

MERSEY DEANERY
ANNUAL ASSESSMENT
VISIT

Name of Trust:
School of Public Health

Date of visit: 15th June 2010

VISITORS:-

Deputy Director Postgraduate GP:

Dr K N Kini

Mersey Deanery Quality Manager:

Jim Lindsay

Introduction

The visitors extend their thanks to the Public Health School for the extensive documentation and preparation prior to the visit.

The program was discussed as the first AAV to this school occurred 2 years ago and the School of Public Health were still developing a format to ensure the Deanery were able to get a comprehensive overview of the structure of the school and nature of the public health training program.

The school of Public Health differs in its unique trainee recruitment as approximately half the registrar intake are non medical. This brings with it its own challenges and opportunities as there is a broad mix of candidates entering Public Health Training.

This last year there are approximately 40-50 trainees with the potential of 100 training slots.

The School had planned the AAV for a series of presentations from Educational Supervisors, Training Directors, Head of school and trainees.

The Public Health Network gave a short presentation of their role in the provision of CPD for a range of professionals including trainees. The trainees present were delighted with this program organised on a monthly basis.

Dr Paula Grey presented a short overview of the considerable achievements of Public Health and the PCT leading on a range of projects with education and development set as its core values. Liverpool PCT clearly have developed a wide network working with Liverpool City Council and many others with a wish to know more about the HIECs when they become established.

Daniel Seddon gave some areas in his overview covering the context, GMC issues, The good and ugly areas and some take home messages that he felt were important to the School of Public Health.

The major issues he felt was the need for support for Educational Supervisors, Training Program and Training and Zonal Program Directors. There needs to be a discussion with the various organisations of how time for educational support is built into job plans. Daniel Seddon wished to ensure trainees receive the highest quality of educational support and this needs time.

Dr Seddon confirmed that the leadership course was a success and should add value to Public Health Training.

Induction this last year had not been as successful but with the trainee's representative taking an active role next year the school hopes to rectify this.

The School hopes in future to report outcomes measures with the publication of exam passes.

Dr Hannah Chellaswamy reported on a range of issues that had been covered during the general discussion but hoped that in future the trainee response rate to the Deanery pre-visit questionnaire using survey monkey would be improved. It was noted that within the survey some of the questions were thought to need greater clarification. Dr Chellaswamy would work with trainees to unpick the two areas –“being asked to work beyond competency” and “feeling undermined” by a small number of trainees. Interestingly the trainees present today were unable to report any issues where they were undermined or bullied.

Gillian Maudsley from the University of Liverpool gave a presentation explaining the range of opportunities available to PH trainees in both clinical lectureship and research.

There was general anxiety about future reorganisation of the role of Public Health by the DOH.

Progress to Deal with Recommendations of Last Visit

All the recommendations from the 2008 report had been completed

The school of public health place their 40-50 trainees in potentially 100 training slots

Out of hours experience has been negotiated and now complies with curriculum requirements.

Detailed Findings

A. Patient Safety

No issues – The induction process although less than planned would be corrected in 2010

The work in Health Protection Unit advice line was potentially a risk but the visitors were pleased there was a robust supporting mechanism to ensure several levels of cover.

There was a health zone reporting mechanism to ensure all advice from the HPA were recorded and could be used to provide handover of clinical advice given and provide feedback to the trainees

B. Quality Assurance, Review and Evaluation

No issues

C. Equality, Diversity and Opportunity

No issues

D. Recruitment Selection and Appointment

No issues the process was thought to be fair and well carried out

The school needs to look at the recruitment process to ensure it meets the skills of all the applicants half of whom might be non medical. There were no significant concerns but the recruitment process perhaps biased towards medical applicants.

E. Delivery of the Curriculum including Assessment Specialty:-

F1's

F2's

SHO's/ST1's

VTS**SpR's****F. Support and development of trainees, trainers and local faculty
Specialty:-****F1's****F2's****SpR**

5 public health trainees covering ST2-ST5 were seen and presented their experiences during their training program. They expressed their unreserved satisfaction with the opportunities for them to complete their training in a way to support their eventual career wishes.

All the registrars were progressing well with their portfolios and competencies.

All registrars complimented on the work of the Public Health Network that provided a valuable opportunity for networking and CPD.

Given sufficient notice there seemed little problem being granted study leave if the registrars educational needs were clearly identified.

F. Management of Education and Training

The School of Public Health, specifically Head of School, Zonal Leads, Training Program Directors were praised at the continued efforts made on the trainees behalf to achieve a training program allowing excellence to thrive.

G. Educational resources and capacity

No issues raised re resources. Study leave if relevant to educational needs was always supported

H. Outcomes

I. Hygiene Factors

No issues identified

Summary

This School should be congratulated on working towards a learning culture throughout the School and always referencing their activities to the needs of the trainees and service.

Highlights

The visitors were impressed with the presentations today with the school clearly having as its core values education and training.

The trainees all agreed without hesitation that they would recommend Mersey School of Public Health if approached by a prospective candidate.

Recommendations

Mandatory

1. No issues

Advisory

1. The School needs to work with the Deanery and the employers' of Training Program Directors and Educational Supervisor's on how both protected time and administrative support could be identified to support educational work.

2. The School needs to continue to work with the Deanery to identify opportunities to ensure Educational Advisers and Training Program Directors are supported in their role as educators.

- 3 The school should consider for the next AAV the visitors being given the opportunity to see the trainees as a group without the other senior members of the School present. We did not however feel the trainees felt restricted to their comments but feel this methodology is consistent with other specialities

Deputy Director
Postgraduate GP

Dr Vish Kini

Date ...17/06/10.....

Mersey Deanery
Quality Manager

Mr Jim Lindsay

Date17/06/10.....