. Many of these points can be acted upon without debate as they relate to the organisation of the visit. However, the following questions require more consideration:

- 1) What is the purpose of the MPV?
- 2) What is the anticipated added value of the MPV when compared with previous uni-professional visits and the normal continuous improvement processes in place between stakeholders?
- 3) What, if anything, is lost by undertaking an MPV rather than the uni-professional visits, and can these aspects be included in the normal continuous improvement processes in place between stakeholders?
- 4) Which learners should be included in an MPV, how many should be included and how do we ensure full representation at an appropriate stage of training for all learners?
- 5) Should all learning environments be included in the MPV?
- 6) What is the best method for obtaining and triangulating the learner and educator feedback during the visit? I.e. small focus groups which come together at the end of the day, or another method?

These questions should be addressed before repeating the exercise in a different organisation.

Recommendations

The recommendations are as follows:

No	Recommendation	Responsibility
A.	Consider questions 1-6 above.	HEE YH Quality Team
B.	Review the areas for improvement highlighted in the Data Feedback section.	HEE YH Quality Team
C.	Review the contents of the data pack and the timeframe of when this is sent to panel members as a result of the comments received.	HEE YH Quality Team
D.	Review the “KLOE” to determine their effectiveness in assessing the experiences of each learner/educator type.	HEE YH Quality Team
F.	Share the findings of the Evaluation Report with all parties involved	HEE YH Quality Team
G.	Establish the purpose of the MPV to assist in the understanding of those involved in future pilots.	HEE YH Quality Team
H.	Evaluate the outcomes of the next pilot and the effectiveness of the implementation of recommendations from this report.	HEE YH Quality Team

Summary

The positive engagement of all parties involved with this pilot MPV demonstrates a huge commitment to education and training in Yorkshire and the Humber, and a willingness to be innovative.

Whilst there were a number of issues raised during the evaluation of the pilot, many of these can be addressed at the management of future visits. There does however need to be a clearer understanding of the purpose of the multi-professional visit and how this will be achieved which is to be communicated to all parties involved.

Appendix A - HEE YH Quality Team Survey

The following online survey was issued to the HEE YH Quality Team. The response rate was 60% (3 out of 5).

No.	Question	Format of the answer
1.	Please indicate all the activities you have been, and will be, involved in for the MPV pilot.	<p>Multiple answer</p> <p><i>Please tick all which are applicable:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaising with the working group • Liaising with panel members • Liaising with Rotherham staff to arrange the 15th facilities and attendees • Project Lead / Manager • Preparing the paperwork • Facilitator on the 15th • Administrator on the 15th • Writing the multi-professional visit report • Other – please comment (<i>free text box</i>)
2.	<p>General Housekeeping</p> <p>Please indicate how happy you were with the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Car Parking b. Venue c. Catering d. Timekeeping during the day e. Breaks f. Length of the day 	<p>A grid with possible answers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very happy • Happy • No strong Opinion • Unhappy • Very Unhappy • An optional comment free text box for each point.
3.	<p>What went well before the visit?</p> <p>Please share two things which went well prior to the 15th from your point of view</p>	Free text box
4.	<p>What could have gone better before the visit?</p> <p>Please share two things which could have gone better prior to the 15th from your point of view</p>	Free text box
5.	<p>What went well on the 15th?</p> <p>Please share two things which went well on the day of the visit from your point of view</p>	Free text box
6.	<p>What could have gone better on the 15th?</p> <p>Please share two things which could have gone better on the day of the visit from your point of view</p>	Free text box
7.	<p>How could we improve in the future?</p> <p>Please suggest two ways of improving a</p>	Free text box

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

	multi-professional visit in the future.	
8.	Additional comments Please add any additional comments about the day you would like to share with us.	Optional free text box
9.	Objectives of the visit With your experience of undertaking visits, and your involvement in the pilot do you think it is possible to review the whole environment in one day?	Multiple choice <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes, but improvements need to be made• No, there are too many areas to cover• Partially, but it is not as robust as separate visits• I don't know at the moment• An optional comment free text box

Appendix B – Panel Chairs and Panel Members Survey

The following online survey was issued to the panel chairs and panel members. The response rate was 54% (13 out of 24).

No.	Question	Format of the answer
1.	On the day Please indicate if you were the panel chair, or a panel member?	Two possible answers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel Chair • Panel Member
2.	Please indicate the panel you attended.	Multiple choice answer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel A: Medical Specialties • Panel B: Acute/Emergency Medicine • Panel C: Women/Children’s Health • Panel D: Educational Infrastructure
3.	General Housekeeping Please indicate how happy you were with the following areas: a) Car Parking b) Venue c) Catering d) Timekeeping during the day e) Breaks f) Length of the day	A grid with possible answers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very happy • Happy • No strong Opinion • Unhappy • Very Unhappy • An optional comment free text box for each point a. to f.
4.	Communication Did you feel prepared for the day?	<i>If the answer is yes, please comment on what went well, if the answer is no, please let us know how we could have done it better?</i> Yes/ No answer with a compulsory comment box
5.	Paperwork Please comment on how useful / relevant you found the paperwork. a) Data pack b) Agenda c) Panel Handbook d) Park and ride information e) Who’s who f) Rotherham Site Map g) Pack contents	A grid with possible answers <i>Please indicate how useful / relevant you find the paper work</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very relevant • Relevant • Not relevant • An optional comment free text box for each point i. to ix. • An additional free text box for any further comments.
6.	Please add any additional comments about the paperwork	
7.	To what extent did the MPV make a contribution to the understanding of the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial • Added little • No new information

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

	learning environment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other- Compulsory free text box
8.	Did the format of the meeting allow a comprehensive exploration of the quality of the learning environment?	<p>Multiple choice answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Don't know • Optional free text box
9.	<p>What went well on the 15th?</p> <p>Please share two things which went well on the day of the visit</p>	Compulsory free text box
10.	<p>How could we improve in the future?</p> <p>Please suggest two ways to improve a multi-professional visit</p>	Compulsory free text box
11.	Overall was the MPV a positive experience for learners, educators and teams likely to ensure continuous improvement of quality?	<p>Multiple choice answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Don't know • Optional free text box
12.	<p>Additional comments</p> <p>Please add any additional comments about the day you would like to share with us.</p>	Optional free text box

Appendix C – Learners and Educators Survey

The following online survey was issued to the learners and educators. The response rate was 25% (26 out of 103).

No.	Question	Format of the answer
1.	Please select the session you attended?	<p>Multiple choice answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel A: Panel A: Medical Specialties, Session 1: 09:45-10:45 • Panel A: Medical Specialties, Session 2: 11:00-12:00 • Panel A: Medical Specialties, Session 3: 12:45-14:00 • Panel B: Acute/Emergency Medicine, Session 1: 09:45-10:45 • Panel B: Acute/Emergency Medicine, Session 2: 11:00-12:00 • Panel B: Acute/Emergency Medicine, Session 3: 12:45-14:00 • Panel C: Women/Children’s Health, Session 1: 09:45-10:45 • Panel C: Women/Children’s Health, Session 2: 11:00-12:00 • Panel C: Women/Children’s Health, Session 3: 12:45-14:00 • Panel D: Educational Infrastructure, Session 1: Morning • Panel D: Educational Infrastructure, Session 2: Afternoon
2.	Please indicate your profession or level.	<p>Multiple choice answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical - Foundation Trainee • Medical - Core Trainee • Medical - Specialist Trainee • Medical – Educator • Midwife • Nurse • Occupational Therapist • Operating Department Practice • Paramedic • Physiotherapist • Other (please state)
3.	<p>General Housekeeping</p> <p>Please indicate how happy you were with the following areas:</p> <p>a) Car Parking</p> <p>b) Venue</p>	<p>A grid with possible answers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very happy • Happy • No strong Opinion • Unhappy

Review of Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: Evaluation

	<p>c) Catering d) Timekeeping during the day</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very Unhappy • An optional comment free text box for each point
3.	<p>What went well on the 15th? Please share one thing which went well on the day of the visit</p>	Optional free text box
4.	<p>How could we improve in the future? Please suggest one way of improving a multi-professional visit</p>	Optional free text box
5.	<p>Overall were your views of the quality of the learning environment communicated to the panel?</p>	<p>Multiple choice answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Don't know • Optional free text box
6.	<p>Was a discussion alongside other professional colleagues a positive experience?</p>	<p>Multiple choice answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • It was not multi-professional at the session I attended • Don't know • Optional free text box
7.	<p>Additional comments Please add any additional comments about the day you would like to share with us.</p>	Optional free text box

Appendix D - Rotherham staff involved in organising and preparing for the day Survey

The following online survey was issued to DBH staff involved in organising and preparing for the MPV. The response rate was 67% (2 out of 3).

No.	Question	Format of the answer
1.	Please tell us how you were involved in organising and preparing for the multi-professional visit on the 15 th November?	<p>Multiple answers</p> <p><i>Please tick all which are applicable:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust Panel member • Completing the self-assessment report • Providing information to Health Education Yorkshire and the Humber • Providing information for trust management • Liaising with learners • Liaising with educators • Room booking • Photocopying • Other – please comment (free text box)
	<p>Please indicate how happy you were with the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Timekeeping during the day b. Breaks c. Length of the day 	<p>A grid with possible answers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very happy • Happy • No strong Opinion • Unhappy • Very Unhappy • An optional comment free text box for each point
2.	<p>What went well?</p> <p>Please share one thing which went well</p>	Optional free text box
3.	<p>How could we improve in the future?</p> <p>Please suggest one way of improving a multi-professional visit</p>	Optional free text box
4.	<p>Additional comments</p> <p>Please add any additional comments about the day you would like to share with us.</p>	Optional free text box

Acknowledgements

The following individuals and groups have contributed to the evaluation of the MPV visit by, either completing an online evaluation, commenting on the report, providing feedback via email, or on the telephone. On behalf of HEE YH, a huge thank you is extended for their contribution to the evaluation and their time on the day of the visit.

- HEE YH Quality Team (3 online survey responses)
- The Panel Chair and Panel Members (13 online survey responses)
- The learners and educators (26 online survey responses)
- Rotherham staff involved in organising and preparing for the day (2 online survey responses)
- Learner Representative
- Patient/Public Voice