Review of Education

Purpose of paper	This paper presents a draft version of the review of education for discussion and approval by Council.
Action	For **discussion** and **approval to publish.**
Corporate Strategy 2020-22	**Strategic aim 1:** operate a regulatory system which protects patients and is fair to registrants, while being cost-effective and proportionate; which begins with education, supports career-long learning, promotes high standards of care and professional conduct and is developed in the light of emerging evidence and experience.
Decision Trail	• Since 2012 the GDC has published biennial education reports and this will be the fourth version, covering the period 2016 - 2018. • In June 2019, the proposed changes to the style and content of the document were presented to the Policy and Research Board (PRB) and they were welcomed at that forum. • In October 2019, a draft of the Review of Education was discussed and approved at the SLT Board, with minor suggested amendments (which have since been included).
Next stage	If approved by Council, the team will aim to publish the document at the end of 2019, or January 2020 (in advance of Moving Upstream). Work will also be conducted to ensure that the document is accessible to its intended audiences.
Recommendations	Council is asked to **approve** the review of education for publication.
Authorship of paper and further information	Manjula Das Head of Education Quality Assurance Mdas@gdc-uk.org 020 7167 6113
Appendices	1: Draft review of education 2016 - 2018

1.   Introduction

1.1   Since 2012, the GDC has published three iterations of the Annual Review of Education. The review is biennial and the 2016 – 2018 version of the report is appended at **Appendix 1**.

1.2   The aim of the Review of Education is to update on the findings of quality assurance activities and education developments.

1.3   Previous iterations were very detailed, with a limited audience. The style and content of this review has been revised to attempt to reach a wider audience.

1.4   This paper is designed to update the Council on the changes proposed and reasons for this, seeks feedback and the approval of the latest version for publication.

2.   Background

Previous iterations of the Annual Review of Education

2.1   To date there have been three iterations of the Annual Review of Education 2012 - 2013, 2013 – 2014 and 2014 - 2016. These can be found here https://www.gdc-uk.org/professionals/education.

2.2   Previous iterations have been between 50-70 pages in length and gave detailed accounts of the quality assurance (QA) activity undertaken, included policy developments and organisational information, including lists of the QA Inspectors and team members. All have included recommendations, which were developed further to the findings from the most recent round of inspections.

2.3   Due to the depth of the analysis the main audience for the reports was limited to mainly the education providers. In the past, the team have received some positive feedback on parts of the review by the education providers.

The rationale for change

2.4   In 2018, the team decided to take a different approach. In line with the changes and developments happening in the education and quality assurance landscape and closer working relationships with stakeholders including students and registrants in training, it was hoped that the review of education would:

    2.4.1   Appeal to a wider audience – the education sector as a whole, not just dental. We think that other stakeholders, including other regulators would be interested in our findings and messages relating to education and training.

    2.4.2   Have a redefined purpose. By using information and learning from the QA and education development work from the 2016/7 and 2017/8 academic years to highlight themes, issues and considerations to the education sector. Previously the report also served to update on a range of development areas and next steps, but we have decided to take this content out, and share this in different formats, targeted at specific audiences, so the report with be less narrative and list-like.

    2.4.3   Use the content and themes arising from QA activity to drive considerations relating to the education providers' courses and for the sector. In the past we have not named specific institutions, but we thought that the use of case studies and vignettes would help to highlight where there have been issues, what some have done to turn things around, aiming to foster a learning culture within the sector.

2.4.4 Have a different style. A shorter, punchier, less wordy document, with a better use of graphics would help us appeal to a wider audience and highlight the key messages.

The development process

2.5 Informed by comments and feedback from the Strategy Management Team, we took a new approach to the development of the review of education. We went back to basics, back to the original reports of the 2016 - 2018 period, stripping back the content to focus on the key messages arising from the QA activity and started to include named examples of where concerns had arisen, and where areas of good practice had been identified. The Council is asked to consider whether this new approach is welcome. We wrote the content in a more concise and targeted manner, being objective and evidence-led. We have been more clear and stronger in the messages we want to highlight including those around our powers relating to education, training and quality assurance.

2.6 We have taken out the general recommendations, as under the new risk-based approach to QA we are being more focussed and targeted towards the specific needs of each education provider. Where there are common themes, we will address this through our thematic QA work.

2.7 There will be messages that the education providers might not wish to hear, but it important for us to use this platform to be very clear that when things are not working well we will work with key stakeholders to try and support improvements to be made, and if improvements are not made then we will use our powers to enforce change. What is paramount to us is patient and public safety and that the education providers that we QA are developing registrants who are fit and safe to practice. We intend for the education and QA voice to be stronger than it has been, going forward.

2.8 We have been in close liaison with the Communications and Engagement team, members of whom have greatly supported its development, and agreed early on that this will remain a separate review to the Moving Upstream Reports. Going forward we will review and revise this as appropriate.

2.9 We have and continue to feed into the development of the Moving Upstream Report regarding developments and next steps in the education and QA arena.

2.10 We will take into account learning from this report (and previous iterations) when we revise the Learning Outcomes in 2020 and the Standards for Education in 2021.

3. Actions and next steps
3.1 Council is asked to **approve for publication** the content of the Review of Education found in **Appendix 1.**

3.2 Further to approval from Council, we will develop the format and style for online publication.

3.3 We aim to publish in December 2019/early January (in advance of the Moving Upstream Report, which is due to be published late January).