Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust: Directorate of Education and Training (DET) Research Ethics Procedure (Student-led Research Projects)

1 Introduction and purpose

The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust (the Trust) is committed to maintaining the integrity of academic research and upholding ethical standards in line with the professional, regulatory, legal, and statutory guidelines. To this end, the Directorate of Education and Training (DET) ensures that research is of high quality and conducted according to recognised standards and guidelines, including the *Concordat to Support Research Integrity* and *Research Ethics Support and Review in Research Organisations*.

This procedure outlines the principles, framework, and processes through which ethical review of student-led research projects in DET is managed.

This procedure applies to all student-led research projects undertaken within DET. All projects undertaken at the doctoral level are classified as research. However, this procedure does not apply to Trust Quality Improvement (QI) projects, even if students are involved in the project.

The Trust Research Ethics Committee (TREC) is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of this procedure. This procedure operates in conjunction with other relevant policies and procedures, such as the Trust's Research and Academic Misconduct Procedures and Professional Codes of Conduct.

This procedure supersedes all previous versions and is effective as of October 2025. The Trust reserves the right to amend or update this procedure at its discretion. In the event of any changes, a summary of revisions will be provided, along with an updated version number, to ensure transparency and clarity.

2 Principles and commitment to ethical practice in research

To ensure that research adheres to ethical, legal, and professional standards and aligns with good practices, the following general principles should be observed:

1. **Minimising harm and prioritising wellbeing**
   Research should be designed to avoid or minimise any risks of physical or psychological harm or distress to participants at all stages. The involvement of participants must be proportional to the potential benefits of the research. At all times, the safety, wellbeing, rights, and dignity of participants should take precedence.
2. **Informed consent**
   Whenever possible, participants should provide informed consent based on

clear, concise, and relevant information about the aims, purpose, and methods of the research, as well as the potential storage and use of their data. This includes providing details about what participation entails, along with any associated risks or benefits.

3. **Research involving deliberate deception and post-hoc consent**
   If obtaining informed consent prior to data collection could compromise the scientific validity of a study—such as in covert research—consent should be obtained afterward. Deception or covert methods should only be employed when no viable alternatives exist and when measures are in place to mitigate risk and potential harm.

4. **Voluntary participation**
   Participation in research must always be voluntary, free from coercion, and without undue inducement. Participants have the right to withdraw their consent at any time without explanation or fear of negative consequences. They should also be informed about the time for withdrawal and the point at which their data can no longer be excluded, adhering to UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018 and the provisions of the Data Use and Access Bill 2025 as it is implemented over a period of time.

5. **Privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity**
   Participants' privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity must be respected unless there is a legal or ethical obligation to breach confidentiality, such as disclosures involving harm to self or others, illegal activities, or professional misconduct. In cases where participants are named for scientific purposes (e.g., oral histories), this must be explicitly stated in participant briefing documents. Information sheets and consent forms should clearly outline how participants data is being used, how personal details are being protected, if and in what format participant information and research outcomes are being shared throughout and following data collection, and who has access to participant information. This also needs to include any conditions under which confidentiality may be breached or participants identified.

6. **Cultural sensitivity and respect**
   Research should be conducted in a culturally sensitive manner, respecting the dignity and rights of all individuals, groups, and communities.

7. **Data Security and Compliance**
   All data must be securely processed and stored in accordance with the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Data Protection Act 2018 and the provisions of the Data Use and Access Bill 2025 as it is implemented over a period of time to ensure participant privacy and compliance with legal standards.

8. **Trust Research Ethics Committee (TREC)**
   TREC must operate in alignment with this procedure and adhere to the standard operating procedures outlined herein. Reviews should be independent, transparent, and free from conflicts of interest.

3 Scope

3.1 Introduction

This section of the document sets out the types of research that fall within the DET research ethics review framework, and to which this procedure applies.

All members of DET and DET students are expected to uphold professional, legal and ethical standards in accordance with this procedure, ensuring the integrity of research and safeguarding the Trust's reputation. Staff and students must adhere to the processes for ethical review and comply with DET ethics guidelines, and the ethical standards set forth by research funders and relevant professional bodies.

This procedure applies to DET students engaged in research activities, including both taught and research students. A student is someone enrolled on a programme of study where research is a credit-bearing activity. In this respect, a DET staff member can be classed as a *student*, if the research referred to here is undertaken as part of their enrolment onto one of DET's programmes of study.

The procedure encompasses all types of research conducted by DET students, as specified in the following section.

If there is any uncertainty about whether a project qualifies as research, please refer to the NHS HRA decision tool in the first instance.

3.2 Research involving human participants

Projects involving human participation and the collection of personal data require a full ethics review either through TREC or the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS).

- **Research involving human participation**, including activities such as observations, photography, audio or video recordings, surveys, questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, physical activities, or other interventions. This also includes the use of materials collected by a third party.
- **Research involving the collection, use, or storage of human tissue or bodily materials** (e.g., blood, saliva, or urine), whether obtained directly or through a third party.
- **Research involving access to, collection, or use of personal human data or property**, including images or data drawn from social media.

3.2.1 Projects requiring ethical approval from IRAS

For projects involving NHS staff, NHS patients, service users, or individuals lacking mental capacity, researchers must seek research and ethical approval from the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS).

For projects involving the collection, use or storage of human tissue or bodily materials (e.g. blood, saliva, or urine), whether obtained directly or through a third party, requires specialist training, and expert advice should be sought if such research is proposed. Researchers must then seek research and ethical approval from IRAS.

Guidance and support are available through NOCLOR who act as sponsors of NHS research for both the Trust and DET students. No additional review by TREC is required; once approved, a copy of the IRAS ethics application and approval should be registered with and retained by TREC.

3.2.2 Projects requiring ethical approval from TREC

For all other student-led projects involving research with participants who are not NHS staff or patients, service users, or individuals lacking mental capacity. researchers must seek research and ethical approval from TREC.

3.3 Research involving animals

As it is rare for the Trust to engage in animal research, advice on animal welfare in research must be sought if such research is proposed. All research involving animals needs to be conducted in line with appropriate policies guiding such research.

3.4 Research outside of the scope of this procedure

Certain types of research fall outside the scope of the DET's ethical review framework, unless specified otherwise in 3.5. These include:

- **Desk-based studies**, involving literature reviews and systematic literature reviews, and theoretical studies
- **Secondary data collection and analysis** that utilise secondary data, such as meta-analyses, provided the secondary data is publicly available and does not require additional consent or permissions for access or use. The collection of secondary personal data (e.g., from social media) requires a full ethics review.

Staff or supervisors who are unsure whether an ethics review is required should seek guidance from the Chair of TREC. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the project does not raise ethical concerns requiring review.

3.5 Additional project considerations requiring TREC review

Certain types of research, including activities listed in 3.4, may raise broader ethical concerns beyond those associated with human participant, human tissue, or animal research. These concerns may arise in studies that are politically, environmentally, or

socially sensitive, or where there is potential for financial or reputational risk. Examples include:

- **Politically or socially sensitive research** that could significantly impact the welfare or interests of the wider community or society.
- **Projects posing reputational risks** to the Trust, partner organisations, or academia at large including research on radicalisation, terrorism, or the armed forces.
- **Involvement of sponsors, participants, or associates** whose interests or connections might compromise, or appear to compromise, the impartiality of the research process from design through to publication or exploitation.
- **Collaboration with external sponsors, associates, or organisations** that have a controversial ethical or human rights record, such as entities selling harmful products, or where the source of funding could compromise the Trust's position as a public institution.
- **Activities conducted in countries** under oppressive political regimes, with poor human rights records, or deemed dangerous by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.
- **Issues of research integrity,** including the accurate reporting of results and authorship concerns.

These projects may require TREC review. Any concerns or issues related to such projects should be referred to the Chair of TREC for advice. The Chair of TREC may involve appropriate parties for due diligence.

3.6 Audit and service evaluation

Student projects involving audit or service evaluation are considered part of research training and are therefore subject to ethical review. If the audit or service evaluation involves NHS patients, service users, staff, or premises, the NHS HRA decision tool must be used to determine if ethics review is necessary.

4 DET Research Ethics Review Framework

4.1 Requirements for ethics review

All student-led research conducted within DET at the Trust, as defined in Section 3 (Scope), is subject to TREC ethics review. Students **must obtain approval for their projects before recruiting participants or collecting data** and must adhere to the processes outlined in this procedure. If any **significant changes**[1] to the research design are made following ethical approval that could have a potential impact on the

[1] A 'significant change' refers to a new research approach or method that, had it been planned at the time, would have been mentioned on the original research ethics approval application and any ethical implications arising identified.

dignity, rights, safety and wellbeing of participants, the applicant must submit a change request to determine if further ethical review and approval are required. Students unsure whether their changes qualify as "significant" should seek guidance from their supervisor or the Chair of TREC.

4.2 Ethical breaches

Ethical breaches can have profound consequences, including potential harm or distress to participants and significant reputational risks for both researchers and the DET. Examples of ethical breaches include:

- Failing to submit an ethics application before commencing research.
- Starting participant recruitment or data collection before completing the ethics review process and obtaining approval to proceed.
- Implementing significant changes to a project without submitting and receiving approval for a change request after ethical approval has been granted.

Any breaches of ethics must be taken seriously and addressed appropriately. Staff-related breaches will be handled through the Research Misconduct Procedure, while student-related breaches will be addressed via the Academic Misconduct Procedure.

4.3 Trust Research Ethics Committee (TREC): Role and overview of the two-tier research ethics framework

TREC oversees all applications for ethical approval within DET.

All DET Students' ethics applications require sign-off by the supervisor and course lead (or delegate) prior to submission to TREC. TREC employs a two-tier review process, defined by the level of the student researcher (*Masters vs doctoral level*) as well as the risk identifier of the proposed research (*higher vs. lower*). The latter is assessed via the TREC application form. A full description of the review processes is provided in the standard operating procedures in Annex B and C.

4.3.1 Definition of higher-risk applications

Higher-risk research activities include:

- Research involving children aged under 18 and adults where there are safeguarding concerns
- Research taking place overseas
- Research that, either directly or indirectly, refers to trauma, abuse, or illegal activity
- Research which may lead to disclosures of harm to self, others, or illegal activity, and which requires reporting to relevant authorities
- Carries risk of substantive emotional distress
- Presents legal, reputational, or safety concerns for researchers

- Physical activities presenting significant risks to participants.
- Covert research or research using deliberate deception.

Applicants must indicate the perceived risk level of their research in the application form.

4.3.2. Doctoral-level research

Lower risk applications: Each application is assigned by TREC to a reviewer, an academic staff member within DET. Feedback is provided via correspondence and their assessments of applications are discussed at TREC.

Higher-risk applications: Each application is assigned by TREC to two reviewers, at least one of which is a TREC member. The reviewers make recommendations to TREC, which are presented and discussed at TREC. TREC ratifies or rejects these recommendations.

4.3.3. Masters-level research

Lower risk applications: A subcommittee of TREC, namely a *Masters Portfolio Ethics Review Panel,* is responsible for reviewing ethics applications from taught Masters courses.

Higher-risk applications. As outlined in the DET research ethics procedure document section 4.3.2

Annex A: TREC Documentation

TREC COMMITTEE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

ROLE DESCRIPTION: TREC COMMITTEE CHAIR

Overview of role

In addition to the responsibilities set out in the TREC Terms of Reference, the Chair is responsible for overseeing the operation of TREC in conjunction with the Director of Education (Operations), ensuring that items relating to research ethics and integrity strategy and policy are considered appropriately and that issues referred to the Committee are dealt with fairly, competently and in a timely manner. The Chair will also take a lead role in promoting a culture of best practice in research ethics and integrity within the Directorate of Education and Training.

Key responsibilities

1. Oversee operation of TREC, ensuring that items relating to research ethics and integrity strategy or policy are adhered to and ensuring that reports from the Sub-Committee for Masters applications and those referred to IRAS are received.
2. Ensure that appeals and referred ethics applications are dealt with fairly, appropriately and in a timely manner, that any potential conflicts of interest are addressed and that clear decisions are reached and recorded.
3. Have an awareness of equality, diversity and inclusion and ensure that colleagues are treated fairly and equally.
4. Ensure that TREC operates in accordance with the Trusts' policies and procedures, including the research ethics and integrity policies.
5. Nominate a Deputy Chair from the TREC membership and offer support to the person in this role, ensuring they are able to take over the duties of the Chair when required such as when the Chair has a conflict of interest.
6. Identify any training needs for TREC members and ensure that arrangements are made to meet these.
7. Provide advice and guidance on issues relating to research ethics and integrity where appropriate to staff within DET.
8. Review an annual report on numbers of applications and ethical issues which is then considered at the Education and Training Committee.

Annex B: Panel Standard Operating Procedures

1. Purpose and scope of TREC

The formal **Terms of Reference**, **Constitution**, and **Membership** for TREC are detailed in a separate document. The Chair must ensure the panel includes adequate representation of subject disciplines and research methodologies across DET. Efforts should also be made to achieve a balance in gender, ethnicity, and other protected characteristics.

Meetings are scheduled 5–6 times annually but may be cancelled if there is no business.

The Chair should avoid conflicts of interest among members. Members are appointed for a term of three years. The Chair, with panel agreement, should nominate a Deputy Chair from the membership to act in their absence. The membership allows for co-opted members, and TREC may seek advice from external experts as needed for proposal reviews. A quorum requires at least half of the membership, rounded down if necessary. The Chair's key roles and responsibilities are defined in separate role descriptions.

2. Application processes

Applications must be submitted electronically using the standard form, signed and reviewed by the research supervisor and Course or Research Lead and before submission. Supporting documents such as participant information sheets, consent forms, recruitment materials, risk assessments, and sample data collection tools should accompany the application.

An administrator will check submissions for completeness and sufficiency of information. Incomplete applications will be returned for revision.

TREC may conduct random application sampling to ensure appropriate review standards.

3. Review process for lower risk research

Once the application has been checked for completeness, Academic Quality will allocate the application to an assessor. The assessor should submit their feedback to the applicant on the reviewer comments template form, The reviewer comments should be sent to the applicant together with a covering letter indicating the recommended outcome of the review and actions required. The ethical review process takes a minimum of 4 weeks. Any amendments that need to be made by the applicant after initial review will add to this time. See sections 9 and 10 below on outcomes and communication to applicants for further details.

4. Review process for higher risk research

Higher-risk research is reviewed by two assessors and during panel meetings (held online or in-person) to ensure robust evaluations.

Each application is assigned two lead assessors, who complete review templates before the meeting. These reviewers introduce the application to the panel, and other members contribute to the discussion.

Applicants typically do not attend these meetings but may be invited, along with their supervisor, to clarify issues if recommended by reviewers. Discussions and documents remain confidential, and conflicts of interest must be declared.

The ethical review process takes a minimum of 4 weeks. Any amendments that need to be made by the applicant after initial review will add to this time.

See sections 9 and 10 below on outcomes and communication to applicants for further details.

5. Secondary data collection and systematic literature reviews

For other projects involving the use of publicly available secondary data or systematic literature reviews, full ethics review is not needed, but a secondary data collection form should be completed and for student projects the form should be scrutinised by and signed by the supervisor. If the secondary data is publicly available and no additional consents or permissions are required to access or use the data, no further ethical review is required by the TREC, unless the supervisor flags up any additional ethical issues. Projects involving collection of secondary personal data online (e.g. via social media) are subject to full ethics review.

6. Scope of review

Ethical review focuses on ethical considerations, prioritising the safety, welfare, rights, and dignity of participants. Reviewers ensure:

- Risks are identified and mitigated.
- Information sheets, consent forms and recruitment materials are clear and appropriate.
- Research is valuable and well-designed to avoid unnecessary risks or unwarranted time-cost for participants.

Methodological issues will only be flagged if they raise ethical concerns.

7. Outcomes

Once an application has been reviewed, TREC will provide an outcome of the review. The Outcome would normally be one of the following:

Approved (no conditions): The research is fully approved and can commence immediately (subject to any additional, external approvals required).

Approved with minor advice to applicant for consideration (but there is no requirement to resubmit): The application is approved but reviewers have offered some helpful advice that the applicant may want to consider with their team (if staff member) or supervisor (if student)

Conditional: The application needs further work, raises concerns or is incomplete requires significant amendments before resubmission to TREC Research may not commence until this occurs and formal approval from TREC is given.

Unsuccessful: The application is considered to raise fundamental concerns that means it cannot be approved without significant amendments. Applicants will normally be given the option of resubmitting their application with minor or major amendments rather than giving an unsuccessful outcome outright. If applicants are given an unsuccessful outcome without the option of resubmission, they should in the first instance consider submitting a new application.

8. Communication to applicants following review

Outcome notifications to applicants informing them of the decision should be sent out as soon as possible once the review process has been completed (where applications have been reviewed at a meeting this should be within 7 working days of the meeting). Supervisors should be copied in on the outcome notification and any subsequent correspondence relating to the application. The notification using a standard letter template should include:

- The decision.
- Any conditions (including details of revisions, additional information, or clarification) required for the TREC to approve the proposed research. In addition to the decision and any conditions for obtaining a favourable opinion.
- Reasons for being unable to give a favourable ethical opinion or for required resubmission.
- An outline of next steps in terms of process to be followed, including mechanisms for considering further information and deadlines for providing revisions or resubmitting the application.
- For proposals that have been approved, a reminder about the need to contact the TREC in the event of any subsequent changes to the planned research, and to complete an end of project form on completion of the research.
- For applications that have been approved, a reminder of the need to flag up any unexpected ethical issues that arise during the project, and to report immediately any serious adverse events that occur during the research.

- For applications that have not yet been approved, a reminder that applicants may not start to recruit participants or collect data until a favourable ethical opinion has been obtained, and that to do so would constitute research misconduct.

9. Changes to projects

Occasionally there may be a need to make significant changes to a research study after an ethics application has been approved, and this may raise ethical issues. Changes that might raise ethical issues could include:

- Changes to the design of the research and data collection methods used
- Changes to the location or context in which the research is being carried out
- Engagement with a different group of participants
- Changes to methods of recruiting participants
- Additional uses to which the data collected might be put
- Major changes to information given to participants or to the consent form

A notable change does not apply to the routine, everyday adjustments to data gathering plans and activities that researchers must often make in response to the contingencies of research. Nor does it apply to minor corrections in the written information given to participants, such as remedying spelling errors or typos.

Changes to the study may not necessitate additional ethics review, in cases where they do not raise significant ethical issues. Students need to discuss the proposed changes with their supervisor and Course Lead/ Research Lead who can recommend that they be approved by the Chair of TREC without further review.

10. Appeals

Appeals against the decision of TREC should only be made as a last resort and based on one of the following criteria:

- that there was evidence of procedural irregularity in the review process
- that there was evidence of improper conduct, prejudice, or bias on the part of one or more members of the Research Ethics Panel.

Appeals will be submitted to the Chair of TREC and referred to the Student Complaints, Conduct and Appeals Officer who will manage the appeal process and collect evidence to be presented to the Chair.

Training

All members of TREC and all reviewers will be provided with copies of the Terms of reference, Standard Operating Procedures, and a description of their role. They will also be invited to a training session on ethics review framework, as well as covering key ethical issues.

Annex C: Masters Ethical approval Protocol

Directorate of Education Masters Portfolio Ethics Review Panel
Terms of Reference

As per the Tavistock Research Ethics Procedure 2025, a subcommittee of the TREC namely a Masters Portfolio Ethics Review Panel is responsible for reviewing ethics applications from taught Masters courses. Projects at this level are usually considered lower-risk and so can be reviewed via a Panel at Portfolio level. In the event of higher-risk projects, these may be referred to the TREC Chair for further review.

This Protocol only applies to research in NHS and non-NHS settings. For NHS settings, a completed HRA decision tool by the student is required (i.e. to show it does not apply) and must be submitted as part of the student's TREC documentation.

1 PURPOSE AND REMIT

1. To undertake independent, competent and timely review of research ethics applications on Masters programmes in DET, ensuring that:
    a. Ethical risks have been identified and addressed, and recommendations have been made regarding any measures that might be required to ensure the safety of research participants and researchers.
    b. The wellbeing, rights, dignity and interests of research participants have been considered and respected, including issues of voluntary informed consent.
    c. Applicants have been provided with clear feedback and guidance on improving their proposals and any changes that are required before ethical clearance can be granted.
2. To review and approve any changes proposed to applications that have already received ethical clearance.
3. In exceptional cases to seek advice from the TREC on specific issues raised by applications or to refer applications to the TREC if the Panel feels that it does not have appropriate expertise to undertake the review.
4. To refer any higher-risk applications to the TREC Chair
5. To produce an annual report to the TREC on the discharge of the Panel's responsibilities, including statistics on applications reviewed.
6. To ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different groups of people.

2 MEMBERSHIP OF MASTERS PORTFOLIO ETHICS REVIEW PANEL

Local Ethics Panel	Panel Roles	D10/ED10 masters	M6 masters
TREC Committee	Head of Portfolio as an research-active member of DET staff with delegated authority from TREC Committee Chair	**Head of Interprofessional Portfolio**	**Head of Systemic Portfolio**
Local Panel Chair	Delegated authority by TREC committee via Head of Portfolio	**Head of Interprofessional Portfolio**	**Head of Systemic Portfolio**
Ex officio members	Deputy Chair appointed annually by the local Chair, and is a member of the local panel	**Course Lead Practice Lead**	**Course Lead Research Lead**
Appointed members	Other academic staff from within the Portfolio with a range of disciplinary and methodological expertise to cover the types of applications to be reviewed and ensuring a sufficient number of Panel members to review the volume of applications.	Appointed one to two **academic lecturers** from outside the module who are Senior Lecturer, Lecturer or Associate Lecturers; or from outside the course from D10D for example.	
Academic quality and support	Academic Quality	A senior officer in AQ team	A senior officer in AQ team

3 LOWER RISK RESEARCH AND REVIEW PROCESSES

The masters programme and research are by definition lower risk, whether carried out by domestic or overseas students. As such, the following review process applies.

- Review via virtual correspondence is appropriate for lower-risk activities such as: group discussions, workplace observations, and individual interviews with participants who are not vulnerable and unlikely to experience health distress.
- Review action research organisation consultancy projects with teams, cross-functional groups or whole organisations by a trainee consultant working in a systems psychodynamic consultative
- Physical activities with minimal risk to participants.

Where research is considered higher risk, the application should be reviewed by the Panel and the Reviewer's feedback and recommendations referred to the TREC Chair. The TREC Chair will consider the recommendations and either approve the application for ethical approval, ask for additional information or amendments, or refer for consideration at the TREC Committee.

Higher-risk research activities include –

- Research involving children aged under 18 and adults where there are safeguarding concerns
- Research taking place overseas

- Research that, either directly or indirectly, refers to trauma, abuse, or illegal activity
- Research which may lead to disclosures of harm to self, others, or illegal activity, and which requires reporting to relevant authorities
- Carries risk of substantive emotional distress
- Presents legal, reputational, or safety concerns for researchers
- Physical activities presenting significant risks to participants.
- Covert research or research using deliberate deception.

Applicants must indicate the perceived risk level of their research in the application form.

4 APPLICATION PROCESS

Applications must be submitted within the timeframe and via Moodle. The submission includes a completed official TREC application form, completed as per course level guidance, along with required and other relevant supporting documentation. The form must be reviewed and signed by the research/practice supervisor who has delegated initial oversight from the Course Lead and Research/Practice Lead. The supervisor authorises completeness and readiness for the student to formally submit for ethical approval.

Supporting documents must include a copy of explicit organisational client authorisation for the project where applicable and if action research is being conducted in NHS setting then a copy of the completed HRA decision tool (i.e. does not require review by an NHS Research Ethics Committee (REC))

All submissions are checked for completeness prior to circulation to the assessor. The required documentation is set out below. Incomplete applications will be returned.

- TREC form completed in full (as per the course guidance)
- Organisational client authorisation (e.g. email, signed consultancy proposal,…)
- HRA tool outcome if in an NHS setting (i.e. to attest that NHS REC not applicable)
- A copy of the full consultancy or research proposal as provided to the client (optional)

5 REVIEW PROCESS FOR LOW-RISK MASTERS ORGANISATIONAL PROJECTS

Once the application documentation has been checked for completeness by Academic Quality, Academic Quality circulates the submission(s) to the assessors for their review. Assessors provide their feedback in the Reviewer feedback form which is sent to the Chair for their review.

The applicant will receive an email from Academic Quality indicating the recommended outcome (approval, amendments, rejection or referral to TREC). All recommendations will be forwarded to TREC and Academic Quality will issue the formal letter of approval after TREC ratification.

6 KPIs

Three performance measures that capture quality and efficiency of the overall process:

- % reviewed and initial feedback by local panel within agreed timeframe
- % submissions approved and informed within agreed timeframe
- % formal approval letters issued within 1 month of emailed indicating approval