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Different systems for QA of Supervision

• Trainee report – bespoke measure
• Trainee report – validated measure (eg SRQ, LASS, SRM, SAGE)

• Fed back to supervisors
• Fed back to supervisor’s line manager
• Overview reported more widely
Surveys in other professions

- Medicine – National training survey (NTS) run by GMC
- Medicine – Scottish training survey (STS) run by NES
- Nursing – Quality Management of Placement Learning environment (QMPLE) – run by NES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust / Board</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lothian</td>
<td>St John's Hospital - S308H</td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>77.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Supervision</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>90.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Supervision out of hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work Load</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>49.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Handover</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>65.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>78.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate Experience</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>77.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Supervision</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>86.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>77.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Teaching</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>71.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Teaching</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>70.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study Leave</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>59.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rota Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scottish postgrad psychology training?

• 4 courses – 2 Doctorates and 2 Applied Masters
• NES commissions training and funds Clinical Tutors and Local Tutors
• All have QA systems but none cover all Boards/all supervisors
• No benchmarking possible
• All paper-based
Develop an online survey?

- That is psychometrically sound
- That is free
- That is short (ish)
- That can include supervisor’s name
- That includes SV relationship as this is key
- But also skills development
- No existing measures fit this
- Develop a new measure
Development 1

- Consultation
- Quality indicators developed by expert reference group
- Items generated for each indicator
- Anchored Likert scale 1 – 5 strongly disagree – strongly agree
- Tested for clarity and relevance
Development 2

- Sent to trainees on all four courses
- Anonymous – no Board/supervisor details
- Exploratory factor analysis – 5 factors
- Drop items
- Confirmatory factor analysis – 5\textsuperscript{th} factor (weakest) was Skills development
- Consensus - to develop more items to try to strengthen this
Development 3

- Further confirmatory factor analysis of 5 factors using new items
- Factor 5 stronger
- 25 items dropped – 30 item questionnaire
- The NES Psychology Supervision Questionnaire (NES PSQ)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher order factors</th>
<th>Sub-factors to Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Supervisory Working Alliance</td>
<td>1A: Understanding and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1B: Rapport and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1C: Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Establishing and Protecting Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Reflective Practice and Emotional Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Safety and Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Skill Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Convergent validity

- SRQ (full version) completed as well
- Total NES PSQ and Total SRQ $r = .894$, $p < .001$
- But not all factors/subscales intercorrelate significantly
Criterion Validity – Items included

Total NES PSQ predicts ratings of items such as:

- I would recommend to a friend coming into my course to seek a clinical supervision placement with this supervisor.
- Given the choice, I would choose a placement with this clinical supervisor again.
- This placement has significantly contributed towards the development of my skills as an applied psychologist.
- The overall quality of my clinical supervision experience
- The quality of my supervisory relationship
- The quality of the learning experience
Also used in survey

- Placement experience items (5)
- Overall satisfaction items (3)
- Satisfaction with Clinical Tutor support
- Satisfaction with Local Tutor support
Reporting – Board/Specialty/Supervisor level

Mean scores on Factor 1A - Board level

- Board A
- Your Board
- Board B
- Board C
- Board D
- Board E
- Board F
- Board G
- Board H
- Board I
- Board J
- Board K
- Board L

Blue bars represent individual boards, while the red line represents the average.
Access to the measure

- Neil.Millar@nes.scot.nhs.uk

- Could be used by:
  - individual supervisors
  - a programme
  - a team
  - across a region
  - As the PSQ alone or the wider survey
This resource may be made available, in full or summary form, in alternative formats and community languages. Please contact us on 0131 656 3200 or email altformats@nes.scot.nhs.uk to discuss how we can best meet your requirements.