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Foreword

Our Educational Governance Framework expresses NES’ commitment to high standards and improving quality across our numerous programmes and projects. Since it was first published in 2006, the Framework has proved effective in assuring our Board that educational quality and performance is subject to appropriate scrutiny. It has also made us more accountable to patients and families, NHSScotland Health Boards, the Scottish Government Health Directorates, health profession regulators, education providers and our other partners and stakeholders. From the outset, the Educational Governance Framework established key principles, a robust governance structure, an accountabilities framework and a comprehensive reporting process for our educational initiatives. Although Educational Governance is analogous to Clinical Governance as practised by the territorial boards, it reflects our unique educational context and the importance of our relationships with partners in health, education, social services and elsewhere.

The Educational Governance Framework has been implemented vigorously across all our directorates and educational programmes. We have completed four full monitoring cycles encompassing each of our professional directorates and all major educational programmes. As confirmed by external review and internal audit, this work has been successful in assuring the NES Board about the management of educational quality and performance, highlighting areas of good practice and risks, and providing the basis for accountability and control. NES’ experience of Educational Governance, together with regular reviews and audits, and a review of related research literature have greatly enhanced our collective understanding of requirements and good practice in this key area of our work. Accordingly, our core Educational Governance principles, processes and structures have evolved substantially.

The third edition of the Educational Governance Framework reflects our enthusiasm for quality improvement in all our core activities and sets out a vision for further development in a strategic action plan (Appendix 1). We hope the revised governance structures and processes reflect the application of the NHSScotland Quality Strategy ambitions in our work.

We are pleased to present the revised Educational Governance Framework as a key reference document for all NES staff involved in the planning, development, implementation and quality management of education and training.

Malcolm Wright OBE
Chief Executive Officer,
NHS Education for Scotland

1 R.Coward, ‘Educational Governance in the UK National Health Service,’ International Journal for Health Care Quality Assurance (2011)
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“Quality is never an accident; it is always the result of high intention, sincere effort, intelligent direction and skilful execution; it represents the wise choice from many alternatives.”
William A. Foster

1. Introduction

The governance arrangements for organisations such as NES comprise several inter-related elements; starting from broad strategic aims and including the structures and procedures used by organisations to monitor, support and control their activities. In most large organisations and businesses the term corporate governance is a convenient way of referring to various aspects of management including staff governance, performance management, quality assurance, financial management, information governance and research governance. NHSScotland emphasises the importance of effective governance as a means of setting strategic directions and ensuring that performance and quality is continuously improved for the benefit of patients and their families.

For territorial health boards, the critical importance of standards of care is reflected in their reliance on effective clinical governance arrangements. Similarly, given NES’ unique mission within NHSScotland, our educational governance arrangements are a defining feature of the organisation. Since the publication of the original Educational Governance Framework in May 2006, NES remains committed to its key principles. Our collective understanding of Educational Governance concepts and practice has however developed through experience of implementation, frequent review, audit and research. The third edition of the Framework reflects the growing maturity of Educational Governance at NES and presents some key changes in process.

The most significant developments since the publication of the second edition of the Educational Governance Framework stem from the implementation of the three-tier reporting structure. This approach has proven largely effective; allowing the NES Board to focus on the areas of highest risk and facilitating interaction between Board members and senior managers. An additional benefit of this approach has been the release of time to ensure that a wide range of educational programmes is reviewed in greater depth. Since the publication of the revised framework document we have improved the process of critical review at the programme level in the following ways:

- Revision of the Programme Report form to include a new section on inclusive education. This was designed to assist programme teams and reviewers in
considering equality and diversity issues in accordance with the NES Inclusive Education Policy.

- Revision of Programme Reports to require further contextual information relating to inputs (staff members, budget etc) and outputs (numbers of participants, assessment results etc). This section has also been revised to encourage programme teams to report on the progress of planned activities detailed in previous reports.

- Revision of Programme Reports to enable programme teams to reflect on educational infrastructure relating to their workstreams. This infrastructure includes knowledge support (e.g. Knowledge Network portals), online support (e.g. e-Portfolio, Portal), practice education networks etc.

- Provision of detailed guidance for programme teams in preparing quality monitoring reports.

- Provision of guidance for critical readers to assist them in reviewing quality monitoring reports submitted by programme teams.

The Educational Governance Executive Group has reviewed triennial reports from six directorates using the new format. It was not always clear what these reports added to the review of individual programmes, or what should be included within their scope. The process for quality monitoring at this level is substantially revised in the 3rd edition of the Educational Governance Framework to enable directorates to articulate their quality management objectives, processes, good practices and priorities.

In reviewing the Educational Governance Framework we have considered the ambitions of the NHSScotland Quality Strategy, and in particular the need to be more ‘person centred’ in our approach. To this end we have set out arrangements for the involvement of appropriately briefed external partners in our quality monitoring processes. We hope that this step will further enhance our accountability and help ensure that the needs of patients and front line services are at the forefront of our thinking about education and training.

NES has invested significant time and resources in the review and development of educational evaluation. This has enabled us to develop our understanding of quality in this important area of educational practice. The revised Educational Governance Framework places greater emphasis on evaluation practice in our directorates and programme teams, with a particular focus on measuring the impact of educational initiatives.

In summary, we hope the third edition of the Framework builds appropriately on the progress achieved by NES in this area of governance. The Framework will remain a key point of reference for all staff wishing to understand Educational Governance concepts, principles, structures and processes. It may also be of interest to territorial NHS Boards where we believe that Educational Governance

---

2 NES Inclusive Education and Learning Policy, June 2011
3 NHSScotland Quality Strategy - putting people at the heart of our NHS, May 2010
has a potentially significant contribution to make in the quality of education and training, and thus to patient care.

Prof. Brian Durward  
Director, Educational Development  
NHS Education for Scotland
2. What is Educational Governance?

‘Educational Governance’ is increasing practised by healthcare organisations in the UK, although there is no universally accepted definition or approach. Our research at NES indicates that Educational Governance shares characteristics with Clinical Governance, Staff Governance and other aspects of health service management. The explicit purpose of governance in these cases is to maximise accountability for quality improvement in service provision and patient care. This is usually achieved through a framework approach comprising standards, processes and reporting structures. Following this approach, we have defined Educational Governance as:

The systems and standards through which organisations control their educational activities and demonstrate accountability for continuous improvement of quality and performance.


The above cited NES literature review highlights a number of features and desirable characteristics associated with effective practice. These include the need for board involvement and oversight (and accountability), use of appropriate standards and benchmarks, alignment of educational interventions with service needs and organisational/NHS priorities, the importance of quality enhancement and the development of a positive learning culture. Most of the literature also places educational governance in a wider, integrated governance framework comprising elements such as clinical audit, risk management and organisational development.

The current iteration of the Framework and the strategic action plan address each of these areas, ensuring that NES is aligned with contemporary governance practice.
3. Purpose, aims and principles

The central purpose of the Educational Governance Framework is to ensure that all NES educational workstreams are accountable for their quality and performance. To this end the NES Board and senior managers will require assurance that arrangements are in place for effective quality management and that significant risks are visible and subject to appropriate controls. It is further expected that NES will achieve a number of specific benefits from the Framework as described below.

3.1 Specific benefits

• Quality assurance
Among the primary benefits to be derived from educational governance is to ensure the NES Board is in a position to exercise its statutory responsibilities for governance. The NES Board and the senior management team are ultimately accountable for the range and quality of outputs from the organisation. It is therefore important that the most senior levels of the organisation receive regular information about educational quality and the operation of quality management arrangements.

The Board should be confident that standards, structures and mechanisms are in place to maintain and continuously enhance educational quality. This will require robust lines of reporting and the flow of relevant performance data. By maintaining oversight of educational outputs and quality Board members will be in a position to exert control and give direction to the NES executive. It is not expected that the Board will receive detailed information about the operation of individual programmes (although this may be desirable on an exceptional basis).

• Quality enhancement
A major feature of the new Framework is the emphasis placed on quality enhancement. Quality enhancement is defined as taking deliberate steps to bring about continuous improvement in the effectiveness of education provided, funded or quality assured by NES. Through the sharing of good practice and a process of critical review the Educational Governance Framework will contribute to improved service quality and better outcomes.

• Organisational learning and integration
The Educational Governance Framework has proven successful in encouraging inter-professional learning in different aspects of educational practice. We anticipate that the Framework will further support organisational integration by reinforcing the standards emerging from cross-directorate Educational Strategy activities.
• To manage risk and reduce exposure to legal challenge
NES’ educational workstreams are subject to numerous potential risks. The existence of clear standards, reporting lines, robust quality management procedures and well defined accountabilities will contribute significantly to NES’s Risk Management Strategy as it relates to educational activity.

One significant risk for NES is the possible exposure to legal challenge in cases of clinical incidents where the quality of education and training is at issue. In such cases NES should be in a position where it can demonstrate that it has in place appropriate arrangements for identifying and controlling risk, and robust quality management procedures.

• To exercise accountability for educational outputs, quality and value added
NES is increasingly accountable to a growing list of external stakeholders for the relevance, quality and value for money of its educational outputs. The Educational Governance Framework is an important means of demonstrating due process and effective management to the Scottish Government, Healthcare Improvement Scotland, territorial health boards, professional and statutory bodies, the Scottish public etc.

• To demonstrate leadership of the educational governance agenda in NHSScotland.
It is hoped that the Educational Governance Framework will enable NES to demonstrate its leadership of the educational governance agenda in NHSS as envisioned in the initial 2001 consultation paper leading to the establishment of the organisation. This paper expressed the intention to assess the educational performance of local NHS systems in the same way as clinical governance, and in connection with the Staff Governance Framework. NES is sharing its knowledge and experience of Educational Governance with other NHS Health Boards and is actively promoting related concepts, principles and processes.

3.2 Educational Governance principles

Educational Governance at NES is based on the application of key principles. These are derived from NES’s experience of educational quality management, but also take into account relevant research literature on this subject as well as the Good Governance Principles published by the Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services. The Educational Governance principles are as follows:

---

4 NES, Risk Management Strategy (2011)
5 Scottish Executive Health Department, A new special health board for education in NHSScotland, (2001)
6 Independent Commission for Good Governance in Public Services (2004)
a) Educational Governance is focused on enhancement of educational outcomes and consequent improvement of services and patient care. It also helps to ensure alignment of educational services with NES’ corporate values and strategic priorities.

b) Educational Governance processes are integrated within NES’ wider corporate governance structures and processes. To this end appropriate links have been established with systems for Risk Management, Performance Management, Research Governance and the strategic planning processes.

c) Governance processes will be proportionate to the risk and strategic importance of individual educational workstreams.

d) Educational quality management processes involving external partners (including health profession regulators) are subject to scrutiny by the NES Board.

e) The development and implementation of Educational Governance processes are conducted on a multi-professional basis.

f) The NES Board is closely involved in the development of Educational Governance strategy and the scrutiny of process application.

g) There is a risk management approach to quality improvement, with clear action plans and transparent reporting processes.

h) Educational Governance processes minimise bureaucracy and additional work through the re-use of existing reports and data.

i) The quality of NES educational activities is determined through the collection and analysis of evidence against recognised standards. In most cases this will involve peer review by NES staff and external organisations and experts.
4. Elements of Educational Governance

The NES Educational Governance Framework comprises six inter-related elements as illustrated by figure 1 below. Further details on each of these elements are also provided below.

Figure 1. The six elements of the NES Educational Governance Framework

4.1 NES’ organisational values and priorities

As indicated in the Educational Governance principles set out at 3.2 above NES’ Educational Governance Framework ensures that educational services are fully aligned with organisational values and strategic priorities. Accordingly, our Educational Governance Framework will address the following learning principles as expressed in our Strategic Framework 2011-2014⁷:

- Self-managed – participants take ownership of their learning, are fully involved and see how it contributes to their goals

• Experiential – learning through previous life and work experience is recognised and education already completed is used
• Focused – participants know what they want to achieve through prior identification and discussion of aims and objectives
• Relevant – the reason for learning is clear and theories and concepts can be applied in familiar work and life settings
• Inclusive – learning is designed to enable and maximise opportunities for participation
• Practical – participants agree how and why the learning is useful to them

These principles provide a broad guide to planning and evaluating NES' educational initiatives. NES also expects that all educational workstreams will address strategic priorities as set out in the Strategic Framework, Corporate Plan and other corporate planning documents. By ensuring appropriate alignment of educational workstreams with corporate principles and priorities, Educational Governance processes will support performance management and reporting.

4.2 Governance principles

In addition to the above organisational values and priorities, the NES Framework is based on the nine key principles for educational governance set out in 3.2 above. The governance principles provide a robust set of design criteria for the development and implementation of governance structures and quality management processes.

4.3 Governance structures and lines of reporting

The Educational Governance structure set out in Figure 2 (below) has delegated authority from the NES Board to ensure appropriate delegation of responsibility and effective internal communication and control. At the heart of the Educational Governance Framework is the Educational and Research Governance Committee (E&RGC), which has primary responsibility for ensuring robust quality management arrangements throughout NES. It is responsible for strategic oversight of the development, implementation and review of educational standards (as appropriate) and quality enhancement mechanisms. It also has primary responsibility for scrutinising the operation of governance and quality mechanisms to ensure they are effective. The E&RGC comprises non-executive Board members and reports directly to the NES Board.

Responsibility for monitoring educational quality and performance is delegated to the Educational Governance Executive Group. The Executive Group is a multi-professional forum comprising Educational Governance leads from each of the NES directorates. It is chaired by the Director of Educational Development and supported by an Educational Projects Manager who acts as operational lead for
Educational Governance. The primary function of the Executive Group is to monitor educational performance and quality through the analysis of reports submitted by directorates and project teams. It is also responsible for the development of educational governance monitoring arrangements in accordance with the strategic direction set by the Educational Governance Committee. The remits for the Educational Governance Committee and Executive Group are provided at Appendix 3.

Educational Governance responsibilities are shared widely throughout NES. This is reflected by the creation of quality management and educational groups for individual directorates and/or educational programmes. These directorate level groups lead on the development, implementation and review of quality management arrangements for their respective professional groups or cross-cutting initiatives. In other directorates, educational governance functions fall within the remit of Professional Advisory Groups and similar forums.

At the level of individual educational programmes and projects, it is expected that programme boards and project steering groups will manage quality and performance. NES' Educational Governance structures are illustrated by Figure 2 below.
Figure 2: NES Educational Governance structures

**NES Board**
Final accountability for educational quality and performance to external stakeholders and has authority to:
- Determine the educational governance framework and strategic direction
- Set educational principles and standards

**Educational & Research Governance Committee**
Accountable to the NES Board and has delegated authority to:
- Oversee the development, implementation and review of educational quality standards and mechanisms
- Scrutinise the operation of educational quality assurance and enhancement arrangements
- Receive data and reports from the Educational Governance Executive Group
- Report to the NES Board

**Educational Governance Executive Group**
- Delegated authority from the Educational & Research Governance Committee for quality monitoring
- Requests and analyses quality monitoring reports from directorates
- Report to the Educational & Research Governance Committee
- Responsible for the development, implementation and review of corporate educational quality standards and management arrangements

**Executive Team**
- Approving strategy and action plans prior to consideration by E&RGC
- Operational policy decisions for NES on Educational Governance
- Resource allocation for Educational Governance
- Monitoring progress

**Educational Governance mechanisms within education directorates**
Responsible for the local development, implementation and review of quality management mechanisms and reporting to the Educational Governance Executive Group or E&RGC

| Nursing, Midwifery & AHP Ed. Gov Group | Medicine Quality Management Group | Dental Educational Gov Group |
| Pharmacy | Psychology | Educational Development |
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4.4 Risk Management

As indicated in 3.1 above, one of the specific benefits of the Educational Governance Framework is to assist with the management of risk. This is achieved through the identification, management and reporting of educational risks, which ensures that programme teams, directorates and wider NES are aware of key risks and have mitigating measures in place. Reporting of educational risks to governance groups also ensures that senior managers and Board committees are able to intervene in exceptional cases.

The focus on educational risk as part of Educational Governance processes allows integration with corporate NES Risk Registers and risk management processes.

4.5 Standards and criteria

NES and partner organisations use standards and criteria to express the quality required of educational initiatives and activities. In several contexts these standards are set by external bodies, such as healthcare profession regulators (e.g. Health Care Professions Council) and the Quality Assurance Agency’s Subject Benchmark statements. In other cases, standards are developed by NES programme teams according to the specific requirements of educational projects.

Educational quality management processes involve the application of judgements about compliance with external and NES educational standards.

4.6 Quality management procedures

NES operates procedures for managing educational quality at various levels of the organisation. These include the processes used for individual projects and courses (e.g. learner feedback mechanisms, validation processes, project evaluations etc), whole directorates (such as the NMAHP self-assessment framework and the Medical Quality Management Framework) and for NES as a whole. These procedures may be specified by external regulatory and professional bodies, but directorates and programme teams often have discretion to determine their own quality management arrangements according to professional, organisational and policy contexts. NES’s corporate processes will focus on the adequacy of 'local' quality management, compliance with external or internally set standards, and improvements achieved or required.
Although the quality management processes applying to workstreams and programmes are context driven, they should also comply with any relevant NES policies, processes and standards. For example, it is expected that NES funded or designed educational programmes will be consistent with the NES Inclusive Learning & Education Policy.

### Inclusive Education and Learning

The NES Inclusive Education and Learning Policy is an important reference point for Educational Governance. This sets out our commitment to making education and training accessible and inclusive of learners who may find themselves at risk of marginalisation or exclusion. Our approach to inclusive education will be proportionate and flexible, and will be suited to the professional or multiprofessional context in which education is being developed.

Educational Governance reports should demonstrate how directorates and programme teams have acted to make education more inclusive in the following ways:

- Developing educational products and resources inclusively, in response to learners’ needs and in accordance with best practice
- Engaging with our educational service users on an ongoing basis to understand their diverse needs, and using this knowledge to inform the way we carry out our work
- Promoting equality of opportunity in access to the education which is being offered
- Providing accessible learning, learning support and reasonable adjustments to support access to education and enhancement of outcomes from education
- Delivering education, training and learning inclusively where NES is the direct provider of training
- Developing the knowledge and skills of our staff to support inclusive education
- Integrating the review of inclusive education into educational governance arrangements in an effective, proportionate manner.

The corporate Educational Governance procedures are set out in Section 5 below.
5. Processes and structures

5.1 Accountabilities

Clear accountability for educational quality and performance, and quality management processes is a key feature of the Educational Governance Framework. The assignment of accountability and responsibilities means that there is clear ownership of workstreams, procedures and issues, and a locus for control. NES's arrangements are set out in the Accountabilities Framework at Appendix 2, which illustrates Board, management and operational responsibilities for Educational Governance and educational quality.

5.2 Educational quality monitoring procedures

NES operates a range of procedures for the management, assurance and control of educational quality. As indicated above, these arrangements are used at the level of our directorates, programmes or individual projects. Others are at the corporate level, and are designed to provide the Educational & Research Governance Committee, Strategic Managers and the Board with maximum assurance about quality management, risk management and quality improvement in relation to our educational workstreams.

The educational quality monitoring procedures set out below accord with the Educational Governance principles at Section 3 above. Thus, reporting and scrutiny arrangements are designed to be:

- focused on enhancement of educational outcomes (not just outputs),
- integrated within NES's wider corporate governance structures and processes,
- proportionate to the risk and strategic importance of individual educational workstreams,
- conducted on a multi-professional basis,
- as efficient as possible, minimising bureaucracy and additional work.

5.2.1 Quality monitoring reports

The central corporate monitoring process is the production and analysis of quality monitoring reports for NES educational workstreams. In keeping with the principle of proportionality, the type and frequency of report is related to the strategic risk and importance of individual workstreams. High profile, high risk, permanent workstreams are the subject of more detailed and frequent reports than lower risk, time-limited educational projects. A schedule of the NES Educational Projects subject to quality monitoring, and the frequency and type of report is presented at Appendix 4.
Although the frequency and format of quality monitoring reports will differ between workstreams, they are all designed to provide assurance about quality and risk management. This may involve the presentation of pre-existing quality reports (such as Annual Deanery Reports required by the General Medical Council) or the use of the NES report template (Appendix 5). Whatever report format is used programme teams, deaneries or directorates will be expected to provide assurance on the following points:

- adherence to relevant educational standards (including the NES Inclusive Education Policy);
- alignment with NES educational objectives as set out in the Strategic Framework and Corporate Plan;
- appropriate structures, standards, resources and processes are in place to evaluate and manage educational quality and performance;
- areas for improvement and enhancement have been identified and plans are in place to address these;
- areas of educational risk are identified and managed effectively.

Educational Governance reports should be approved by the accountable managers and groups prior to submission for review by the Educational Governance Executive Group or Educational & Research Governance Committee. The line of reporting (to either the E&RGC or EGEG) will depend on the involvement of health profession regulatory bodies. Where educational workstreams are subject to such external scrutiny, reports will be submitted directly to the Educational & Research Governance Committee and copied to the Executive Group. The Schedule presented at Appendix 4 indicates the Educational Governance forum responsible for considering quality monitoring reports, together with the report format and frequency. The Educational Governance report template is presented at Appendix 5.

The three quality monitoring processes are set out in Figure 3 below.
Figure 3. Summary of corporate quality monitoring processes

i) Significant workstreams subject to external scrutiny (including externally regulated education)

**Scope:**
Educational Governance reports are required for significant educational workstreams subject to scrutiny by an external regulator, professional body, or governmental agency. Such workstreams are considered critical to NES's overall mission and receive major resource allocations. This type of educational activity is associated with exposure to high levels of reputational and financial risk.

**Frequency:** Annual (plus other reports as required)

**Format:**
Directorates submit copies of reports to and from professional, statutory and regulatory bodies indicating compliance with standards and planned enhancement/remedial activity. Such reports also provide details of feedback from regulatory bodies including overall assessments and recommendations.

**Governance route and process:**
Reports on significant workstreams subject to external regulation are submitted directly to the Educational & Research Governance Committee for review and comment. Reports are also submitted to the Educational Governance Executive Group for information. The lead officer responsible for this type of educational workstream (or their senior representative) will normally attend E&RGC meetings to present reports and respond to questions and observations.
ii) Significant educational workstreams not subject to external regulation

Scope: A second category of Educational Governance report covers significant educational workstreams not subject to external regulation or other types of formal scrutiny. This educational activity is associated with exposure to high levels of reputational and/or financial risk and often addresses national policy priorities and targets.

Frequency: Biennial

Format: Programme Teams submit a standard Educational Governance report providing a comprehensive overview of the initiative. Specifically, this includes:
• a description of the programme (purpose, origins, objectives, inputs, outputs etc)
• arrangements in place for the management of quality and performance (governance, quality assurance processes, evaluation etc),
• the standards or criteria against which the initiative is evaluated/assessed,
• evidence of performance against the defined standards or criteria;
• areas of achievement or practice worthy of sharing and dissemination
• an action plan detailing priorities for quality enhancement/performance improvement
• an assessment of the main risks to the initiative and the related control measures

Governance route and process: Reports on significant educational workstreams not subject to external regulation are initially considered by the Educational Governance Executive Group (analysis will be led by a designated Critical Reader). The report, together with a summary of the outcomes of the Executive Group review and the programme team's response is submitted to the Educational & Research Governance Committee for scrutiny of due process and additional comment.

The allocation of NES educational workstreams to one of the reporting routes described above is subject to agreement between the corporate Educational Governance team and the Professional Leads in each directorate and the respective Educational Governance Lead. The distribution of workstreams between the different categories of reporting and the related governance processes are illustrated by the algorithm at Figure 4 below.
iii) Directorate review events

**Scope:**
In addition to considering reports on educational projects and programmes NES will review each of its education directorates on a regular cycle. This process involves a review of all directorate educational activities, including systems of governance and quality management.

**Frequency:** Triennial

**Format:**
The review will involve the discussion and analysis of submitted documentation and a presentation at a review event. The review event will involve the relevant director and other directorate representatives who will present to the Educational Governance Executive Group plus external representatives and other NES staff. The event will be chaired by a member of the Educational Leadership Group.

**Governance route and process:**
The Review Panel will meet with the Directorate Team to exchange information and discuss issues. A summary report of the event will be prepared by the Executive Secretary to the EGEG, which will be checked for accuracy by the Directorate and confirmed by the Review Panel. The report will be submitted to the Educational & Research Governance Committee for information and scrutiny of process. It will also be copied to the NES Executive Team for information.
5.2.2 Critical reading
Programme reports considered by the Educational Governance Executive Group are subject to review by a Critical Reader who takes lead responsibility for analysis. The purpose of the critical reading process is to ensure that Educational Governance Quality Monitoring reports are subject to thorough scrutiny and analysis. In discharging this responsibility the Critical Reader will lead the Executive Group discussion relating to the monitoring report and prepare questions for the programme/directorate team for clarification and explanation. It is recommended that these questions are distributed prior to the meeting if possible.
The main focus for the process is the quality monitoring report, which is forwarded to the critical reader four weeks before the EGEG meeting by the Secretary. Reports are usually accompanied by supporting information such as evaluation reports, procedural documents, external review reports, summaries of participant feedback etc. The supporting documents will typically be used to obtain further information or assurance on issues raised by the main report, or to seek clarification.

### Evaluating education and measuring impact

Evaluation is recognised as an important part of the educational development process and is practiced widely at NES. In early 2012 a cross-directorate working group reviewed the different approaches to educational evaluation employed by professional directorates and programme teams to identify good practice examples and key learning points.

The report of the review ([Measuring Impact and Evaluating Education](#)) indicates that the evaluation process and evaluation outcomes should provide key focuses for Educational Governance at NES. It further suggests that programme teams and directorates should, where possible, identify the impact of NES educational activities on healthcare services and the patient experience.

It is assumed that all successful educational activities will have a positive effect in one or more of the following areas: service productivity, service quality, cost savings, time savings, improvements in relationships (external or internal to the organization) and innovation.

In the light of the review, Educational Governance reports and Critical Reviewer/EGEG analyses should provide assurance about evaluation methods used and information about impact.

The particular focuses of the critical reading process are to:

- Identify areas of the report for clarification;
- Identify where further information is needed;
- Seek assurance that the quality and risk management arrangements (including evaluations) are fit for purpose;
- Identify evidence that education and training is developed and delivered in a way that is inclusive of the needs and preferences of all learners
- Identify evidence of appropriate impact, quality and performance;
- Highlight particular quality and performance issues for further attention
- Ensure that the directorate's work/project/initiative fits well with NES, Scottish Government and professional standards, strategies and imperatives
- Highlight good practice and achievements worthy of dissemination and inter-professional learning.
- Check that planned quality enhancement activities are appropriate and address main quality issues highlighted in the report.
- Check that strategic and operational risks to educational quality and performance have been identified and that suitable arrangements are in place to manage these.

Critical Readers are members of the Educational Governance Executive Group and will be provided with information and briefing to assist them in their role.
5.2.3 Directorate review events

In addition to reviewing reports from educational programmes and projects, the Educational Governance Executive Group will hold triennial peer review events for each NES educational directorate. The purpose of these events is to take a broad overview of the directorate and to seek assurance that educational performance and quality is being managed effectively. A secondary purpose is to ensure that smaller educational workstreams and projects are subject to scrutiny. The review is an opportunity for directorates to explain the arrangements in place for quality assurance/improvement and to present evidence of current performance in key workstreams. An important area of focus is directorates’ good practice and successes, as well as the emerging issues to be addressed with remedial action.

Prior to the event, the Directorate will be invited to submit a concise self-assessment report to the review panel together with key supporting documents. The report and supporting documents should provide evidence of processes, performance, and quality.

Review Panel composition

The Review Panel will comprise the members of the Educational Governance Executive Group together with a member of the NES Educational Leadership Group who will act as Chair. In addition, the Directorate under review will be asked to identify up to four independent external witnesses who can comment on issues of educational quality and performance. These external nominees should be in a position to provide informed comment on at least one educational workstream and could include representatives of professional and regulatory bodies, service user organisations, representatives from counterparts in other UK countries etc. The external panel members will be fully briefed on the process and are expected to take an equal part in panel discussions.

Running order

The event itself will begin with a brief meeting of the review panel followed by a presentation from the Directorate team. Members of the review panel have an opportunity to ask questions relating to the submitted documentation and presentation; seeking clarification where necessary, asking for additional information, or asking the directorate to respond to observations. Following this plenary session the panel will meet to highlight key points for inclusion in a final report, and to identify any residual areas where greater clarity is needed.

Outputs and outcomes

In concluding the event the panel will make summative observations identifying areas of good practice for wider notice and issues for attention by the Directorate. Panel members may also make specific recommendations to the Directorate where it is considered there are opportunities for improvement e.g. collaboration with other directorates or external organisations. The panel may
also stipulate requirements where there is clear evidence the remedial action or quality improvement is needed. The review event concludes with a meeting between the Panel and the Director to feedback key points, recommendations and any requirements. The standard agenda for review events is presented at Appendix 6.

The review report
Following the event, the Educational Projects Manager will produce a report summarising the evidence submitted, information from the directorate presentation, questions from the panel, directorate responses and the panel’s concluding observations and recommendations/requirements. Once the report is approved by the Review Panel, it will be forwarded to the directorate to check for accuracy and to provide final comments about the outcomes and process. The final report will be presented to the Educational & Research Governance Committee, which will check that due process has been followed and comment on the themes and issues emerging. The NES Executive Team will receive a copy of the report for information.

Detailed guidance for Directorate Teams in drafting self-assessments, collating evidence and preparing presentations and for members of the Review Panel will be provided.

5.2.4 Outcomes of quality monitoring processes

i) Biennial programme reports
The output from the reporting process to the Executive Group will be summative comments about the quality and performance of key educational initiatives, together with recommendations to the directorate, deanery or programme team about enhancements or issues raised. The directorate or programme team will respond to the comments and recommendations indicating future action to be taken. The response may challenge particular Executive Group recommendations; citing appropriate reasons.

The monitoring report, together with the Executive Group comments and recommendations and the team's response will be forwarded to the Educational & Research Governance Committee. The Committee’s role in this respect will be to ensure that due process has been implemented effectively and to identify any issues relating to the design or implementation of the control measures.

Where reports are submitted directly to the Educational & Research Governance Committee they will be the subject of review by members. The outcome of this review will be summary comments about educational quality, quality management arrangements, risk etc together with recommendations. Reports submitted directly to the E&RGC will be circulated to E&E members for information together with the pertaining Committee minutes.
ii) Triennial directorate review reports
Reports of Directorate Reviews will be prepared by the Educational Governance team following the review events. These reports will document the following:

- The review process and participants
- Documentation submitted by the directorate
- Key points from the Director’s presentation
- Quality improvement priorities
- Commendations, comments and questions raised by EEG EG members and others together with the Directorate’s responses
- Noteworthy practice and recommendations
- Final comments from the Director about the review process and issues raised

When the draft report has been approved by the Director of EDD it is sent to the relevant Director to check for accuracy and for final comments. It is then finally approved by the EEG EG before distribution to the Educational & Research Governance Committee and Business Group (for information only in the latter case).

The triennial directorate review process will be evaluated in late-2014 or after four review events (whichever is soonest).

5.2.5 Action plans
A key feature of the Educational Governance quality monitoring process is the development and scrutiny of action plans relating to the future direction of the directorate, programme or project. Action plans are developed by the directorate or programme team to indicate quality enhancement priorities for the next reporting period. These priorities should address areas for improvement indicated by the need for compliance with relevant standards, feedback from learners and other stakeholders, learner performance, recruitment statistics, evaluation studies, research findings, changes in clinical practice, new legislation, policy and guidelines etc. As usual for action plans, they will specify the groups and individuals responsible for the planned improvements and the anticipated timescales for completion.

Action plans presented in quality monitoring reports will be re-visited in subsequent reports to assess the progress achieved in implementing planned improvements.
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### Educational Governance action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Target dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NES is more accountable for educational quality.</td>
<td>Educational Governance reports are made available through the NES website.</td>
<td>NES Educational Governance summary reports are uploaded to NES Educational Governance web page</td>
<td>Educational Projects Manager, EDD</td>
<td>From January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Governance supports integration of NES Education Strategy outcomes</td>
<td>Educational Governance processes used to ensure alignment of educational practice with standards, good practice guidance, recommendations etc emerging from Education Strategy activities</td>
<td>EGG and ERGC members to receive reports and other materials produced by Education Strategy groups. EG report templates revised to include references to Education Strategy outcomes (as required). Guidance to programme teams and critical readers revised to include references to Education Strategy outcomes (as required).</td>
<td>Educational Projects Manager, EDD</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES staff have better understanding of Education Governance benefits, principles and processes.</td>
<td>A wider group of NES staff are aware of Educational Governance principles and practice through events, communication activities and</td>
<td>Education and Research Forum event. Revised EG intranet and NES website pages</td>
<td>Educational Projects Manager, EDD</td>
<td>Winter 2012/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Focus/NES Express articles</th>
<th>January 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NES demonstrates compliance with the NHSS Healthcare Quality Standard in relation to the use of data</td>
<td>Identification of educational metrics to comply with requirements of the Healthcare Quality Standard. Integration of quality metrics in Educational Governance processes.</td>
<td>Educational Projects Manager, EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance produced on identifying suitable metrics for use by directorates and programme teams. Agreed process for integrating education quality metrics in governance processes as required</td>
<td>Educational Projects Manager, EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Accountability Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility of:</th>
<th>Responsible for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NES Board</strong></td>
<td>Approves the overall strategic direction and framework for educational governance. The Board has ultimate accountability for educational quality and performance and delegates authority to the Educational &amp; Research Governance Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Educational & Research Governance Committee** | Responsible for the system of educational quality management. Its remit is to:  
  - advise the Board on educational quality assurance and enhancement issues which may influence NES’ strategic direction.  
  - oversee the development of educational standards and quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms;  
  - scrutinise the effectiveness of educational governance arrangements;  
  - arrange for the ongoing monitoring of educational quality against agreed standards.  
  - report to the Board on outcomes of Committee activity.  
  - undertake such work as may be delegated by the Board.  
  - work in partnership on educational governance and enhancement issues with other Board standing committees and external agencies.  

The Committee delegates scrutiny and monitoring functions to an Executive Group. |
| **Educational Governance Executive Group** | Responsible for the development, implementation and review of educational governance principles, standards and processes. Its remit is to:  
  - develop a three-year schedule of work, ensuring that directorate quality management arrangements and major educational activities are subject to scrutiny and monitoring.  
  - develop appropriate quality monitoring methodologies and recommend these to the Educational & Research Governance Committee for approval.  
  - request, receive and scrutinise reports from the directorates in accordance with agreed quality monitoring methodologies.  
  - report the outcomes of scrutiny and monitoring activities to the Committee, highlighting noteworthy practice and issues for attention.  
  - undertake such work as may be delegated by the Committee.  
  - work in partnership with relevant external agencies on educational governance and quality enhancement issues. |
| Directorate Educational Governance groups | Directorates will convene educational governance groups (or otherwise assign Educational Governance responsibilities to other management groups) according to contexts. They will be responsible for:  
- Developing, implementing and reviewing quality assurance mechanisms for the directorate or individual workstreams  
- Ensuring alignment of directorate educational programmes and educational management with external requirements and NES guidance  
- Monitoring implementation of quality management processes  
- Analysis of performance data  
- Reporting to Educational Governance Executive Group |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Overall executive responsibility for educational quality and performance management arrangements within NES,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Director for Educational Governance</td>
<td>As Executive Lead for Educational Governance, has corporate responsibility for advising the Educational &amp; Research Governance Committee, Business Group and NES Board on the development, implementation and review of educational governance arrangements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Executive Team | Approving Educational Governance processes, strategy and action plans prior to consideration by E&RGC  
- Operational policy decisions for NES on Educational Governance as required  
- Resource allocation for Educational Governance  
- Monitoring progress |
| Directorates | Each NES Directorate will have (a) designated member(s) of staff with responsibility for leading on:  
- Developing quality management systems  
- Monitoring educational outputs  
- Providing advice and support on educational quality management issues;  
- Involving other NES staff and external representatives in educational quality management processes;  
- Work with the other designated quality management staff to bring consistency to the NES wide approach, share knowledge and experience, make the necessary changes happen e.g. process or behavioural changes. |
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Committee remits

Educational and Research Governance Committee Terms of Reference

Purpose
The Educational and Research Governance Committee (E&RGC) is established as a standing committee of the NES Board with delegated authority for quality improvement in core areas of business. It is responsible for ensuring that educational and research activities are governed to standards of best practice to ensure compliance with external regulation and statutory requirements. The Committee is also accountable for putting in place arrangements for monitoring educational and research initiatives against agreed priorities and aligning educational and educational research activities with NES' values and strategic aims.

The E&RGC’s governance responsibilities include scrutiny of NES compliance with statutory requirements, NHSScotland policy and good practice in equality and diversity as it affects education and training. The Committee also promotes effective patient focus and public involvement in NES workstreams and monitors compliance with statutory requirements and NHSScotland standards in this regard.

Remit
The Educational & Research Governance Committee has delegated authority to:

- advise the Board on matters relating to educational research and the management of educational quality;
- oversee the development and implementation of strategies, policies, structures and processes governing educational research and the management of educational quality;
- be assured of the effective management of educational and educational research programmes, including the identification and management of risk;
- monitor compliance of educational activities with statutory duties, NHSScotland policy and NES priorities in relation to equality and diversity;
- promote collaboration within NES and with external agencies in relation to educational governance, educational research, development and evaluation;
- promote education and training in relation to research and quality management within NES and to monitor capacity and capability in these areas;
• promote effective patient focus and the involvement of service users in NES workstreams, and monitor compliance with statutory requirements and NHSScotland standards in this regard;
• monitor approval processes for disbursement of educational research funds;
• work collaboratively with other Board standing committees in relation to educational quality and educational research;
• encourage innovative and creative approaches in all aspects of educational research and educational governance;
• report to the Board on the outcomes of NES educational governance activity and research and development programmes.

The remit of the Educational & Research Governance Committee will be reviewed annually.
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Educational Governance Executive Group – remit and membership

Purpose
The Educational Governance Executive Group has delegated responsibility from the Educational & Research Governance Committee (‘the Committee’) to scrutinise quality assurance mechanisms and monitor educational quality within the NES professional directorates and functions.

The Executive Group also promotes effective patient focus and public involvement in NES workstreams and monitors compliance with statutory requirements and NHSScotland standards in this regard.

The Educational Governance Executive Group reports directly to the Educational & Research Governance Committee.

Remit
The remit of the Educational Governance Executive Group is to:

i. develop a three-year plan of work, ensuring that all directorate quality management arrangements and major educational activities are subject to scrutiny and monitoring.

ii. develop appropriate quality standards and monitoring methodologies and recommend these to the Committee for approval.

iii. request, receive and review reports from the directorates in accordance with agreed quality monitoring methodologies.

iv. promote and monitor the participation of service users in NES workstreams and quality monitoring processes against statutory requirements and NHSScotland standards.

v. report the outcomes of review and monitoring activities to the Committee, highlighting noteworthy practice and issues for attention.

vi. undertake such work as may be delegated by the Committee.

vii. work in partnership with relevant external agencies on educational governance, service user participation and quality enhancement issues.

Membership
The membership of the Educational Governance Executive Group will comprise representatives from the following NES directorates and functions:

Director of Educational Development (Chair)
One representative from each of the following professional groups:
- Allied Health Professions
- Dentistry
- Educational Development
- Nursing and Midwifery
- Medicine
- Medicine (General Practice)
- Pharmacy
• Psychology
Educational Projects Manager (Executive Secretary)
Equality & Diversity Adviser
Educational Projects Manager (PFPI)

The Executive Group may also co-opt representatives of relevant external agencies or service users as required.

**Frequency of meetings**
The Executive Group will meet a minimum of four times per year, and on further occasions each year for the review of directorates.

The remit and membership will be reviewed annually.
**Appendix 4**

**Quality monitoring report schedule 2013- 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme/Directorate</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>E&amp;RCG Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre – Reg Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td>Biennial/Standalone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Health (NMAHP)</td>
<td>Biennial/Standalone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optometrist report</td>
<td>Biennial/Standalone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Clinical Psychology programme</td>
<td>Biennial/Standalone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology Practitioner Masters programmes</td>
<td>Biennial/Standalone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme/Directorate</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>ERGC Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Skills Programme</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental ACT</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Deaneries</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Education Facilitator programme</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Directorate HCPC report</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine e-Portfolio</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Leadership Unit</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 4</td>
<td>Programme/Directorate</td>
<td>Type of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dental Directorate Report ?</td>
<td>Triennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre – Reg Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td>biennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Registration Pharmacist Scheme (PRPS)</td>
<td>biennial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGE Cycle 5</th>
<th>Programme/Directorate</th>
<th>Type of report</th>
<th>E&amp;RG C meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1</td>
<td>Quality Improvement Medical Deaneries</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2</td>
<td>Dental Biennial report to include</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Undergraduate BDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Undergraduate BSc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CPD (Dental)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre Registration Dental Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Start courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clinical dental technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dental Training Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dental Vocational Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDD Directorate Report</td>
<td>triennial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHP Career Fellowships Scheme</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3</td>
<td>Healthcare Scientists</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Psychology Doctorate</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Psychology Practitioner</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Associated Infection</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 4 Optometrist report</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGE6 Cycle 6</th>
<th>Programme/Directorate</th>
<th>Type of report</th>
<th>ERGC meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1</td>
<td>Child Health (NMAHP)</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Skills Programme</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Deaneries</td>
<td>annual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2</td>
<td>NMAHP Directorate Report</td>
<td>triennial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice Education Facilitator programme</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3</td>
<td>Medicine e-Portfolio</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology Directorate HCPC report</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Leadership Unit</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 4</td>
<td>Pre – Reg Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine Directorate Report</td>
<td>triennial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Registration Pharmacist Scheme (PRPS)</td>
<td>biennial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NHS Education for Scotland

NHS Education for Scotland
Educational Governance

Programme Report
This form is for use by Programme Teams in reporting to the Educational & Research Governance Committee in relation to the management of educational quality and performance. The report is to be used for significant educational workstreams not subject to external regulation.

Programme: 

Directorate: 

Completed by: 

Date approved by Programme Lead/ Director: 

1. Reporting period
Please state the dates to which this report refers (this should be the period since the previous Educational Governance report).

2. Context for the report
Please indicate which projects and initiatives are covered by the report, providing a brief description of their purpose and other key information. This should include the programme inputs (staff, budget and other resources) and outputs (e.g. numbers of courses presented, numbers of learners successfully completing). Where the report relates to initiatives that have been subject to previous quality monitoring reports, this section should list the priority actions set out in the first report and indicate the progress achieved against each one. This information can be presented as a table.

December 2012
3. Quality improvement strategy
Please provide a brief description (or a reference to accompanying documentation) of the quality improvement strategy pertaining to the Programme. This should describe matters such as programme governance, programme development, validation/approval or accreditation, external regulation and evaluations. Please use this section to identify the individuals and groups accountable and responsible for programme quality and performance.

4. Standards and performance criteria
Please indicate what standards, objectives and performance criteria are used to appraise the quality of the Programme. How are standards and performance criteria used to gauge quality (e.g. programme review, quality assurance visits)?

5. Quality improvement
Please indicate how quality management processes are used to affect improvements in educational and service outcomes. Where possible, provide examples of where measurable improvements in quality and performance have been identified through evaluation and other quality improvement approaches e.g. LEAN, Total Quality Management.

6. Quality and performance outcomes
Please provide details of noteworthy issues relating to educational quality and performance. This should include areas of high quality or issues requiring remedial action. This analysis of educational performance during the reporting period should be based on the performance indicators, objectives and standards specified in the report. It should provide an account of progress toward objectives and targets, and issues to be addressed in future activity.

This section may be used to comment on dimensions of educational quality such as impact on service, the learner experience (including attainment), recruitment, selection and appointment, delivery of curriculum including assessment, support and development of trainees, trainers and local faculty
Evidence of quality and performance outcomes will normally be derived from evaluation activities, programme reviews/reports, assessment data and quality improvement activities.

7. Key achievements and innovation
Please describe any key achievements and innovative practice demonstrated during the reporting period (for example, development of new provision to meet service needs, enhancement of existing provision).

8. Complaints
Did you receive complaints or negative comments\(^8\) relating to the programme? Please record the number and nature of the complaints/negative comments received, together with an indication how they were resolved and the time taken to do so. Importantly, please indicate lessons learned through the complaints and the actions taken to improve quality and/or performance as a result.

9. Inclusivity
Please describe the measures taken to ensure that educational initiatives are fully inclusive of all learners within the target staff group(s). This section of the report should be used to record key points from related Equality Impact Assessments and any reasonable adjustments\(^9\) made to enable learners to participate and succeed in NES education and training initiatives.

10. Educational infrastructure
Many of NES’ educational initiatives involve infrastructure provided by other NES directorates and teams, or by external organisations. Briefly describe the external educational infrastructure for the programme including tutors, educational supervisors, ePortal, e-Portfolio, learning management systems, and Knowledge Network services.

---

\(^8\) This excludes negative ratings or comments submitted as part of a NES evaluation exercise.

\(^9\) The Equality Act 2010 requires service providers and employers to make ‘reasonable adjustments’ to facilitate access for people with disabilities. Guidance on reasonable adjustments is available from Kristi Long (kristi.long@nes.scot.nhs.uk)
11. Quality improvement priorities

Reflecting on the educational quality issues identified above, describe how the Programme Team plans to improve educational quality in the next reporting period. This should include anticipated changes to quality management/improvement processes.

The status of items identified in the action plan will be addressed in the subsequent quality monitoring reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue to be addressed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible officer(s)</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December 2012
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## 12. Risk assessment and management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk identified</th>
<th>Exposure to NES</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Actions planned or taken to address the identified risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact (1 to 5 scale)</td>
<td>Likelihood (1 to 5 scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Schedule for directorate review events

Panel members:
- Chair – a member of the NES Educational Leadership Group
- External members as nominated by directorate under review (up to 4)
- Members of the Educational Governance Executive Group including Educational Projects Manager who will record the event and produce a final report.

Directorate Team:
- Director and up to 10 other directorate staff

AGENDA

Private meeting of Review Panel for introductions and initial thoughts on the submitted documents

Welcome to Directorate Team and introductory remarks from the Chair

Presentation by Directorate Team

Question and Answer session

Private meeting of Review Panel to agree key points for final report and any recommendations or requirements

Final session with Directorate Team for feedback and closing remarks from the Chair including a summary of the next steps in the process
Appendix 7

Glossary of terms

Clinical Governance The means through which NHS organisations are accountable for both continuously improving the quality of their services, and safeguarding high standards of care, by creating an environment in which excellence in clinical care will flourish. Management of clinical risk at an organisational level is an important aspect of clinical governance. Clinical risk management recognises that risk can arise at many points in a patient’s journey, and that aspects of organisational management can systematically influence the degree of risk.

Educational Governance The systems and standards through which organisations control their educational activities and demonstrate accountability for continuous improvement of quality and performance.

Quality Assurance The systems and procedures used to ensure that quality standards are built into educational programmes from the outset (e.g. programme approval arrangements, procedural documentation).

Quality Control The monitoring and moderation of outcomes to ensure they are maintained at a consistent level and that variations in performance are rectified.

Quality Enhancement The planned and systematic procedures and interventions designed to bring about continuous quality improvement.

Quality Management The totality of quality control, quality assurance and quality enhancement arrangements.

Risk Management The systematic identification, evaluation and treatment of risk. A continuous process with the aim of reducing risk to organisations and individuals.
## Appendix 8

### Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Bennison</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Postgraduate Education, Medicine</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jenny.bennison@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Jenny.bennison@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0131 650 8085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Brailey</td>
<td>Assistant Director Pharmacy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Arlene.brailey@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Arlene.brailey@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0141 223 1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Coward</td>
<td>Educational Projects Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rob.coward@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Rob.coward@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0131 313 8095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Durward</td>
<td>Director, Educational Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Brian.Durward@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Brian.Durward@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0131 313 8010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isobel Madden</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Dental Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Isobel.Madden@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Isobel.Madden@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>01463 255 842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Irvine</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Medicine, Medical Group</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stewart.irvine@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Stewart.irvine@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0131 313 8129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Lam</td>
<td>Director AHPs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sonya.Lam@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Sonya.Lam@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0131 313 8011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Parry</td>
<td>Associate Director, NMAHP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.parry@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Robert.parry@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0131 220 8686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Thomson</td>
<td>Director of Training for Psychology Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Judy.thomson@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Judy.thomson@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0131 313 8009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Williams</td>
<td>Educational Projects Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Simon.williams@nes.scot.nhs.uk">Simon.williams@nes.scot.nhs.uk</a></td>
<td>0131 313 8079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>