

# Multi-Professional Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation Report



Quality Assurance of Local Education and Training Providers

Developing people  
for health and  
healthcare

[www.hee.nhs.uk](http://www.hee.nhs.uk)



## **Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Executive Summary.....</b>	3
<b>Introduction.....</b>	8
<b>Evaluation Process.....</b>	10
<b>Data Feedback.....</b>	11
Dental MPR Working Group Members.....	11
Panel Chairs and Panel Members.....	15
Learners and Educators.....	19
Lay Representatives.....	22
Multi-Professional Approach: What went well? / How could we improve in the future?.....	23
General Housekeeping.....	26
<b>Discussion and Recommendations.....</b>	29
Discussion.....	29
Recommendations.....	31
<b>Summary.....</b>	32
<b>Appendix A: Dental MPR Working Group Members.....</b>	33
<b>Appendix B: Panel Chairs and Panel Members Survey...</b>	35
<b>Appendix C: Learners and Educators Survey.....</b>	37
<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	39

# Executive Summary

The Quality Team within Health Education England, Yorkshire and the Humber (HEE YH) undertook a multi-professional review (MPR) to the Dental training programmes in the North of the region on the 2<sup>nd</sup> November and the South of the region, on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2016. This type of MPR to a training programme was the first to be piloted within HEE nationally.

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

For HEE YH, the aims of the pilot were as follows:

1. To assess learner experiences of multi-professional learning and the way in which Local Education Providers (LEPs) provide that environment.
2. To determine whether the structure and organisation of the MPR is effective for participants.
3. To identify concerns or areas of good practice within specific learner groups.
4. To establish whether the Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE) assist in the identification of common themes when reviewing the professions together.
5. To make an assessment as to whether HEE is training and developing an effective multi-professional workforce for the future by providing learning environments that mirror working environments.
6. To establish the extent to which an MPR reduces the burden of HEE YH visits for LEPs by holding one larger multi-professional visit rather than multiple singular visits.
7. To determine whether the formation of a working group assists in the successful organisation of an MPR to an entire training programme.

During the MPR, the following training commissions were reviewed by four separate panels, in three separate sessions:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Dental Foundation Training (DFT)</li><li>- Dental Core Training (DCT)</li><li>- Dental Specialty Training (DST)</li><li>- Undergraduate Training</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Dental Nursing</li><li>- Hygiene Therapy</li><li>- Dental Technology</li></ul> |
|--|--|

All participants were invited to contribute to the evaluation of the MPR. Participants were invited to complete one of three separate online surveys. The response rate to these was 26% (87 out of 331). Lay Representatives provided feedback via email.

Survey questions focused on “What went well?” and “What improvements could be made in the future?” Respondents were provided with lots of opportunity to provide free text comments ([Appendices A-C](#)).

## Feedback

The feedback from each of the surveys was analysed separately and comments relating to the multi-professional approach were reviewed together. The following tables summarise this data.

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

Feedback (Key – Specific questions, common themes)		
	What went well?	How could we improve in future?
<b>Dental MPR Working Group Members (Page 11)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular, frequent, structured planning meetings</li> <li>• Good communication amongst group</li> <li>• 80% felt it was possible to review the whole environment in one day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline the role and expectations of working group members and identify appropriate admin support contacts</li> </ul>
<b>Panel Chairs and Panel Members (Page 15)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 91% felt the MPR was a positive experience for all involved, likely to ensure the continuous improvement of quality</li> <li>• 73% felt that the format of the meeting provided the opportunity for a comprehensive exploration of the quality of the learning environment</li> <li>• 73% felt prepared for the day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify the questions to be asked by all panels</li> <li>• Re-consider the time allocated to each session</li> </ul>
<b>Learners and Educators (Page 19)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organised event that allowed the opportunity to feed back about current training</li> <li>• 73% felt that their views about the quality of the learning environment were communicated to the panel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold the MPR at a Dental School/University Campus to reduce travel and disruption to learning/teaching commitments outside of the process</li> <li>• Re-consider the time allocated to each session in response to the number of participants</li> </ul>
<b>Multi-Professional Approach (Page 23)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 73% of Learners and Educators agreed that a discussion alongside other professional colleagues was a positive experience</li> <li>• The MPR facilitated open, inclusive, multi-professional discussions which allowed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the sharing of good practice</li> <li>- an exploration of training issues</li> <li>- the opportunity for participants to develop an understanding of other training routes</li> <li>- an opportunity for participants to network outside of their own profession</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that participants could be split by learner environment to allow for an exploration of the way in which multi-professional teaching is delivered within each setting</li> </ul>

# Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

## Discussion

The pilot visit to the Dental Training Programmes was the first multi-professional review of a programme to be undertaken by HEE nationally. The review involved predominantly Learners and Educators from the dental professions with a number of non-medical educators participating to ensure the capture of views of each educator type. Educators working in Outreach settings were also invited to participate.

Representation from each group of Learners was dependent on them being in post or on placement at the time of the visit. Invitations to Learners and Educators outlined an opportunity to provide written feedback for those participants who were not able to feed back in person.

The review of the evaluation feedback indicates many positives from the event whilst also acknowledging 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 review. However the following questions require more consideration:

1. What is the purpose of an MPR?
2. What is the anticipated added value of the MPR 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 MPR rather than the uni-professional visits, and can these aspects be included in the normal continuous improvement processes in place between stakeholders?
4. Which and how many Learners should be included in an MPR?
5. How do we ensure full representation at an appropriate stage of training for all Learners?
6. Should all learning environments be included in an MPR?
7. 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.

## Aims of the MPV: Review

Aim	Met	Partially Met	Further Visits and Evaluation Required
1. To determine whether the formation of a working group assists in the successful organisation of an MPR of an entire training programme.	✓		
2. To assess Learner experiences of multi-professional learning and the way in which LEPs provide that environment.		✓	✓

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

Aim	Met	Partially Met	Further Visits and Evaluation Required
3. To determine whether the structure and organisation of the MPR is effective for participants.	✓		
4. To identify concerns or areas of good practice within specific Learner groups.	✓		
5. To establish whether the KLOE assist in the identification of common themes when reviewing the professions together.			✓
6. To establish the extent to which an MPR reduces the burden of HEE YH visits for LEPs by holding one larger multi-professional visit rather than multiple singular visits.			✓
7. To make an assessment as to whether HEE is training and developing an effective multi-professional workforce for the future by providing learning environments that mirror working environments.			✓

See [page 29](#) for full evaluation of the aims.

### Recommendations

The recommendations are as follows:

No.	Recommendation	Responsibility
A.	Consider questions 1 to 7 as outlined in the Discussion.	Quality Team
B.	Review the areas for improvement highlighted in the Data Feedback section.	Quality Team
C.	Review the contents of the data pack including the KLOE as a result of the comments received.	Quality Team
D.	Establish the purpose of the MPR and a definition of multi-professional working within the context of the programme being reviewed to assist effective participation.	Quality Team
E.	Have a second pilot MPR to a different programme, incorporating the outcomes of recommendations A-E in the preparation and organisation. <b>Note:</b> If all aspects of the review are amended it will be difficult to compare the results of the two pilots.	Quality Team
F.	Evaluate the second MPR pilot.	Quality Team
G.	Share the findings of the Evaluation Report with all parties involved.	Quality Team
H.	Evaluate the outcomes of the next pilot and the effectiveness of the	Quality Team

## **Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation**

implementation of recommendations from this report.

### **Summary**

The positive engagement in this pilot MPR from all parties demonstrates a huge commitment to education and training within Yorkshire and the Humber. Both learners and educators displayed a sense of loyalty to their training programmes and a willingness to embrace multi-professional working.

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 reviews. There does however, need to be a clearer understanding of the purpose of the multi-professional review (see recommendations above) and how this will be achieved, which is communicated to all parties involved.

# Introduction

The Quality Team within Health Education England, Yorkshire and the Humber (HEE YH) undertook a multi-professional review (MPR) to the Dental training programmes in the North of the region on the 2<sup>nd</sup> November and the South of the region, on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2016. This type of MPR to a training programme was the first to be piloted within HEE nationally.

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

For HEE YH, the aims of the pilot were as follows:

1. To assess learner experiences of multi-professional learning and the way in which Local Education Providers (LEPs) provide that environment.
2. To determine whether the structure and organisation of the MPR is effective for participants.
3. To identify concerns or areas of good practice within specific learner groups.
4. To establish whether the Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE) assist in the identification of common themes when reviewing the professions together.
5. To make an assessment as to whether HEE is training and developing an effective multi-professional workforce for the future by providing learning environments that mirror working environments.
6. To establish the extent to which an MPR reduces the burden of HEE YH visits for LEPs by holding one larger multi-professional visit rather than multiple singular visits.
7. To determine whether the formation of a working group assists in the successful organisation of an MPR to an entire training programme.

Currently, the Dental training programmes are subject to the following visiting/monitoring processes:

- HEE YH Postgraduate Quality Management visits
- Soft intelligence from within HEE and the two Dental Schools
- Library Facilities visits/HEE YH Clinical Skills visits
- Non-medical Commissioning reviews
- Learner feedback surveys
- CQC Visits
- GDC Visits

During the MPR, the following training commissions were reviewed by four separate panels, in three separate sessions:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Dental Foundation Training (DFT)</li><li>- Dental Core Training (DCT)</li><li>- Dental Specialty Training (DST)</li><li>- Undergraduate Training</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Dental Nursing</li><li>- Hygiene Therapy</li><li>- Dental Technology</li></ul> |
|--|--|

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

The format of these sessions is outlined below:

	<b>Panel A</b>	<b>Panel B</b>	<b>Panel C</b>	<b>Panel D</b>
<b>Session 1</b>	Multi-Professional Learners	Multi-Professional Learners	Multi-Professional Learners	Multi-Professional Learners
<b>Session 2</b>	Undergraduate and DFT Learners	Non-Medical Learners Dental	DCT Learners	DST Learners
<b>Session 3</b>	Multi-Professional Educators	Multi-Professional Educators	Multi-Professional Educators	Multi-Professional Educators

A random sample of Learners from the professions were invited to attend a question and answer session if they were in post, or on placement within one of the following learning environments at the time of the visit:

- Primary Care Dental Practices
- Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust including Leeds Dental School
- Sheffield Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust including Charles Clifford Dental Hospital
- The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust
- York Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
- Mid Yorkshire Teaching Hospital NHS Trust
- Hull and East Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
- Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

A different set of Learners were invited to attend the second session where possible so as to allow for the contribution of a larger sample of participants. It is to be noted however, that due to the size of some of the professions, this was not achievable for all (e.g. DST, DCT, Dental Nursing and Dental Technology).

The aims of Session 1 were to explore how all Learners experience the development of multi-professional skills and abilities, and the aims of session 2, were to investigate any specific concerns or areas of good practice within the specific learner groups.

A representative sample of Educators from the same professions and learning environments were also invited to participate. The educator session took a multi-professional format to allow for an assessment of the way in which multi-professional teaching is delivered. Non-medical educators and educators working in Outreach settings were also invited to participate so as to ensure the capture of views of each educator type.

To provide anonymity and to allow for the identification of views during the interviews, participants wore colour coded stickers to reflect their training commission type.

Two lay representatives rotated amongst the panels throughout the two days. The lay representatives were present to review the equitability of the approach by the Panel Chairs.

Due to the size of the MPR, it was not possible to hold the event at a HEE YH local office, University Campus or either of the Dental Schools. Therefore, two external venues were used for the review.

## **Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation**

The individuals invited to contribute to the evaluation were therefore:

- Visit Facilitator
- Working Group Members
- Panel Chairs and Panel Members
- Learners and Educators
- Lay Representatives

The response rate was 26% (87 out of 331).

This report includes:

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

## **Evaluation Process**

An evaluation proposal was developed and shared with the Visit Facilitator and the Quality Team Visit Lead and Manager for comment and amendment. The agreed evaluation process included:

- Three online surveys created by using the Bristol Online Survey (BOS) software for the following groups:
  - The Dental MPR Working Group Members
  - The Panel Chairs and Panel Members
  - The Learners and Educators
- Questions which focused on “What went well?” and “What improvements could be made in the future?” The surveys included lots of opportunity for respondents to provide free text comments ([see Appendices A to C](#) for the detailed surveys).
- Requests for feedback from the lay representatives. These were sent and received via email.

Invitations to complete the online survey were issued within five weeks of the MPR and surveys remained open for two weeks.

Interim findings were reported to the HEE YH Deans meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> November 2016 by Emma Jones, Head of Quality. The final evaluation report is due to be issued by the end of February 2017.

## Data Feedback

The following data analysis reviews the feedback from the individual groups which includes comments about the organisation of the day and comments regarding the multi-professional approach.

To avoid duplication, issues raised by a number of respondents are not necessarily repeated 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.

### Dental MPR Working Group Members (*Response rate was 31% (5 out of 16)*)

#### What went well?

##### Before the review

- Good communication amongst group
- Regular (x1), organised planning meetings (x3) which helped the team to understand different components of Dentistry (x1)
- Excellent communication with Leeds Dental School regarding learner and educator attendance
- Plan developed for timing and distribution of questions amongst Panel Members on the day
- Use of meeting action point list to keep organisation on track
- Evaluation of meeting minutes and action points to identify gaps in planning process which were discussed at the next meeting
- Suggestions and contributions from the administrative team were welcomed
- Quality Team working group pre-meetings
- Amendments to the KLOE by Panel Chairs

#### What could have gone better?

##### Before the review

- Better agreement of questions to be asked by all panels ahead of the day
- Quicker communication amongst the group. Delayed responses led to an increase in the admin team's workload (x2)
- A more flexible schedule of meetings prior to the review to allow more members to attend and gain greater insight into the process
- Data to inform the review to be distributed earlier to allow panels to effectively use this to inform questioning amongst the panels

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

**Structure of the Working Group: Please comment on how useful relevant you found the paperwork.**

Component	Very Happy	Happy	No Strong Opinion	Unhappy	Very Unhappy	Comments
Structure	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0	0	0	I feel that it was important to have representation from all the areas of Dentistry and believe this was achieved.
Meeting Sites	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	0	0	
Number of Meetings	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	0	0	I felt that the number was appropriate. The administrators met additionally to these meetings to work through the logistics and planning of the event.
Frequency of Meetings	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	0	0	
Communications	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	0	0	In the majority of cases, communication was good. There were a couple of instances where some members were slow to respond to the admin team.  There were times when communication wasn't prompt from some members of the group.
Explanation of Process Prior to the Review	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	0	0	
Division of Meeting Action Points	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0	0	0	

## **Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation**

### **How could we improve in the future?**

- Clearly outline the roles and expectations of working group members to allow members to effectively complete action points around their existing commitments (x2)
- Gather basic information about training routes and discipline numbers for all working group members to refer to
- Provide admin templates when assigning admin tasks outside of the Quality Team to ensure that the required information needed for organisation is gathered in an accurate and timely manner
- Include the admin support teams of working group members in communications about allocated admin tasks to ensure that they know what is required if they are asked provide support
- Clearer and more regular communication with Clinical Directors and Training Programme Directors to ensure required pre-visit information is available to Panel Members earlier
- Electronic input of information on the day
- To reduce dilution of information received, panels to focus on groups who work together on a day to day basis (e.g. DST trainees with Dental nurses and technicians) to understand how multi-professional working takes place in the training environments
- Additional small discussion groups to feedback about the same profession
- Think about administering invitations to Learners/Educators-was difficult to administer

### **Additional Comments:**

- Panel Members were engaged and enthusiastic and learner and educator attendance was good
- Perhaps the questioning could be done differently next time. I think it may have been better for all panels to ask the same questions in session 1 to allow for the comparison of views about multi-professionalism but a different set of questions for session 2, which are derived from the data of each profession. This would allow for more focused discussions around topics important to the individual learner types
- I did wonder whether the Learners and Educators fully understood what is meant by 'multi-professional' (x2)
- The educator session was the most challenging and possibly least useful...most have been through this process with other organisations ... and therefore had stock answers to most questions ... it was difficult to obtain anything other than a superficial view of the topics discussed
- The panel that I worked on was excellent. They were receptive to instructions regarding the paperwork ... and did very well to encourage all Learners and Educators to respond.
- Planning-wise, this was a challenging event but a great learning experience (x2)
- Good Panel Member composition on each panel

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

**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?**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No, there were too many areas to cover</b>	<b>Partially but it is not as robust as separate visits</b>	<b>Don't know at the moment</b>
Total = 5	4 (80%)	0	1 (20%)	0

Comments included the following:

I think that if the panel ensure that all Learner and Educator types have the opportunity to voice their opinions, then any issues or areas of good practice can be recorded much in the same way as a Quality visit.

Having a mix of Learners/Educators together is important as it allows examination of whether multi-professional learning is taking place.

It would be important to look at discrete groups who work together as this would give far more valuable information as to whether, and how, multi-professional working is taking place.

It felt like some Panel Members forgot that this was about multi-professionalism.

I think the organisation for this event was so challenging because there were so many 'unknown' elements such as; details of the different disciplines, the different training routes, Learner numbers and who to contact for information about the different types of Learners. With this background information, future organisation will be easier.

Perhaps we could look at which groups train together and how they train then assess whether this mirrors real working environments. We could do this by speaking with qualified Dental professionals within different environments who are not necessarily Educators. Educators may present a biased view.

I gained an overall view but not enough detailed information to be able to improve DFT for instance. I didn't learn anything that I didn't already know about DFT. I would gain that from a performance review.

Perhaps more focus could be given to how the groups being interviewed are chosen.

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

### Panel Chairs and Panel Members (*Response rate was 42% (11 out of 26)*)

Two Panel Chairs and nine Panel Members completed the survey. All panels were represented:

- Panel A: 3 responses
- Panel B: 2 responses
- Panel C: 3 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 8, No 3)**

There were many positive comments about the organisation of the event and how this helped the panels to prepare for the day. Four respondents felt that the paperwork was relevant and commented that receiving the paperwork in advance of the review, really helped them to feel prepared. Two respondents also felt that communicating with their panel prior to the event enabled them to gain a greater understanding of their role within their panel before the review began. Two less experienced respondents stated that they felt suitably prepared for the day despite not being involved in a Quality visit before.

One respondent felt that the paperwork should have been shared earlier.

It was felt by two respondents that there was some uncertainty around the questions that should be used for the review. During the final Dental MPR working group meeting, a set of KLOE were shared with the Panel Chairs and representative Panel Members. Panels were asked to use these as a framework for their questioning by selecting pertinent KLOE in response to the information within the data pack. Whilst it appeared that the working group understood this message, following the meeting, it became evident that this was not the case which led to some confusion amongst the panels.

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

Information	Very Relevant	Relevant	Not Relevant	Comments
Data Pack	6 (55%)	5 (45%)	0	<p>Not sure that the self-assessment helps. One Trust seemed to have passed it over to a marketing firm.</p> <p>I think the booklet with the supporting data provided by the various groups was not particularly useful and I didn't refer to it on the day.</p>
Agenda	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	0	
Park and Ride Information	4 (36%)	7 (64%)	0	

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

Information	Very Relevant	Relevant	Not Relevant	Comments
Panel Handbook	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	0	I think that the questions in the handbook were very unimaginative and would not have generated good discussions without the revisions that we made to them beforehand.  Sections of the KLOE were missing but there was nothing that we couldn't add in as a panel.
Who's Who	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	0	
Pack Contents	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	0	

### Additional Comments about the paperwork:

- All the paperwork was important for Panel Members to have and to have read before the visit.
- The paperwork was most helpful. High quality and highly relevant.
- Credit must be given to the team on the days. Given the sheer quantity of paperwork, it was all in order and the days ran very smoothly. There had evidently been a lot of hard work to achieve this given the number of people invited on both days.

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

	Substantial	Added Little	No New Information	Other
Total = 11	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	0	0

### Did the format of the review allow for a comprehensive exploration of the quality of the learning environment?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Total = 11	8 (73%)	0	3 (27%)

### Comments:

- One respondent felt that the format of the review allowed for an insightful discussion of the challenges, areas of good practice and areas to improve upon in regards to multi-professionalism.

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

- Comments were made by two respondents that some groups voiced their opinions more than others, whilst another respondent commented that there was a reasonable voice present for each of the groups.
- Three respondents felt that the review facilitated the exploration of the learning environments, and two respondents felt that time constraints meant that further investigation would be needed for a comprehensive exploration.
- One respondent indicated that they did not know whether a comprehensive exploration had taken place as they did not know what information may have been missed throughout the days.

**Overall was the multi-professional review a positive experience for Learners, Educators and teams and likely to ensure continuous improvement of quality?**

	Yes	No	Don't know
Total = 11	10 (91%)	1 (9%)	0

Comments:

- I hope that there will be some positive improvements based on these visits.
- Of the recommendations in the report, two were multi-professional, one was Dental nurse related, one was hygiene and therapy, and ten were Dentist/Dental student related. There were no recommendations regarding Dental technicians. MPR?
- It offered a good opportunity for Learners to provide positive and negative feedback in an open but safe environment. In my personal experience, the Educators were slightly defensive at times.

The Panel Chairs and Panel Members were asked what went well on the visit and how we could improve in the future. Comments related to the multi-professional aspect of the visit are included on [page 23](#). Other comments are as follows:

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Excellent organisation</li><li>Whole Panel Member briefing at start of review</li><li>Individual panel meetings before start of the sessions</li><li>Well-structured event. Good co-ordination and flow of the whole process</li><li>Comprehensive panel discussion</li><li>Good attendance-an important parameter for receiving opinions</li><li>Honest, open (x1), engaged participants who were happy to share their experiences (x2), including the Facilitators (x1)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>More time per session (x2)</li><li>Receive paperwork earlier</li><li>Clarity of questions to be asked (x2) to avoid repetition between sessions (x1), gather more information (x1) and cover necessary areas adequately (x1)</li><li>More of a focus to target issues</li><li>Uncover a method to acquire more detailed understanding of issues raised</li><li>Electronic input of data on the day</li><li>Smaller groups (x2)</li><li>More informal room set up to promote further discussion</li></ul>

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Good feedback sessions</li><li>• Structure of questions (x1). Starter questions enabled the delivery of good answers (x1)</li><li>• Positive feedback received from Learners/Educators that open circle seating was less of a barrier to communication in Panel C</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More comprehensive briefing for Educators to promote the review as developmental and not inspection</li></ul>

General comments from the panel included the following:

This was a most excellent event. Well organised and well considered. It was a pleasure and a privilege to be involved. Thank you.

A counsellor and a room should be made available on the day.

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

### **Learners and Educators** (Response rate was 25% (71 out of 289))

The Learners (31) and Educators (40) were asked to indicate their profession.

Learner and Educator Type	Number of Respondents
Dental Undergraduate	10
Dental Foundation	16
Dental Core	8
Dental Specialty	10
Hygiene Therapy	10
Dental Nursing	1
Dental Technician	3
Other	13

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 = 71)	52 (73%)	9 (13%)	1 (1%)	9 (13%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Learners and Educators (total = 71)	52 (73%)	11 (16%)	8 (11%)

#### **Comments:**

- I think the feedback and information elicited by the panel was honest
- Unable to express some views
- Review appeared to be about hospital Dentistry
- Process driven with vague questions
- Not enough quality time. Didn't feel like my opinion was wanted. Kept being overlooked by some Panel Members
- Somewhat lost in discussions outside of my profession
- Not adequately able to express views
- Many challenges for Learners at my level were voiced openly
- Not communicated in any great depth
- Groups were too large to get views across. Not sure what panel took on board
- Difficult for trainees to openly give feedback for fear of repercussions. Often seems that little change occurs once feedback is given

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

- Difficult to give considered, fully comprehensive responses in a large group without seeing the questions beforehand
- Not possible to give specific feedback in this setting. It is impossible for everyone to express their views with approximately 30 people in the room
- More time with more information about questions to be asked beforehand would have been better
- Was mainly about multi-professional working for an environment which supports this. If you don't work in a hospital, it seemed there was little point to the questions

### **Additional Comments:**

- Review highlighted the need for support staff (nurses, admin etc.) to allow teaching to take place and not be hindered by low staffing levels
- I hope someone was listening and actions the issues raised.
- Time pressure is the main problem. With clinical activity increasing all over NHS Trusts and more pressure added, there is almost no dedicated time for teaching on 'business clinics'. All clinicians make effort and usually teach/assess/provide feedback/fill in the forms outside of these teaching sessions. Teaching is a very important part of the job irrespective of whether it is a University or NHS job.

The Learners and Educators were asked what went well on the visit and how could we improve in the future. Comments related to the multi-professional aspect of the visit are included on [page 23](#). Other comments are as follows:

<b>What went well?</b>	<b>How could we improve in the future?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Genuine (x1), caring (x1), polite (x2) Panel Members who welcomed comments from all (x5)</li><li>• Good panel Chair (x3)</li><li>• Informal not interrogative (x2), allowed for open discussions (x2)</li><li>• Comprehendible (x3), relevant (x1) questions</li><li>• Well organised (x7)</li><li>• Opportunity to feed back about current training (x10)</li><li>• Well attended</li><li>• Time for all to contribute (x2)</li><li>• Clear, detailed pre-visit information (x2)</li><li>• Time keeping</li><li>• Communication</li><li>• Engaged participants</li><li>• Length of session</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Organised on University campus/Dental school</li><li>• Greater period of notice needed (x2)</li><li>• More detailed guidance about purpose of review beforehand (x5) and prior/during session (x2)</li><li>• Provide guidance on scope of possible outcomes</li><li>• Longer sessions (x10)</li><li>• Smaller discussion groups (x3)</li><li>• Narrow scope of discussion (x2)</li><li>• Better venue location (x3), not city centre (x1)</li><li>• Refreshments (x5)</li><li>• Targeted questions to be answered beforehand (x4) to be more time efficient (x2)</li><li>• Allow all opportunity to speak</li></ul>

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

What went well?	How could we improve in future?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good venue (x2)</li> <li>Good room layout in panel C (x2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less formal room layout, perhaps circular seating (x2)</li> <li>• Provide copy of questions to allow preparation (x2)</li> <li>• Allow opportunities for quiet participants</li> <li>• Less informal approach to questioning</li> <li>• No use of abbreviations</li> <li>• More probing and discriminating questions</li> <li>• More interactive</li> <li>• Timing. Having the session in the middle of the day disrupts the clinical activity in both the morning and afternoon sessions</li> </ul>

**Additional comments left were as follows:**

- I thought it was great.
- Sufficient notice of event was given, however, it was not clear which members of staff were required. This made clinic bookings difficult.
- Lots of interesting views. Challenges faced have been heard and hopefully positive changes can now be made.
- I only hope that someone was listening to all the important issues raised and actions at least half of them. We have fed this back before and nothing has ever happened.
- Most of the discussion was not relevant to those of us not Dentally trained. The panel might like to think about who it asks to participate in the future, or alternatively make it relevant to all Dental Educators.
- I don't think that there is anything you could improve on as I felt the questions allowed suitable feedback.
- Despite being reassured that we were anonymous, that was not the case as we were wearing coloured stickers and were being asked for individual comments from our specified specialty and teaching team.
- I'm not quite sure what the point of it was. I left feeling like I didn't need to be there.

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

### Lay Representatives

Two lay representatives attended the review. To provide consistency, the same lay representatives were used on both days.

Overall, the lay representatives felt that the day went well. A summary of their feedback is outlined below:

	<b>What went well?</b>	<b>How could we improve in the future?</b>
Representative 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The involvement of the full range of Dental Learners and their Educators</li><li>• Manageable group sizes that allowed for a range of opinions and opportunity for contribution</li><li>• A list of questions for each session to focus discussions which included prompts</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All Panel Members to meet together following the sessions to discuss the outcomes of the day</li></ul>
Representative 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Well organised event. Good use of colour code to categorise Learner and Educator type</li><li>• Separate Learner/Educator sessions to allow opportunity to feed back about training</li><li>• Good use of comments cards allowing participants to feedback anonymously in written form</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learner/Educator group introductions from the Facilitator to provide a consistent message regarding the purpose of the day, allowing participants to prepare and panels to begin questioning immediately at the start of sessions</li><li>• Structured method to ensure participation of each Learner/Educator type. This was demonstrated by one panel. It increased participation and the confidence of participants to contribute</li><li>• Outline the HEE Quality Framework domains during the panel brief and provide an explanation of good/outstanding practice to help panels report back effectively and efficiently at the end of the day.</li></ul>

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: 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:

<b>What went well?</b>	<b>How could we improve in the future?</b>
73% of Educators and Learners agreed that a discussion alongside other professional colleagues was a positive experience.	Split Undergraduates from Foundation etc <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
Panel Members from different professions worked really well together <b>(Panel)</b>	Make the group mix more balanced and have less core/undergraduate trainers <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
Good mix of team members <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>	Grouping into relevant areas <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
Range of attendees. Could listen to their views and start linking discussions together <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>	Separate hospital from community/general practice <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
Everyone got a chance to put their opinions across about each course <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>	Would be more time efficient to hold review during lunch break with all StRs in the Dental hospital <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
Gained a good, general understanding of the overall picture <b>(Panel)</b>	Undergraduate and DFT could have been interviewed at different times. Issues raised by each group weren't relevant to the other <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
The fact that this took place is a step in the right direction <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>	Not mix different groups in the same rooms and discuss a topic that relates differently to everyone <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
It being multi-disciplinary (x2) <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>	Splitting the session into sections of concern for Undergraduates and DFT separately <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
Interesting to hear other's opinions about how their team works <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>	To engage with Educators around specific issues, you need to get us together as a group and spend a greater length of time discussing things <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>
Good to hear views from Learners at different levels, some of which echoed personal experience <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>	Ensure proportional representation from each professional group and each learning environment <b>(Panel)</b>
Questions asked got a good collection of opinions from all types of students/staff <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>	I still don't see the point of discussing the education of trainees of the level that I teach with clinicians who don't teach them...It hasn't helped me <b>(Learner/Educator)</b>

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

<b>What went well?</b>	<b>How could we improve in the future?</b>
This prompted a good discussion of all the issues ( <b>Panel</b> )	Keep different trainee levels together for questions which are broad...Spend more time asking questions with less jargon ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )
Everyone able to give their opinion with people from different settings. Gave me a different perspective on things and allowed sharing of good practice ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	Have a broader range of backgrounds from those asking questions i.e. from different specialties ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )
Good seeing so many Educators in one place and hearing their views ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	To make a real change in training, I think specialties/work groups should be targeted specifically ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )
Opportunity to understand the challenges faced by other Educators ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	This method of feedback in my opinion, is non effective...no meaningful feedback can be gained from asking generic questions to different healthcare professionals ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )
Comparables were notable between teaching styles at different venues and how they were impacting the learner ( <b>Panel</b> )	Speak to Learners at the end of each educational stage or in their new post to assess whether their previous post had satisfactorily prepared them for the next stage of training ( <b>Panel</b> )
Good to meet Educators from other branches of Dentistry ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	It may have been more efficient to separate the professions as they seem to be different, with different needs, administration and work in a different setting. It would be easier to explore the current situation of each group if so ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )
Good to network/hear from different specialties ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	
Everyone being included ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	
Open discussions from all represented groups ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	
It was fascinating being able to talk to all the groups and to tease out common areas of interest ( <b>Panel</b> )	
Gave insight into HEE, met fellow colleagues and heard their views ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	
An opportunity to express opinions from trainees within different categories of Dental training ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	
All participants got equally involved in discussions and some important points were raised ( <b>Panel</b> )	

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

What went well?	How could we improve in the future?
Getting so many people across Dental education together ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	
It was useful to meet with a group of educator colleagues from different areas of training in the profession. We were able to express our insights and views ( <b>Learner/Educator</b> )	

# Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

## Organisation of the MPR

The visit facilitator, Panel Chairs and Panel Members were asked to indicate how happy they were with the following areas:

KEY	Highest	2 <sup>nd</sup> Highest			
	Very Happy	Happy	No strong Opinion	Unhappy	Very Unhappy
<b>Car Parking</b>	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	6 (55%)	1 (9%)	0
<b>Comments:</b>					
	- Not relevant (x2)				
	- Came by bus so did not try this				
	- Day 1: no car parking. Day 2: excellent				
<b>Venue</b>	5 (46%)	3 (27%)	3 (27%)	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>					
	- Sheffield was better than Leeds.				
<b>Catering</b>	2 (18%)	5 (46%)	4 (36%)	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>					
	- Great in Sheffield				
	- Leeds catering was poor				
<b>Timekeeping</b>	4 (36%)	4 (36%)	2 (18%)	1 (10%)	0
<b>Comments:</b>					
	- Never quite enough time to ask everything you would like. Strict timekeeping was essential to cover all areas but this meant restriction in following up interesting comments				
	- Too much time spent analysing answers at end of day by our panel. Once clarified about what needed to be reported back, our timing was better for day 2				
	- One panel seriously delayed the departure for other panels. This needs to be managed better in future				
	- First day panel B end of day meeting ran over by 1 hour				
<b>Breaks</b>	5 (46%)	5 (46%)	1 (8%)	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>					
	- Not able to follow up a trainee in difficulty which occurred during the day at a break. Needs to be provision for this.				

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

<b>Length of the day</b>	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	0	0	0
--------------------------	---------	---------	---	---	---

**Comments:**

- Just right. Sensitively arranged so

The Learners and Educators were asked to indicate how happy they were with the following areas. Their views were sought due to the use of external venues which have not been utilised before.

<b>KEY</b>	<b>Highest</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Highest</b>			
	<b>Very Happy</b>	<b>Happy</b>	<b>No strong Opinion</b>	<b>Unhappy</b>	<b>Very Unhappy</b>
<b>Car Parking</b>	4 (6%)	9 (13%)	38 (53%)	13 (18%)	7 (10%)

**Comments:**

- No parking facilities in Leeds (x5)
- Came by train
- Arrived on foot
- Arrived by coach (x4)
- Limited parking
- Very difficult to park (x3)
- Not enough on site in Sheffield
- Did not drive (x2)

<b>Venue</b>	11 (16%)	33 (47%)	16 (23%)	8 (11%)	3 (3%)
--------------	----------	----------	----------	---------	--------

**Comments:**

- Location was ok but parking was not
- Away from where working which meant time spent away from where I should have been
- Too far to go at lunchtime as this affected both morning and afternoon teaching
- Leeds city centre is difficult to get to by car and so had to take public transport increasing travel time
- Would have been better on the outskirts of Leeds for ease of travel
- Far for me to travel. It took me 3 times longer to get to the session compared to the amount of time that I was there
- Car parking was impossible
- Would have been better at the Dental School so didn't have to travel
- Venue was nice but disruptive to move so many people away from their bases
- Had to cancel clinics due to this not being held on site (2)

<b>Timekeeping</b>	17 (24%)	40 (57%)	8 (11%)	5 (7%)	1 (1%)
--------------------	----------	----------	---------	--------	--------

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

### Comments:

- Overran so problems with afternoon responsibilities
- Good

Length of session	14 (19%)	33 (47%)	16 (23%)	7 (10%)	1 (1%)
-------------------	----------	----------	----------	---------	--------

### Comments:

- Just long enough
- Some panels finished late which made some people late for other meetings/clinics
- Session used a whole clinical slot. The questions could have been obtained in a more time efficient way (e.g. questionnaire/local sessions)
- Insufficient time to cover breadth of issues (x5)
- Amounted to an entire day out of clinic for a short session ... expensive exercise
- Session in middle of day and a 45 minute journey which impacted on clinical time
- We ran late despite trying to rush
- Session didn't start on time. Went over allotted time and we had other commitments.
- Questions were timed, didn't allow all opinions to be heard due to size of group

# Discussion and Recommendations

## Discussion

The pilot visit to the Dental Training Programmes was the first multi-professional review of a programme to be undertaken by HEE nationally. The review involved predominantly Learners and Educators from the dental professions with a number of non-medical educators participating to ensure the capture of views of each educator type. Educators working in Outreach settings were also invited to participate.

Representation from each group of Learners was dependent on them being in post or on placement at the time of the visit. Invitations to Learners and Educators outlined an opportunity to provide feedback for those participants who were not able to feed back in person.

The review of the evaluation feedback indicates many positives from the event whilst also acknowledging 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 review. However the following questions require more consideration:

1. What is the purpose of an MPR?
2. What is the anticipated added value of the MPR 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 MPR rather than the uni-professional visits, and can these aspects be included in the normal continuous improvement processes in place between stakeholders?
4. Which and how many Learners should be included in an MPR?
5. How do we ensure full representation at an appropriate stage of training for all Learners?
6. Should all learning environments be included in an MPR?
7. 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.

## Aims of the MPV: Review

1. **To assess Learner experiences of multi-professional learning and the way in which LEPs provide that environment. Partially met.**

73% of both the Learners and Educators and panel members felt that the review allowed for an exploration of the quality of the learning environments. However, amongst both groups of respondents, it was felt that more time was needed to explore themes fully. **Further visits and evaluation required (see recommendations below).**

2. **To determine whether the structure and organisation of the MPR is effective for participants. Met.**

## **Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation**

Whilst the majority of participants agreed that the review allowed for an exploration of the quality of the learning environments, comments regarding the venues and the schedule of the interview sessions highlights a need for future MPRs to consider the impacts of these on the learning/teaching commitments of participants on the day.

### **3. To identify concerns or areas of good practice within specific Learner groups. Met**

Fourteen examples of noteworthy practice and fourteen recommendations for improvement were made in the findings report. The combination of these spanned all specialties and one Learner/Educator commented that the review allowed for the sharing of best practice.

### **4. To establish whether the KLOE assist in the identification of common themes when reviewing the professions together.**

The majority of each group of respondents felt that the views about the quality of the learning environments were communicated to the panels throughout the review. However, mixed feedback was received in the free text comments from panel members and Learners and Educators regarding the effectiveness of the KLOE. One particular comment from an educator highlighted that the KLOE weren't relevant to non-medical educators. In light of this, and the confusion surrounding the questions to be asked by panel members ([page 15](#)), the KLOE should be reviewed again. **Further visits and evaluation required (see recommendations below).**

### **5. To establish the extent to which an MPR reduces the burden of HEE YH visits for LEPs by holding one larger multi-professional visit rather than multiple singular visits.**

It is difficult at this stage to establish whether an MPR would meet the HEE requirements for quality whilst reducing the burden on the local education providers. **Further visits and evaluation are required (see recommendations below).**

### **6. To make an assessment as to whether HEE is training and developing an effective multi-professional workforce for the future by providing learning environments that mirror working environments.**

It is difficult to make a true assessment of this at this stage. Suggestions from the working group and the Learners and Educators indicated that a better reflection of this could be achieved by grouping Learners and Educators together by learning environment type. Without a pre-assessment of the structure of real working environments, it is difficult to apply the findings of the MPR to this aim. **Further visits and evaluation are required (see recommendations below).**

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

7. To determine whether the formation of a working group assists in the successful organisation of an MPR of an entire training programme. **Met.**

All working group respondents reported to be 'very happy' or 'happy' with the structure, frequency and number of working group meetings. These were used to establish the structure of the MPR. The MPR was well attended by Learners and Educators and many positive comments regarding the organisation of the review were received from each group of respondents.

## Recommendations

The recommendations are as follows:

No.	Recommendation	Responsibility
A.	Consider questions 1 to 7 as outlined in the Discussion.	Quality Team
B.	Review the areas for improvement highlighted in the Data Feedback section.	Quality Team
C.	Review the contents of the data pack including the KLOE as a result of the comments received.	Quality Team
D.	Establish the purpose of the MPR and a definition of multi-professional working within the context of the programme being reviewed to assist effective participation.	Quality Team
E.	Have a second pilot MPR to a different programme, incorporating the outcomes of recommendations A-E in the preparation and organisation. <b>Note:</b> If all aspects of the review are amended it will be difficult to compare the results of the two pilots.	Quality Team
F.	Evaluate the second MPR pilot.	Quality Team
G.	Share the findings of the Evaluation Report with all parties involved.	Quality Team
H.	Evaluate the outcomes of the next pilot and the effectiveness of the implementation of recommendations from this report.	Quality Team

## Summary

The positive engagement in this pilot MPR from all parties demonstrates a huge commitment to education and training within Yorkshire and the Humber. Both learners and educators displayed a sense of loyalty to their training programmes and a willingness to embrace multi-professional working.

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 reviews. There does however, need to be a clearer understanding of the purpose of the multi-professional review (see recommendations above) and how this will be achieved, which is communicated to all parties involved.

## **Appendix A – Dental MPR Working Group Survey**

The following online survey was issued to the Dental MPR Working Group. The response rate was 31% (5 out of 16).

No.	Question	Format of the answer
1.	Please indicate all the activities you have been involved in for the multi-professional visit. Please tick all activities which apply to you.	<p><b>Multiple answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liaising with the working group</li> <li>• Liaising with Panel Members</li> <li>• Project Lead / Manager</li> <li>• Preparing the paperwork</li> <li>• Facilitator on the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup></li> <li>• Administrator on the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup></li> <li>• Writing the multi-professional visit report</li> <li>• Other – please comment (<i>free text box</i>)</li> </ul>
2.	<p><b>General Housekeeping</b></p> <p>Please indicate how happy you were with the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Structure of the working group</li> <li>b. Meeting sites</li> <li>c. Number of working group meetings</li> <li>d. Frequency of working group meetings</li> <li>e. Communications</li> <li>f. Explanation of the process prior to the review</li> <li>g. Division of meeting action points amongst the group</li> </ol>	<p><b>A grid with possible answers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very happy</li> <li>• Happy</li> <li>• No strong Opinion</li> <li>• Unhappy</li> <li>• Very Unhappy</li> <li>• An optional comment free text box for each point a. to g.</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>What went well before the visit?</b></p> <p>Please share two things which went well <b>prior</b> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3rd from your point of view.</p>	Free text box
4.	<p><b>What could have gone better before the visit?</b></p> <p>Please share two things which could have gone better <b>prior</b> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> from your point of view.</p>	Free text box
5.	<p><b>How could we improve in the future?</b></p> <p>Please suggest two ways of improving a multi-professional visit in the future.</p>	Free text box
6.	<p><b>Additional comments</b></p> <p>Please add any additional comments about the day you would like to share with us.</p>	Optional free text box
7.	<p><b>Objectives of the visit</b></p> <p>In your experience of being a working</p>	<p><b>Multiple choice</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, but improvements need to be made</li> </ul>

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

	<p>group member and your involvement in the pilot, do you think it is possible to review the whole environment in one day?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No, there are too many areas to cover</li><li>• Partially, but it is not as robust as separate visits</li><li>• I don't know at the moment</li><li>• An optional comment free text box</li></ul>
--	--	--

## **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 73% (17 out of 23).

No.	Question	Format of the answer
1.	<b>On the day</b> Please indicate if you were the panel chair, or a Panel Member.	Two possible answers i. Panel Chair ii. Panel Member
2.	Please indicate the panel you attended.	Multiple choice answer • Panel A • Panel B • Panel C • Panel D
3.	<b>General Housekeeping</b> Please indicate how happy you were with the following areas: a. Length of the day b. Timekeeping during the day c. Breaks d. Venue e. Car Parking f. Catering	A grid with possible answers • Very happy • Happy • No strong Opinion • Unhappy • Very Unhappy • An optional comment free text box for each point a. to f.
4.	<b>Communication</b> 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.	<b>Paperwork</b> Please comment on how useful / relevant you found the paperwork. i. Data pack ii. Agenda iii. Panel Handbook iv. Park and ride information v. Who's who vi. Pack contents	A grid with possible answers <i>Please indicate how useful / relevant you find the paper work</i> • 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 learning environment?	• Substantial • Added little • No new information

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other – with a compulsory comment box</li> </ul>
8.	Did the format of the meeting allow a comprehensive exploration of the quality of the learning environment?	<p><b>Multiple choice answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul> <p>Optional free text box</p>
9.	<b>What went well on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>?</b> Please share <b>two</b> things which went well on the day of the visit.	Compulsory free text box
10.	<b>How could we improve in the future?</b> Please suggest <b>two</b> ways to improve a multi-professional visit.	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><b>Multiple choice answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul> <p>Optional free text box</p>
12.	<b>Additional comments</b> Please add any additional comments about the day you would like to share with us.	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 30% (38 out of 125).

No.	Question	Format of the answer
1.	<b>Please select the session you attended?</b>	<p><b>Multiple choice answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panel A: Session 1, Learners, 10:15-11:15</li> <li>• Panel A: Session 2, Learners, 11:30-12:30</li> <li>• Panel A: Session 3, Educators, 13:00-14:15</li> <li>• Panel B: Session 1, Learners, 10:15-11:15</li> <li>• Panel B: Session 2, Learners, 11:30-12:30</li> <li>• Panel B: Session 3, Educators, 13:00-14:15</li> <li>• Panel C: Session 1, Learners, 10:15-11:15</li> <li>• Panel C: Session 2, Learners, 11:30-12:30</li> <li>• Panel C: Session 3, Educators, 13:00-14:15</li> <li>• Panel D: Session 1, Learners, 10:15-11:15</li> <li>• Panel D: Session 2, Learners, 11:30-12:30</li> <li>• Panel D: Session 3, Educators, 13:00-14:15</li> </ul>
2.	<b>Please indicate your profession or level.</b>	<p><b>Multiple choice answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dental Undergraduate</li> <li>• Dental Foundation</li> <li>• Dental Core</li> <li>• Dental Specialty</li> <li>• Hygiene Therapy</li> <li>• Dental Nursing</li> <li>• Dental Technician</li> <li>• Other (please state)</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>General Housekeeping</b></p> <p>Please indicate how happy you were with the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Length of session</li> <li>b. Timekeeping</li> <li>c. Venue</li> <li>d. Car parking</li> </ol>	<p><b>A grid with possible answers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very happy</li> <li>• Happy</li> <li>• No strong Opinion</li> <li>• Unhappy</li> <li>• Very Unhappy</li> <li>• An optional comment free text box for each point a. to d.</li> </ul>

## Review of the Dental Training Programmes: Evaluation

4.	<b>What went well on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>?</b> Please share one thing which went well on the day of the visit.	Optional free text box
5.	<b>How could we improve in the future?</b> Please suggest one way of improving a multi-professional visit.	Optional free text box
6.	<b>Overall were your views of the quality of the learning environment communicated to the panel?</b>	<p>Multiple choice answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Don't know</li> <li>• Optional free text box</li> </ul>
7.	<b>Was a discussion alongside other professional colleagues a positive experience?</b>	<p>Multiple choice answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Don't know</li> <li>• The session I attended was not multi-professional</li> <li>• Optional free text box</li> </ul>
	<b>Additional comments</b> Please add any additional comments about the day you would like to share with us.	Optional free text box

### Acknowledgements

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

- The Dental MPR Working Group (5 online survey responses)
- The Panel Chair and Panel Members (11 online survey responses)
- The Learners and Educators (71 online survey responses)
- Matthew Sibley, Lay representative
- Geoff Mountfield, Lay representative