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Introduction: University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust provides placements for more than 200 medical students per year. The General Medical Council (GMC) on their revised ‘Promoting Excellence’ standards set out the requirements for the management and delivery of undergraduate training. Increasingly, placement providers are required to demonstrate compliance with quality standards for education, training and to demonstrate accountability for educational funding. We saw this as an opportunity to create a quality monitoring tool that will allow us to oversee placement education quality against the new GMC standards.

We describe the development and initial implementation of the undergraduate educational dashboard (EQD)

Methods: We created a ‘traffic light’ dashboard (Table A) that was mapped against the GMC’s Promoting Excellence standards. The dashboard has several components, including: a summary of key undergraduate education performance indicators, service level data and data from the learner’s feedback.

The dashboard will be completed by the Department of Clinical Education and Clinical Education Leads on a six-monthly basis.

Results:

Completion of 17 metrics required the collaboration of Educational Leads, Educators and managers. Initial completion of metrics was 71% (initially retrospective data). Poorly completed indicators included: access by Learners to IT systems, evidence of integration of undergraduate quality data into Board and Departmental governance processes, Clinical teachers trained for the role, and accountability for training funding. With recent prospective survey data we anticipate reaching 88% completion rate. The EQD allowed identification of areas that require further improvement, i.e., induction to clinical placements. Furthermore, it reassured us that areas such as supervision and learning were satisfactory across the organisation.

Conclusions: The ‘traffic light’ dashboard system provides a mechanism to enable the Trust to monitor and report on undergraduate education quality and support the management of education quality outcomes. The EQD is a mechanism to raise awareness, drive compliance and improvement in educational governance across the organisation. Identifying a responsible individual in each service area will be crucial to success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
<th>UG/4th Yr</th>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
<th>UG/4th Yr</th>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
<th>UG/4th Yr</th>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
<th>UG/4th Yr</th>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
<th>UG/4th Yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Testimonials</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category 2: Undergraduate education**

- **Undergraduate Student Feedback**: Rich
- **Percentage of Undergraduate Students Who Have Submitted Feedback**: Good
- **Percentage of Undergraduate Students Who Have Submitted Feedback**: Moderate
- **Percentage of Undergraduate Students Who Have Submitted Feedback**: Weak
- **Percentage of Undergraduate Students Who Have Submitted Feedback**: Not applicable

**Identification and Implementation**

- **Identification and Implementation**: Rich
- **Implementation and Implementation**: Good
- **Implementation and Implementation**: Moderate
- **Implementation and Implementation**: Weak
- **Implementation and Implementation**: Not applicable

**Evidence Type**

- **Evidence Type**: Rich
- **Evidence Type**: Moderate
- **Evidence Type**: Weak
- **Evidence Type**: Not applicable

**UG/4th Yr**

- **UG/4th Yr**: Good
- **UG/4th Yr**: Moderate
- **UG/4th Yr**: Weak
- **UG/4th Yr**: Not applicable