
Performance review process report

Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, Review Period 2023-2025

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which / if any, themes needed to be explored through quality activities
- Decided that we did not need to undertake further exploration of key themes through quality activities, as the education provider's portfolio was clear on their performance against the themes set
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed

Through this assessment, we have noted;

- The education provider's ongoing institutional merger with another NHS Foundation trust. We have considered this ongoing institutional change throughout this assessment.
- The following are areas of best practice:
 - The education provider's approach to equality, diversity and inclusion. Detailed, clear actions and initiatives at the programme level, a specific EDI lead in place, and a clear programme-level action plan.
- The education provider should next engage with monitoring in four years, the 2029-30 academic year, because:
 - This recognises the work the provider has done in this review and review period.
 - This recognises the introduction of required verified data from the education provider to be submitted on an annual basis.
 - This allows sufficient time for their merger to be completed and the outcome of the merger to be reflected.

Previous consideration	Review as a result of the end of the last ongoing monitoring period.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: • when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be

Next steps

Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:

- Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2029-30 academic year
-

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	4
About us	4
Our standards	4
Our regulatory approach	4
The performance review process	4
Thematic areas reviewed	5
How we make our decisions	5
The assessment panel for this review	5
Section 2: About the education provider	6
The education provider context	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	6
Institution performance data	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	10
Portfolio submission	10
Data / intelligence considered	10
Quality themes identified for further exploration	10
Section 4: Findings	10
Overall findings on performance	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	27
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	33
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	35
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	37
Data and reflections	42
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	45
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	45
Assessment panel recommendation	45
Appendix 1 – summary report	47
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution	47

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:

- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:

- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this education provider:

Joanne Lusher	Lead visitor, Practitioner Psychologist, Health Psychologist
Lyn McLafferty	Lead visitor, Practitioner Psychologist, Educational Psychologist
Jenny McKibben	Service User Expert Advisor
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers one HCPC-approved programme in Educational Psychology. It is an NHS Trust and Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2005.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Practitioner psychologist	☐ Undergraduate	☒ Postgraduate	2005

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes¹.

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	16	16	2025-26	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the number of actual learners reported through the education provider's portfolio submission.

¹ An explanation of the data we use, and how we use this data, is available [here](#)

				As the education provider has stated that they continue to recruit to their intended learner numbers, this would indicate that their approved provision continues to recruit well and remains stable.
Learner non continuation	7%	0%	2024-25	There is no HESA or HCPC data available for this data point. This is due to the nature of the education provider not being a Higher Education Institution (HEI), and is therefore not included in HESA data returns The education provider has provided their own data that was used as part of this performance review. The source of this data was their "Student Registration and Exam Board Progression 2023/24 & 2024/25". It details that they have recorded a 0% non-continuation rate for the two specified academic years. The education provider has confirmed that this data will continue to be supplied annually to the HCPC on the 31st of October each year. This value is below the benchmark from the HESA data, indicating that the education provider are performing well in this area. The education provider also explained how they have set an internal benchmark of 3.3% and also plan to monitor this annual and take action should their rate rise. The lead visitors assessed this in the education providers portfolio and found them to be performing well in

				this area. The education provider has established systems to supply data for this area going forward.
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	92%	100%	2024-25	There is no HESA or HCPC data available for this data point. This is due to the nature of the education provider not being a HEI, and therefore not being included in HESA data returns. The education provider has provided their own data that was used as part of this performance review. The source of this data was South East, East and London (SEEL / SEAL) region Reporting for academic years 2023-24 and 2024-25. It details that they have recorded an 100% graduate outcomes rate. This means that for learners that successfully complete their approved programme, 100% are in work post graduation. They have also stated that this is actively monitored through their contract with the Department for Education (DfE). The education provider has confirmed that this data will continue to be supplied annually to the HCPC on the 31st of October each year. This value is above the benchmark of 92% indicating that the education provider is performing well in this area. The lead visitors assessed this in the education providers portfolio. The education provider has established systems to supply data for this area going forward

Learner satisfaction	N/A	97%	2024-25	There is no National Student Survey (NSS) data available for this data point. This is due to the nature of the education provider's provision and as they are a non-HEI, and is therefore not included in NSS data returns (which is also for undergraduate learners also). The education provider has submitted their own verified data via their internal Student Survey. They have submitted data for the 2023-24 and 2024-25 academic years which showed overall satisfaction rates of 96% and 97% respectively. This data was verified through their Annual Review of Courses (ARC) process with their validating partner, the University of Essex. The education provider has confirmed that this data will continue to be supplied annually to the HCPC on the 31st of October each year. There is no available benchmark for this data point, as NSS data benchmarks are education provider specific, but a score of 97% in their most recent data score rising from 96% shows that the education provider is performing well in this area. The lead visitors assessed this in the education providers portfolio. The education provider has established systems to supply data for this area going forward
----------------------	-----	-----	---------	--

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the [thematic areas reviewed](#) section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

Data / intelligence considered

We also considered data and reflections supplied by the education provider in lieu of existing HCPC data. This is discussed and reflected on in section 4 of this report.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their portfolio. Based on our understanding, we did not identify areas we needed to explore through quality activities. This was due to the assessment by our lead visitors and service user expert advisor finding a complete and thorough portfolio that set out how the education provider has performed well in the two year period being reviewed. They did not raise concerns regarding the education provider's ongoing performance based on their thorough and detailed review.

This may also in part be due to the regular performance review assessments that the education provider has been subject to in recent years. Due to previously not having established data points in place, the education provider has engaged with the performance review process every two years since our current education quality assurance model was established in 2021.

Our findings, which set out the above findings regarding the education provider's performance are contained in the next section of this report. This includes some areas which we clarified with the education provider, to further explore our understanding.

Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Admissions procedures –**

- The education provider has explained the system in place that allowed learners to be admitted to their single approved programme, the Professional Doctorate in Child, Community and Educational Psychology. This is through a national admissions system managed by the Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP) under the Department for Education (DfE) funded Initial Training in Educational Psychology (ITEP) scheme.
- The education provider explained how following their most recent commissioning round (2024–26 with an optional one-year roll-over to 2027), a consortium (referred to as SEAL) made up of University College London's Institute of Education, University of East London the University of Southampton (UoS) and the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust (T&P NHSFT) secured the south east regional training contract for 2024-26. They also explained how the AEP Admissions Portal is used by all SEAL providers, as well as the North, Southwest and Midlands (NORMID-SW) consortium, to manage ITEP applications at a national level.
- The education provider detailed how they currently admit 16 learners annually to the DfE-funded places, with 451 applicants for places being received in Autumn 2025 for entry to the programme in 2026. They also run an annual general open event and a targeted event for historically excluded or underrepresented groups. Both events, as explained, are co-facilitated by current learners and staff and are intended to support informed decisions about applications to the programme and to increase access to training, particularly for historically excluded and under-represented groups.
- The education provider reflects that evaluation of their admissions processes is an ongoing and data-driven process. With reflections from learners, stakeholders and the programme team, helping to identify challenges and areas for development. Key areas include:
 - Principal Educational Psychologists (PEP) colleagues queried whether their admissions process sufficiently communicated the public service obligations tied to DfE funding
 - Learners asked for a clearer public statement of their anti-racist commitment to guide programme applicants
 - Staff identified a need to improve the consistency in shortlisting and to refine the marking of the written task
 - Engagement internally with the 'Student Registry' and with external stakeholders (including the AEP and other consortium partners), highlighted gaps in data access. This included equality data from applications to the AEP portal that was not then shared with the education provider, thereby impacting local equalities monitoring.
- The education provider reflected on the successes that they have identified in the monitoring period. This included ensuring their compliance with admissions policies and SEAL consortium processes through annual review and revision of the programmes Recruitment,

Selection and Admissions Handbook. This review ensured the handbook reflects stakeholder feedback and new learning. This includes alignment with national safer recruitment and equality legislation, with processes cross-referenced to institution-wide policies as relevant. This included transparency in selection criteria and expectations communicated to applicants via revised web content, interview invitations, admissions letters and Orientation Days

- Another success has been their targeted quality improvement work as regards diversification and representation in recruitment and selection. They reflect that they have outlined this further in the supporting document they supplied, 'Review & Enhancement / QI Recruitment, Selection and Admissions Strand – Report'. They reflect that they have undertaken focused development work to improve data collection and analysis and stakeholder engagement. They have also identified potential areas for improvement, such as continuing to work on the representation of men and older people. Furthermore, they recognise a need to adopt a more nuanced perspective regarding the experiences of different ethnic groups and LGBTQ+ communities.
- Through clarification the education provider detailed the actions they are taking to improve their approach to programme admissions. These actions focus on strengthening consistency, inclusivity and evidence-informed improvement across recruitment and selection. Key priorities include rolling out and embedding the revised programme Recruitment, Selection and Admissions Handbook, supporting by staff training and moderation activities such as the shared shortlisting day and working with Marketing and Admissions colleagues after the current Cohort 2026 recruitment phase. They have provided further information on targeted engagement. Including; continuing development of updated recruitment content, completion and integration of the programme's anti-racist statement; and transferring relevant actions from the programme's Review & Enhancement / QI report into the programme development plan.
- They explained that further enhancement work will involve deeper analysis of recruitment data (with the data team and AEP) to enable more nuanced understanding of progression points in the process, exploration of targeted or adapted events to better engage underrepresented groups, and, subject to DfE confirmation, refinement of future open events through clearer structure, wider marketing, digital feedback tools, and stakeholder-informed adjustments to content and facilitation.
- The visitors found the education providers reflections on this section to be detailed and thorough. They also found there to be a transparent process available on the education providers website and linked with associated services and support sites. Additionally, there is a rigorous and inclusive selection underpinned by the programme's Recruitment, Selection and Admissions Handbook. The visitors noted the education provider's reflections and descriptions that demonstrate a robust data recording methods and EDI monitoring procedures in place. They noted the stability in the recruitment of learner numbers over several years and also the work the education provider has done to help

alleviate financial pressures and cost of living impact on learners. This includes the recent increase in bursary payments and travel compensation. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**

- The education provider has reflected on how resourcing across the public sector is under significant strain. As an NHS Foundation Trust they, as well as their Directorate of Education and Training (DET), is facing financial restrictions, a freeze on discretionary spending, and recruitment challenges. This they reflect affect programme delivery despite protected staffing and equipment funds. The organisation is also preparing for a major structural change as it moves toward an April 2026 merger with North London NHS Foundation Trust. They reflect on how this was an opportunity for greater stability but one that has introduced uncertainty and disruption during the transition period. They have also stated that they have always continued to meet the staff-to-learner ratio as set out by the BPS along with other accreditation requirements. Local authority partners are experiencing similar financial pressures, requiring increased contributions to sustain learner practice-based learning, while the ongoing cost-of-living crisis continues to affect learners in the SEEL region, many of whom rely on bursaries and remain financially vulnerable even after recent increases.
- The education provider reflected on how they have completed evaluation of their resourcing. This process identified several pressures alongside areas of progress and future development. Key challenges included internal financial constraints which are expected to ease through an upcoming merger with a larger NHS trust. They also identified ongoing cost-of-living difficulties for Year 1 learners receiving the £16,700 DfE bursary. They also identified the financial burden of providing Year 1 local authority practice-based learning. Both of these challenges, they reflect, are being addressed through a collaborative working group exploring transparent pricing and shared expectations. Looking ahead, the anticipated contract re-tender will require renewed attention to financial planning, and while the approved programme is well-equipped to support disabled students and those with health conditions through strong institutional and programme-level provision, this strength also demands continued responsiveness in managing associated workload and staffing.
- The visitors found the consultation and reviews processes to be in place and robust. Furthermore, they found the education provider to be adequately staffed and well monitored. They noted the understanding and appreciations of sector-wide challenges from the education provider and this being built into planning and continuous monitoring. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

- **Partnerships with other organisations –**

- The education provider has stated that they maintain a wide network of partnerships, working closely with professional and regulatory bodies. This includes the HCPC, British Psychological Society (BPS) and Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP), as well as funding

organisations like the Department for Education (DfE) and consortium partners. They have detailed how their approved programme collaborates with a range of placement providers including Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), local authorities and charities. Furthermore, the programme has a strong quality-assurance relationship with its validating university, the University of Essex, supported by joint governance structures.

- The education provider has also detailed how they have established examining arrangements with the University of Sheffield, University of Southampton and the University of East London (UEL). In addition, the education provider holds wider partnerships with placement providers for non-HCPC programmes, NHS England, UEL and several professional and statutory bodies across psychotherapy and social work. In addition, they hold partnerships with the Office for Students and are members of Independent Higher Education and Advance HE.
- The education provider has reflected on how their programme's location within a working mental health clinic creates unique challenges. This is because effective delivery of the programme relies on managing a wide range of organisational partnerships, each with its own governance, reporting and quality-assurance requirements that place significant demands on the programme team. They detail how their upcoming merger with North London NHS Foundation Trust (NLFT) is expected to introduce additional partner organisations and potentially expand placement opportunities. Whilst also requiring updates to partnership agreements and clinical induction materials due to changes in corporate identity.
- They state that in response to learner feedback and to strengthen the community dimension of training, the programme has also introduced new placement opportunities in charitable and non-clinical community settings for 2025-26. This is aimed at supporting learners to meet relevant Standards of Proficiency, including understanding the educational psychologist's role across diverse school and community contexts.
- They reflect that their successes in the review period include the introduction of new units and the embedding of related employment-readiness teaching, including interview skills co-facilitated by at least four practice education partners through their partnership networks. They reflect that they have also expanded their Year 1 community practice-based learning placements to include a broader range of charitable and local authority partners, which has enriched learner experience and increased the likelihood of securing sufficient practice-based learning placements for future cohorts. They state that this ensures that their approach reflects sector-wide learning and best practice.
- Through clarification, the education provider explained how often partner organisations' meetings occur. This includes SEEL / SEAL meetings occurring termly, validation with their validating body once every five years, monthly meetings of Independent Higher Education and of Advance HE at the Dean level and termly meetings of community placement teams.

- The visitors found the education provider to have evidenced management processes and experience of working in partnership with multiple stakeholders. Furthermore, they detailed how new relationships have been established with areas like charities and non-traditional settings. The visitors were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **Staff development –**
 - The education provider has stated that they place strong emphasis on the continuing professional development (CPD) of programme staff and practice educators, supported by a Trust-wide Staff Training and Development Procedure overseen by the Director of People. They detailed how all staff complete the NHS Mandatory and Statutory Training (MAST) programme. This covers safeguarding, equality and diversity, information governance, conflict resolution, Prevent awareness and other essential areas. They state that this ensures a consistent baseline of professional competence and regulatory compliance across the organisation.
 - The education provider reflects how, at the directorate level, CPD is guided by the Directorate of Education & Training (DET) Learning and Teaching Strategy. Furthermore that staff have access to a comprehensive Moodle site containing CPD resources, recordings and the annual Staff Learning and Teaching programme, which is shaped by identified development needs, learner feedback and emerging innovations such as digital education and AI. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion is embedded throughout, with DET EDI Leads contributing to CPD planning. This strategy, they state, also promotes engagement with Advance HE Fellowships and supports the biennial Learning and Teaching Conference.
 - They detail how, for programme staff, most of whom are HCPC registrants, CPD is further informed by HCPC standards. Furthermore, the appraisal process identifies development needs and appropriate activities. Their programme's approach emphasises CPD that is responsive to gap analysis, service-user feedback and professional relevance, while meeting BPS accreditation expectations for scholarly activity and ongoing professional development. They explained how practice educators are also supported through robust placement governance, led by a Deputy Director with responsibility for Placements and Supervision, and through a personalised CPD offer tailored to the diverse range of supervisors involved in delivering high-quality placement experiences.
 - The education provider explained how, at the end of each academic year, their DET senior leaders undertake a review of the DET CPD programme, identifying levels of staff engagement, evaluation and satisfaction levels. For 2024-25, evaluation data were available from 137 staff who attended 17 internal Learning and Teaching CPD sessions. They also explained how, since the introduction of the DET's Fellowship Scheme, they have supported 42 staff to achieve Fellowship. As well as four Associate Fellows, 16 Fellows, 17 Senior Fellows and five Principal Fellows.

- They have also explained how their Deputy Director (Placements & Supervision) provided training for all practice educators on the implementation of the revised HCPC Standards of Proficiency (SOPs). They paid particular focus on the section on further centralising the service user. Since then, they also identified a professional development need for practice educators via an audit of learners' placement evaluation records in the giving and receiving of feedback. They also designed and delivered online CPD for Year 2 and 3 placement educator in Spring 2025. This focused-on models of feedback and key messages from the evidence base, including the function and benefit of 'contracting' for feedback, the differences between evaluation and feedback, engaging with power differentials, and the emotional elements of giving and receiving feedback. They report that 83% of Year 2 and 3 placement educator participated in this CPD. Impact will be evaluated in the review and audit of placement evaluation records in Summer 2026 and through termly placement 3-way meetings.
- They have detailed how programme staff have recently benefited from targeted CPD led by senior colleagues. This included training on literature reviews delivered by the Deputy Director (Research). Their External Examiners have since noted marked improvements in the quality and confidence of learners' literature reviews. The Deputy Director (Placements & Supervision) also introduced the Lundy Model as a framework for service-user involvement (2025). Module Leads are now selecting enhancement priorities informed by this input for inclusion in programme development plans.
- The education provider also provided details on further developments, including the extension of their Relational Model of Supervision for Applied Psychological Practice (RMSAPP) into research supervision. Senior staff have integrated previously separate guidance into a unified Supervision Guidance document and created a reflective space for staff to explore this approach. This, they explained, draws on internal expertise in a psychoanalytically informed group supervision. The programme has also introduced group supervision for both research and personal supervisors, strengthening consistency, reflective capacity, and the overall quality of supervisory practice across the programme.
- Through clarification, the education provider detailed the process they have in place to address underperformance or non-engagement of their staff in CPD processes. This includes their line and performance management of staff and also their annual performance appraisal process. In addition to this, they have explained how each staff member has a Personal Development Plan. This outlines what the staff member needs to learn or develop in the year ahead, how and by whom it will be arranged, when it will be undertaken, the expected benefits, and who is responsible for completion.
- The visitors note the work the education provider has conducted to further develop and embed their governance system. They found the education provider to have demonstrated how staff have access to a range of opportunities for CPD linked to programme delivery. The

visitors were satisfied with the education providers' performance in this area.

- **Academic quality –**

- The education provider has described how their approved programme is built on a strong integration of advanced academic learning and professional practice. With a focus on developing practitioner-scholars who can contribute both to applied contexts and to wider knowledge in health and social care. They state that academic quality is assured through rigorous internal and external processes, including verification and moderation of assessments, systematic learner feedback, and alignment with national benchmarks such as Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) standards. Quality oversight is embedded in multiple mechanisms, including their Annual Review of Courses (ARC), the Stakeholder Committee, the Academic Governance and Quality Assurance Group (AGQAG), learner surveys and Dean's Forums.
- They state that the AGQAG also plays a central role in maintaining and enhancing academic standards, reporting to the Education and Training Committee of the Trust Board. It reviews quality assurance policies from the Trust, university partners and national bodies, and monitors course reviews, External Examiner reports, validation and revalidation outcomes, PSRB accreditation activity, and the Directorate of Education & Training (DET) Annual Student Survey. It also considers proposals for curriculum and assessment changes and receives updates from the Research and Ethics Committees, the Technology-Enhanced Learning team, and the Student Experience team. At the partnership level, quality assurance processes are aligned with University of Essex (UoE) regulations, supported by UoE representation on AGQAG and a twice-yearly Partnership Management Board. ARC and Periodic Review ensure systematic evaluation of curriculum, delivery, student experience and outcomes, while PSRB engagement ensures compliance with professional standards.
- They also explained how the whole Trust also undergoes a five-yearly Essex Institutional Review, with the most recent (March 2024) confirming re-approval as a partner institution for five years. This is subject to recommendations relating to thesis examination processes, progress monitoring, and consistent adherence to UoE policies and timeframes. The panel also commended the Trust's strong commitment to EDI and widening participation, as well as significant improvements in data management. At the programme level, earlier HCPC performance review feedback highlighted the need to strengthen learner confidence in research, improve assessment approaches and streamline ethics processes. At that time, the programme was also still in the early stages of embedding its course vision and teaching principles across all aspects of learning and teaching quality.
- The education provider has stated that, in response to the conditions set out in the last Essex review, they have set out their plans to improve the quality and stability of their data management. This included a review of their student information system, covering business processes, student data system use, and best practices

across the entire learner lifecycle. The aim was to improve their data collection and management. Additionally, they are undertaking additional projects across DET, including a major review where the scope is to implement formal processes, systems, and procedures to enable better outcomes when managing post-graduate research. Aligned to this is the ongoing process of recruiting additional staff across the Directorate of Education and Training (DET), including several additional roles within the Academic Registry. This includes an expanded Data Returns and Insights team, as well as admissions and programme administration.

- The visitors found that there were detailed evidence and examples provided on systematic approaches for collecting and evaluating learner feedback which is aligned with national benchmarks and standards. They noted the assessment and monitoring the feedback both internally and externally through their validating partner. The visitors were satisfied with the education providers' performance in this area.
- **Quality of practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider has detailed how practice-based learning is central to all Initial Training for Educational Psychologists (ITEP). Furthermore, they explained how the British Psychological Society (BPS) accreditation requires at least 300 practice-based learning placement (placement(s)) days across three years. They explained how year one of their programme includes one placement in a local authority Educational Psychology Service (EPS) and one in a CAMHS team, while Years 2 and 3 each include 130 days allocated through the SEAL panel process, which matches learners to practice-based learning placements based on their ranked preferences.
 - They reflected that although this system generally works well, an appeals process exists for the small number of issues that arise. Furthermore, recent changes to year one practice-based learning reflect financial pressures and a strengthened community focus. This includes structured EPS placement blocks and expanded community practice-based learning, such as CAMHS, Centrepont, and a pilot outreach service supporting children with Emotionally Based School Non-Attendance (EBSNA). They stated that quality assurance is maintained through annual surveys, structured placement evaluations, regular three-way meetings, internal audits, and NHS England's self-assessment process.
 - The education provider reflected that evaluation of practice-based learning is guided by AHP principles and highlights strong co-production between learner and supervisors. This includes learners leading their development through self-assessment and Professional Development Plans (PDPs). Efforts have been made to improve inclusivity, particularly for disabled learners, through partnership work and new guidance on anti-discriminatory practice. They have explained how practice-based learning span clinical, academic, leadership, and research pillars. These offer diverse experiences across education, health, and voluntary sectors, including supervised casework, multidisciplinary collaboration, and research linked to placement

settings. The practice-based learning available support progression across programme learning outcomes and professional standards, evaluation and also notes that wider system pressures, such as financial constraints, affect placement availability and the consistency of supervision.

- The education provider had reflected on how their programme's structured and multi-layered approach to monitoring and enhancing placement quality aligns with their professional body standards and sector expectations. They stated that through systematic use of data, reflective practice, and national frameworks such as the Allied Health Professionals (AHP) principles, the programme maintains a strong commitment to continuous improvement and equitable learning experiences across all placement years. Its ability to adapt to external pressures while safeguarding core values and learning outcomes is reflective of a mature, resilient placement model. They state that the expansion of community-based opportunities, alongside the integration of quality-improvement methods and service-user involvement, further strengthens the programme's distinctiveness and alignment with wider public health and psychological service delivery priorities.
- The education provider has outlined an action plan for continued improvement and development. This states that the programme will continue to enhance placement provision by rolling out new community practice-based learning. They will also ensure that these standards meet the standards set out in the Programme Placement Approval, Allocation and QA Policy. The programme will embed a review and reference group model that brings together service users, clinical managers, and programme staff. This aims to support reflective practice and the implementation of quality-improvement initiatives. Furthermore, ongoing collaboration with consortium partners will remain central to refining and strengthening the second- and third-year placement allocation process.
- Through clarification, the education explained how they have no interview / selection process for placement allocation. Instead, learners are allocated practice-based learning through the ITEP consortia procedure. The education provider reflected on how the placement allocation process is designed to promote equal opportunities across all years of training by taking into account learners' individual circumstances. In the programme's first year, learners are encouraged to disclose relevant needs (such as disabilities, health conditions or travel considerations) in advance of placement decisions, which are then considered by the Deputy Director of Placements & Supervision to prioritise allocations as close as possible to learners' home addresses. In Years 2 and 3, practice-based learning is allocated regionally through the SEAL Placement Panel, where learners rank preferred bursary-pledged services and may submit exceptional circumstance requests related to caring responsibilities, health or disability; these are prioritised by the panel to ensure fairness.
- The visitors considered all information available when completing their assessment. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

- **Learner support –**

- The education provider has stated that the approved programme is grounded in a comprehensive framework of Trust-wide and programme-specific policies. These are designed to ensure that all learners receive equitable, accessible, and proactive support throughout their training. These policies recognise the diverse ways adults learn and the barriers they may face, including financial pressures, emotional well-being needs, and accessibility requirements. Support is introduced at admission and reinforced throughout the programme through induction, Year Leads, supervisors, and the DET Student Support and Engagement Team. They have explained how learners have access to a wide range of resources, including academic skills support, learner groups, wellbeing services, financial guidance, and mechanisms for reasonable adjustments such as Accessibility Passports. They explained how policy implementation is monitored through multiple quality assurance processes. This includes annual programme reviews, stakeholder committees, learner feedback forums, and supervisory oversight. The education provider reports that recent data show high levels of learner satisfaction with the support they receive.
- The education provider has reflected how, by complementing these Trust-wide systems, the programme has developed distinctive approaches that emphasise anticipatory support, learner autonomy, and high-quality supervisory relationships. They explained how learners complete a one-page profile on entry to help staff understand their learning needs. Learners also benefit from digital resources, wellbeing modules, and structured supervisory arrangements across personal, research, and placement domains. They state that supervision is a signature pedagogy, operationalised through the Relational Model of Supervision for Applied Psychological Practice (RMSAPP), which frames supervision as a learning-centred, relational process. The programme monitors supervisory quality through innovative “SR health-checks,” to ensure that supervision contributes positively to learner wellbeing and development. They explained how learners also benefit from well-resourced facilities, including a specialist library, quiet study spaces, bookable rooms, and communal areas, all of which support a conducive learning environment.
- The education provider detailed how the programme continuously evaluates the quality and impact of learner support through multiple data sources, including annual DET surveys, programme-specific feedback, policy-implementation monitoring, and insights from tutorials, supervision health checks, and informal support channels. They reflected that recent findings show very high satisfaction with learning support (96%), but mixed experiences of belonging: only half of learners feel part of a postgraduate research community, and there are limited opportunities for peer interaction despite valuing individual mentoring. Feedback also highlighted the need for clearer, practice-based learning support for disabled learners and stronger alignment between personal and research supervision, alongside calls to extend the health-check system. In response, the programme introduced a

writing group in 2024–25 to support learners with literacy-related disabilities or assessment challenges; although small, its evaluation demonstrated strong positive impact, with participants reporting greater clarity, confidence, and emotional ease in their writing.

- The education provider has stated that their programme provides a systematic, well-embedded and responsive approach to learner support. With strong regulatory compliance and a clear commitment to continuous improvement. The education provider reflect on their high proportion of disabled learners being recognised as both a strength and a driver for flexible, anticipatory and co-produced systems, supported by innovations such as the supervision model, strengthened learner-support infrastructure and the programme Access Passport. Recent and planned developments included enhanced equalities monitoring, supervision-focused quality improvement projects and the creation of a programme common room. They reflect that this demonstrates a strategic, holistic effort to improve learner experience. They also provided details of the action plan they have put together, which prioritises.
 - extending the writing group,
 - completing supervision quality improvement projects,
 - deepening collaboration with disability support services,
 - rolling out the Access Passport,
 - improving real-time monitoring of potential disproportionality in indicative fails, reviewing representation in recruitment (particularly for men and gender-diverse applicants),
 - and contributing to space-allocation work to secure a dedicated programme common room.
- Through clarification, the education provider detailed the plans they have in place to respond to ongoing, increasing and longer-term learner needs. This, they stated, is underpinned by inclusivity and the welcoming nature of the diversity of the learner and staff community. Programme-level planning focuses on designing inclusive access and learning environments that reduce reliance on individualised adjustments and instead benefit all learners. This, they state, is exemplified by the adoption of guidance from the Digital Education Service on accessible slide design, live captions and transcripts in PowerPoint and Zoom to support participation in both in-person and online sessions. They detailed that, where bespoke support is required, planning is learner-centred and developed in partnership with the individual and with involvement from the Student Support and Engagement Team.
- The visitors considered all information and reflections available when completing their assessment. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The education provider has stated that they are a longstanding pioneer in mental health, social work and leadership education. Furthermore, that they have a multidisciplinary, practice-led training culture rooted in influential traditions. Such as
 - infant observation,

- attachment theory,
 - and psychoanalytic and systemic approaches.
- They reflect that these foundations have shaped their programme's relational and community-focused ethos. They state that across their institution and Directorate of Education & Training (DET), learners benefit from a rich interprofessional learning environment that includes academic-skills development through the Postgraduate Skills and Research Week. There are also additional research-focused opportunities, such as Workshops on Wednesdays, EDI-centred Thinking Space forums, and wider scholarly events, including Scientific Meetings and open lectures, alongside interprofessional placement learning. They reflect those distinctive features such as the Group Relations Conference offer challenging but valuable experiential insight into group dynamics. Within the Interprofessional Portfolio, their programme sits alongside organisational consulting, coaching and social work programmes. The education provider reflected on how this creates unique opportunities for collaboration in doctoral-level research skills and work with patients, care environments and vulnerable populations.
- They reflect that the programme has faced several challenges, including a six-month vacancy in the Head of Interprofessional Portfolio role. This slowed strategic development and limited shared learning across programmes until the new post-holder began in September 2025. They have also been impacted by wider NHS financial pressures, which have reduced the availability of high-quality Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) practice-based learning opportunities. They reflect that their upcoming institutional merger is expected to create new opportunities, and the current training freeze is likely to constrain interprofessional learning for and from staff. Alongside these pressures, the programme has continued to develop, with the successful integration of the new Endings and New Beginnings unit. This aims to support the transition from learner to newly qualified practitioner. Targeted work to promote practice-based learning has also been developed and strengthened collaboration with Camden's clinical service manager. This aims to embed outcome measures and enhance the reference-group model. They reflect that plans are also underway to integrate outcome-measure literacy into the Research module.
- They reflected that despite these challenges, the programme has achieved notable successes. DET's strategic focus on research culture has enriched the research-skills offer, and the All Years Events continue to provide valuable interprofessional learning through collaboration with external partners on topics such as parental experiences of Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND) processes, the Power Threat Meaning Framework, and health disparities. They explain how programme learners actively participate in DET-wide interprofessional opportunities. This includes;
 - Thinking Space,
 - Research Week
 - and Workshops on Wednesdays (WOW)

- They explain how alumni contribute to the wider scholarly community and interprofessional learning is embedded throughout the programme journey. This begins with Year one practice-based learning and extends across formal and informal learning spaces, supported by the broader institutional and portfolio-level offer that encourages skill development, critical thinking and shared learning.
- The education provider has detailed how interprofessional learning remains a central pillar of the programme. They explain how this has been strengthened in recent years through developments that better prepare learners for their transition into practice as educational psychologists. The institution's wider institutional context is grounded in psychoanalytic and systemic traditions. They state that they offer learners distinctive learning experiences, including the Group Relations Conference, while DET's strategic focus on enhancing its research culture has broadened opportunities for knowledge exchange, methodological exploration and the development of practitioner-researcher identities. Going forward, they reflect that the programme team will work with the Interprofessional Portfolio to develop a shared strategy that enriches DET's interprofessional learning offer. They will also continue collaborating with practice education providers to identify learner needs, address knowledge and skills gaps, and shape the training accordingly.
- The visitors noted how a wide range of initiatives designed for interprofessional education are designed and evidenced. They also found strong interprofessional education opportunities and opportunities to work in multidisciplinary teams. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied with the education providers' performance in this area.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider has detailed how service users and carers are central to the ethos and delivery of the programme. They state that the programme is continually strengthening its approach in line with HCPC's standards, legislative frameworks and the Trust's wider Patient & Public Involvement infrastructure. They have explained how the Lundy Model of Participation provides a key framework for embedding children's and young people's voices in an ethical and meaningful way. They reflect that their team is extending this thinking to the wider group of adults affected by EP practice, including teachers and multidisciplinary colleagues. They reflect that the programme benefits from strong institutional mechanisms such as Trust-wide forums, Patient & Public Involvement (PPI) structures and external partnerships with organisations like the National Network of Parent Carer Forums. This, they reflect, ensures that service user perspectives inform programme development, governance, practice-based learning and curriculum design.
 - The education provider explains how service user involvement is embedded across staff development. Activities include;
 - module design,
 - research,
 - governance
 - and placement-based consultation,

- They reflect that recent developments include enhanced participatory research teaching. The appointment of an Associate Lecturer specialising in co-production, and an increasing number of doctoral projects using participatory methods. A notable success has been the integration of e-activities, which create structured, reflective and participatory online spaces that deepen learner engagement with service user perspectives and bridge academic learning with practice-based experience. This digital approach, they stated, has strengthened the programme's capacity to embed service user values sustainably and will be expanded further across years two and three.
 - They reflect that the programme has embedded compliance with legislation, HCPC standards and Trust-wide Patient Experience and Service User Involvement (SUI) policy through structured curriculum mapping, staff training and ongoing monitoring via line management, PPI engagement and the bi-annual Stakeholder Committee. They reflect that service user perspectives inform teaching, curriculum development, governance and research, with notable outcomes including increased SUI across modules, enhanced authenticity of teaching inputs and a growing uptake of participatory research methods among learners. They reflect that service users contribute directly to teaching, such as sessions on parental experiences of the SEND system and organisational consultation. Their feedback is integrated into programme reflection and enhancement. Impact is evaluated through learner outcomes, service user feedback, research outputs, and curriculum changes, with evidence of strengthened communication, ethical practice, and cultural responsiveness aligned with HCPC standards.
 - The education provider has stated that since the last HCPC review, the programme has significantly expanded and diversified its SUI structures. This has included establishing two Service User Consultants with lived experience of psychological services who contribute to curriculum design, governance and the new reference-group model for Year one placement-based SUI quality-improvement projects. They state that their involvement ensures service user perspectives actively shape learner learning and staff practice, with plans for an expanded reference group in 2025–26 involving senior programme staff, Trust strategy colleagues and clinical service managers to strengthen the clinical-training interface. They reflect that key risks relate to infrastructure pressures. This includes PPI staffing changes and reimbursement processes, and the challenge of recruiting and sustaining a diverse pool of service users. These are being mitigated through close liaison with Trust leadership and proactive succession planning.
 - The visitors found service user and carer involvement to be embedded at all levels of the programme, and across competencies. They found there to be clear evidence of development and reflection in this area, with notable improvements evidenced since the last performance review. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**

- The education provider has explained how Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) activities across the Trust are overseen by the People, Organisational Development (POD) and EDI Committee. These activities are supported by a Trust-wide EDI Team and an EDI Programme Group chaired by the Chief Nursing Officer. They state that this structure ensures that issues raised by staff networks are addressed strategically, with clear plans, responsible leads and realistic timelines. It also ensures resources are allocated appropriately, accountability is maintained, and progress is communicated back through leadership structures. They also explained that within education and training, the Director of Education acts as the EDI lead, producing an annual report for the Education and Training Committee that monitors student outcomes across five Protected Characteristics under the Equality Act (2010): Disability; Race; Religion; Sex and Sexuality.
- The education provider has reflected, that since 2019, the Directorate of Education and Training (DET) has run an annual cycle of EDI data collection and analysis. This has examined learner outcomes across admissions, progression, assessment and wider learner experience. They reflect that this work has recently been strengthened by the introduction of a Power BI EDI dashboard to support course teams in identifying and addressing disparities. The findings inform DET-wide and portfolio-level EDI action plans and underpin a range of learner support services, including focused groups for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic learners, LGBTQ+ learners, disabled learners, international learners and a new multi-faith group. The Trust has also enhanced its support for disabled learners through updated policies, a new Disabled Student Officer role, a “yes-first” approach to reasonable adjustments, and the introduction of Student Accessibility Passports.
- They explained that the DET also delivers staff development, consultation and learner support through its two EDI Leads, who provide training, facilitate reflective spaces, support curriculum development and respond to concerns. Additional initiatives include mentoring bursaries for global majority learners and an online short course to improve staff confidence in supporting disabled learners. All of this work aligns with the Patient and Carer Race Equality Framework (PCREF), a national initiative to address racial inequalities in mental health services. The Trust’s (Patient and Carer Race Equality Framework) PCREF Steering Group brings together lived experience and professional expertise to drive this work, reporting to the Quality and Safety Committee, with DET represented by the Director of Education.
- The education provider has stated that the Trust, DET and individual programme teams are delivering a substantial programme of EDI work, with notable progress and areas of strength. They reflect that there has been a significant rise in learners declaring disabilities, which has increased demand on staff capacity and resources, prompting careful planning to maintain equitable access to education and training. The development of a new staff training course, alongside close collaboration between the programme team and colleagues across the

Directorate, reflects a proactive approach to strengthening inclusive practice. Encouragingly, the Trust has also reduced the disparity in offer rates between white and global-majority applicants, demonstrating progress toward fair admissions.

- The education provider has reflected that a major development has been the introduction of a bursary and mentoring programme for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic / Global Majority learners on postgraduate introductory courses. This initiative, they state, has been shaped by learner feedback and learning from pandemic-related support. This programme provides a 50% fee contribution and year-long one-to-one mentoring with experienced faculty. Learners consistently report that the financial support reduces anxiety and enables fuller engagement with their studies, while the mentoring offers personalised guidance throughout their academic journey and into future training or employment. They reflect that, although primarily aimed at global majority learners, the programme also recognises intersectional needs, including disability and neurodivergence, and that it forms part of the Trust's longer-term commitment to diversifying the workforce.
- The education provider reflects EDI remains a strategic priority for the Trust and DET, informed by annual learner survey feedback and ongoing investment in data and insight. The creation of a new role within the Data Insights Team, alongside the development of a Power BI dashboard for course teams, strengthens the ability to identify emerging patterns, areas of concern and examples of good practice. Planned actions include reviewing satisfaction levels for Muslim and Asian learners and improving engagement with learner groups.
- Other actions include strengthening links with external partners, embedding EDI within staff CPD, and ensuring portfolio-level action plans are clear and regularly reviewed. Together, they reflect that these developments demonstrate a sustained commitment to creating an accessible, inclusive and welcoming learning environment for all learners.
- The visitors found this to be a strong section with clear evidence and commitment to EDI. They noted the specific EDI lead being in place with a clear remit. The visitors were therefore satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider has discussed the challenge for NHS mental health services as a sector. Those who are experiencing significant pressure due to rising levels of moderate to severe depression in adults and increasing mental health needs among children. This surge in demand is stretching existing resources and highlighting persistent health inequalities across the region, where socioeconomic disadvantage, housing issues and limited access to services disproportionately affect certain communities. They detail how at the same time, workforce shortages, particularly in recruiting and retaining qualified professionals, are making it harder to meet growing needs and ensure equitable, high-quality support.
 - They also reflect how they operate as an education provider within an NHS Trust, which brings both strengths and constraints / challenges.

While the clinical educator model offers clear benefits, the organisation must navigate dual regulatory requirements and limited access to some funding streams, all while managing statutory responsibilities with a small team. They explained how staff who balance clinical and educational duties often have limited capacity for innovation or new product development. The upcoming merger is viewed as a strategic opportunity to address these challenges, especially in a wider policy environment where mental health and special educational needs remain subject to ongoing national change.

- Despite these pressures, they explained how the Trust leverages its dual identity as a clinical provider and centre of educational excellence to maintain a strong understanding of local, regional and national priorities. This, they reflect, includes workforce planning and health inequalities. Its Business Development Team actively identifies and evaluates commercial and strategic opportunities, supported by a cross-functional weekly forum that reviews bids, tenders and horizon-scanning insights.
- Looking ahead, the education provider aims to strengthen its position through the merger and expand its education and training offer. Furthermore, they plan to further develop an integrated, multidisciplinary programme with their partner organisation to better meet the evolving needs of both the population and the workforce.
- Through clarification, the education provider explained how the key components of their risk management system are the risk appetite statement, their board assurance framework and the corporate and local risk registers. They explained how their board assurance framework identifies risks in relation to achievement of their strategic objectives, along with the controls in place and assurance available. This includes strategic risks and also some corporate risks.
- The visitors welcomed this expansion in information and the greater clarity gained from this. They therefore found the education to be performing well in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: The visitors wanted to recognise the education provider's approach to equality, diversity and inclusion as an area of good practice. They found clear actions and initiatives at the programme level, a specific EDI lead in place, and a clear programme-level action plan. Further to this, they noted how the EDI lead had a clear remit, strategy, monitoring, development and reporting oversight. This aligns with the HCPC's EDI indicators, specifically the indicators for EDI that refers to accountability at a programme / institution. Part of the indicator discusses the possibility of having identified named leads as the identified individual pinpointed for accountability. The EDI Lead at the education providers programme is a good example of this and shows they have embraced and developed in line with HCPC guidance.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**

- The education provider detailed how their programme undertook a comprehensive review of the revised HCPC Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) and updated BPS doctoral competencies during the review period. They explained how these were considered through both external collaboration and internal planning. They detailed how, as part of a delegated national task, the Programme Director worked with directors from three other programmes to examine the revised standards ahead of their September 2023 implementation. This collaboration, they stated, resulted in jointly produced, re-mapped SOPs and competencies that were shared across all programmes to ensure consistency and alignment.
- The education provider explained how internally, the programme reflected on how the revised standards would influence all aspects of delivery. This includes the learning outcomes, curriculum design, assessment, placement evaluation, tutor development and partnership working. Documentation requiring updates, such as module specifications, handbooks, placement materials and self-assessment tools, was also identified early. They detailed how these tasks were incorporated into senior staff development planning and discussed within the programme Teaching and Learning Leadership Group. This, they reflect, ensured that revised SOPs and competencies were fully mapped to learning outcomes and modules. This process strengthened coherence between academic learning, professional standards and practice-based training.
- The education provider reflected how to support implementation, all programme staff were encouraged to attend HCPC training events, and the changes were embedded into team discussions, development days and meetings with placement providers. Factsheets and guidance were circulated to learners, tutors, and their professional psychology lead to ensure shared understanding across the discipline. Building on the programme's long-standing emphasis on reflective practice, learners continued to engage in structured self-assessment against the SOPs and competencies, using these reflections to inform ongoing professional development planning throughout their training.
- Several concrete changes were introduced as a result of this work. All programme materials referencing the SOPs were updated to reflect the revisions.
- The education provider also explained how a new Year three unit titled Endings and New Beginnings was created to support the transition from learner to newly qualified educational psychologist. This includes explicit teaching on the HCPC's role in professional practice and active implementation of the standards. Additionally, a new transition planning tool was developed to help learners reflect on their development needs and engage with CPD activities aligned with HCPC expectations as they move into qualified practice.
- The visitors found there to be a high level, reflective process detailed in their portfolio and adequate mapping to the standards. The visitors

found the revised standards to be in place and are satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.

- **Embedding the revised HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics across professions –**

- The education provider detailed how their programme embeds the Ethics Acculturation Model (EAM). This views psychology as a distinct culture with its own values and ethical traditions, and emphasises lifelong, experiential, socially supported ethics learning grounded in learners' backgrounds. They explained how, therefore, any integration of the revised HCPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics had to align with this framework. They reflect that building on the previous successful integration of the revised Standards of Proficiency, the team followed a similar structured process to integrating these revised standards. This included:
 - liaising with the Trust's Professional Lead for Psychology,
 - reviewing HCPC guidance and webinars,
 - dedicating time within the Teaching and Learning Leadership Group to analyse how the revised Standards would affect learning outcomes, curriculum delivery, assessment and practice-based learning,
 - and dedicating time within the Teaching and Learning Leadership Group to analyse how the revised Standards would affect tutor development and documentation.
- The education provider explained how these tasks were incorporated into senior staff development planning and monitored throughout the year, with identified gaps feeding into programme development. Additionally, a staff development day was utilised to further strengthen understanding by refreshing the EAM approach and exploring how the revised Standards fit within it. This allowed them to engage their staff in experiential ethics work, such as ethics autobiographies, making the changes meaningful and helping tutors translate this learning into practice with learners.
- The education provider reflected on how their programme already had a strong foundation in equitable, inclusive and ethically grounded practice. This includes EDI principles, valid consent mechanisms, reflective supervision, culturally responsive practice and personal ethics exploration. This, they stated, is embedded across modules, research training and placement preparation. Building on this, the team updated all Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics-related materials, strengthened communication with academic staff and practice educators, and enhanced teaching in key areas. This included ethical practice in traded services, raising concerns about discriminatory behaviour, and maintaining professional boundaries. Case studies and ethical problem-solving models were revised to reflect the updated standards, and research ethics processes were strengthened through additional review of consent procedures. Learners' reflective work was deepened by revisiting the ethics autobiography in relation to research ethics, ensuring that the revised Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics were fully integrated

into teaching, supervision and professional development across all three years of training.

- They also reflected that the programme already has strong expectations around respectful, considerate and inclusive engagement with service users. This they reflect is reinforced through conduct agreements, placement evaluations and teaching that equips learners with accessible communication tools and approaches across all areas of practice.
- The education provider explained how to integrate the revised Standards, all related materials were updated and both academic staff and practice educators were briefed through established liaison structures. Enhancements were made to teaching, including new activities in the Year three "*Endings and New Beginnings*" unit which explores responsible communication in traded services, and revised Year one ethical problem-solving case studies addressing issues such as consent, identity, assessment misuse, colleague wellbeing and interpreter use. Learners now work directly with the updated Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics booklet when analysing ethical dilemmas, ensuring the revised standards are embedded in their reasoning and professional development.
- The education provider explained how the programme already ensures learners understand and follow the institutional Duty of Candour Policy through the Clinical Passport process, where they review all relevant procedures before beginning placement. Furthermore, to integrate the revised Standards, all associated materials were updated, and both academic staff and practice educators were briefed through established meetings and development days. Teaching was strengthened through the Endings and New Beginnings unit, where learners explore how to apologise effectively when something goes wrong in practice. This is supported by follow-up engagement with HCPC resources, such as the "*Getting it Right When Things Go Wrong*" webinar they provide and an online discussion forum. The education provider explained how ethical problem-solving training in the programme's first-year modules was also updated. This included revised case studies addressing issues such as consent, identity conflicts, assessment misuse, colleague wellbeing and interpreter use. This they reflect, ensures that learners actively apply the updated Standards when analysing dilemmas and planning appropriate actions.
- The education provider reflected that their programme already had strong systems in place to support disabled learners and those with health conditions. This support ensured that these learners understand HCPC expectations around fitness to practise, receive relevant guidance at admissions and induction, and have access to policies, wellbeing resources, and placement procedures that address health-related concerns. They reflected that to integrate the revised Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics, all associated materials were updated, staff and practice educators were briefed, and teaching was strengthened.
- The visitors found the education provider to have consistently and systematically embedded the revised standards across the programme

and the institution. They were therefore satisfied with their performance and evidence in this area.

- **Impact of workforce planning –**

- The education provider has explained how they have worked to align their ambitions with the NHS 10-year health plan for England. Recognising the national focus on training, retaining and reforming the workforce. They reflected that as a major provider of postgraduate education and training in mental health and allied professions, they have a significant opportunity to expand their contribution to workforce planning. This could take the form of increasing training capacity, exploring alternative routes into professional roles, and developing new roles that meet evolving service needs, including those supported by digital innovation.

They reflect that, following the 2026 merger, the enlarged Trust intends to lead workforce development across the North Central London ICS. They are planning to influence regional and national planning and widen access to NHS careers through new micro-credential CPD courses, lower-level qualifications, and the use of the Lifelong Learning Entitlement. They reflect that this approach supports the wider workforce plan's aims to improve productivity, build flexible multidisciplinary teams and ensure staff are equipped to use new technologies effectively.

- They reflected that their merger will also enable the development of new programmes, expansion of practice-based learning and greater access to clinical expertise and estate capacity, supporting long-term growth. Internally, the education provider has strengthened its teaching workforce by investing in substantive posts and reducing reliance on temporary staff, creating greater stability and capacity ahead of the 2025-26 academic year. They reflected that this shift has improved support for learners and increased programme leaders' ability to delegate responsibilities. Looking ahead, they reflect that the merged organisation aims to become a leading global centre of excellence in mental health education. They intend to leverage their OfS registration, partnerships with the University of Essex, PSRB accreditations and combined expertise to attract international learners, drive innovation, shape policy and ultimately position themselves as the first Mental Health University Teaching Trust.
- The visitors found this area to be well evidenced and reflected on. They noted how the education providers' decision-making process is informed by data and reflective analysis. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**

- The education provider has explained how the programme's digital learning, teaching and assessment approach is shaped by their overall institutional Digital Education Strategy. They explained how this prioritises an inclusive digital environment, strong digital skills, and thoughtful learning design. This, they stated, is a key area for preparing educational psychology learners for an increasingly digitised sector. The programme focuses on building Artificial Intelligence (AI) literacy

among staff and learners, ensuring they understand both the potential and limitations of emerging technologies while adhering to academic regulations that prohibit the submission of AI-generated work as original. They reflect that guidance on the responsible use of AI is provided at induction, in the programme handbook, and through staff CPD, with ongoing discussion and policy development taking place through the Trust's AI Steering Group and Assessment and AI workstream. Significant digital developments include the adoption of Panopto for accessible teaching and assessment, a redesigned and more accessible Moodle environment, and new self-study courses that strengthen digital and information literacy for all learners.

- These enhancements have improved the learning experience, particularly for disabled learners, while also prompting deeper reflection on the opportunities and risks associated with generative AI. They reflect that the programme continues to create structured spaces for critical engagement with technology, recognising concerns about bias, environmental impact and the potential for AI to undermine learning if used uncritically. One notable success is the use of e-activities, which provide structured, asynchronous online activities that support reflective practice, equitable participation and deeper engagement with service user perspectives. This approach has strengthened learners' ability to integrate theory, ethical awareness and lived experience into their developing professional identities.
- They have detailed how the programme prepares learners for academic progression and, for safe, ethical, and reflective professional practice in an increasingly digital context. This, they stated, reflects wider developments across education and healthcare, where digital systems, remote working, and emerging technologies are now routine. They have reflected on how Educational Psychologists are already integrating technology across all aspects of practice, including digital assessment, teleconsultation, and secure data management. Embedding digital pedagogy within the programme, therefore, aims to build learners' confidence and critical awareness of issues such as informed consent, confidentiality, digital safeguarding, and the appropriate use of online platforms. They reflect that this is underpinned by a strong commitment to digital accessibility and equity, aligning with community psychology principles of inclusion and social justice, and mirroring the realities of work with marginalised children, young people, and families.
- The programme is responding proactively to emerging technologies, particularly the growing presence of AI in assessment, reporting, and decision-making, while remaining grounded in regulatory requirements and ethical practice. Ongoing curriculum developments focus on digital safeguarding, ethical research practice, and critical engagement with digital tools, including AI-assisted approaches and secure cloud-based systems. Planned actions include reviewing and enhancing curriculum content, integrating digital safeguarding more explicitly, exploring simulation and Virtual Reality (VR)-informed teaching within resource constraints, supporting staff CPD, and strengthening collaboration with placement educators to reflect real-world digital practice. Continued

engagement with institutional digital strategies and dissemination of scholarly work will support sustainable innovation, ensuring learners are well prepared for service-user-centred practice in an evolving digital landscape.

- The visitors found the education provider to have demonstrated a clear, systematic and ethical approach to the use of digital technologies. They found the evidence and reflections to demonstrate strong alignment with regulatory requirements and professional practice realities, ensuring that digital developments meet evolving field demands. They were therefore satisfied with their performance in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
 - The visitors noted how the education provider supplied a report in reference to this section, but has not completed any assessments within the review period. They found there to be no concerns or areas of feedback and are satisfied with this section.
- **Office for Students (OfS) –**
 - The education provider has detailed how, due to their ongoing merger. Their new structure / trust will be a significantly enhanced provider of education and training. They seek to build upon the combined strengths and expertise of both organisations. This will include the valuable registration with the Office for Students (OfS) that their merged partner holds.
 - Furthermore, this will mean that the new merged institution will continue to be the only OfS-registered NHS Trust in the UK.
 - The visitors reported on how the education provider has recorded reflections in relation to overall learner satisfaction surveys.
 - The visitors were therefore satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider has explained how their programme remains accredited by the British Psychological Society (BPS), with the most recent accreditation visit being in March 2023. This resulted in them receiving four commendations. These recognised the programme's strong commitment to multidisciplinary working through a unique Year one CAMHS placement. It was additionally recognised.
 - the programmes; its exemplary, sector-leading approach to equality, diversity and inclusion.
 - the provision of multiple layers of high-quality, relational supervision.
 - and the meaningful use of learner and stakeholder feedback to inform ongoing development.

- The education provider reflected those additional areas of good practice included experiential learning, psychoanalytically informed elements such as Nursery Observation, and inclusive, practice-relevant assessment. They state that the conditions attached to the ongoing accreditation have since been fully met, and the recommendations for enhancement have been addressed, as previously reported.
- The education provider reflected that since their last performance review submission, the programme has further strengthened its national profile and influence, particularly in relation to professional supervision. The Programme Director's involvement in BPS and DECP supervision working groups has contributed directly to the publication of new national supervision resources for Educational Psychologists. These developments have informed updates to the programme's supervision policy, supervisor training, and information-sharing practices. This, they state, ensures that learners benefit from reflective, ethical, and culturally responsive supervision. The Programme Director has also contributed at the policy level as an expert advisor to the DfE-commissioned Supervision in Education Quality Standards Framework launched in October 2025.
- The programme continues to engage actively with a range of professional bodies to ensure learners develop a clear understanding of the wider professional landscape. This includes enhanced engagement with the Association of Educational Psychologists, reflected in curriculum resources, learner signposting, and direct liaison with new cohorts. They explained how teaching is informed by up-to-date research and guidance. For example, on consent procedures for young people aged 16–25. Internationally, longstanding engagement with the International School Psychology Association (ISPA) strengthens the programme's global outlook, with staff, learners, and alumni contributing to conferences, webinars, and task forces. This includes leadership within ISPA's consultation taskforce, which was recognised with a Presidential Citation in 2025.
- The education provider reflected that despite these strengths, ongoing challenges remain. These include pressures on resources in managing multiple regulatory frameworks and professional standards. Additionally, the complexity of aligning overlapping standards across bodies such as the BPS and HCPC, and the lag between emerging practice issues and formal guidance. They reflect that financial constraints in higher education, the NHS, and local authorities also affect practice-based learning capacity and supervision availability. Additionally, ensuring all stakeholders remain up to date with evolving guidance requires sustained effort, and variation in implementation across contexts can affect learner experience. The programme continues to mitigate these challenges through proactive communication, careful standards mapping, and evidence-informed curriculum development.
- The visitors found there to be clear evidence of effective working relationships with their professional body and professional, regulatory and statutory bodies. The visitors were satisfied with their performance

in this area noting how evidence and examples of good practice are built upon.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Curriculum development –**
 - The education provider has reflected on how curriculum development at their institution is an ongoing and responsive process. It is shaped by internal reflection, research developments, stakeholder engagement, and external regulatory drivers. They reflected that since their last performance review, curriculum changes have primarily responded to the revised HCPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics. As well as to continuous module-level enhancements informed by emerging evidence and developments in educational psychology. Profession-specific responses to the revised Standards of Proficiency were detailed in the previous portfolio submission.
 - They have reflected that their curriculum design remains fully aligned with the Department for Education's commissioning requirements for Initial Training of Educational Psychologists. While also having evolved and developed in response to emerging national priorities. These include increased attention to social, emotional and mental health needs, strengthened inclusive and preventative practice, and responsiveness to ongoing SEND system reforms. This, they reflect, ensures the curriculum remains relevant to contemporary policy and practice contexts within education and children's services. They reflected on internal drivers for curriculum development, including.
 - systematic feedback gathered through annual programme monitoring,
 - Stakeholder Committee meetings,
 - learner consultation forums,
 - and External Examiner reports.
 - They reflect that these processes have led to concrete developments, such as a review of assessment load and structure. This has resulted in more authentic and inclusive assessment approaches, a strengthened emphasis on research–practice integration, and the introduction of an annual interdisciplinary Research Week. They also reflected that an enhanced research capacity within the programme, including the appointment of research-active staff, has further supported curriculum innovation.
 - The education provider reflects that externally, the curriculum continues to be shaped by HCPC, BPS, and QAA frameworks. Existing programme principles around inclusion, service-user involvement, experiential learning, and reflective practice provided a strong foundation for responding to revised HCPC standards, ensuring greater visibility, coherence, and alignment across modules. As a

BPS-accredited programme, the programme maps the 2023 doctoral core competencies against HCPC requirements. This they detailed informs developments such as enhanced research, teaching, and expanded content on ethics, diversity, and values-led practice. QAA Subject Benchmark Statements and Level 8 descriptors continue to inform the overall academic level and standards of the programme without prescribing specific content.

- The visitors found the education provider to reflect on the effectiveness and the robustness of their own internal curriculum review. Additionally, mechanisms are in place for feedback and monitoring to inform ongoing curriculum development. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**
 - The education provider has reflected on how practice-based learning is central to their programme. Additionally, it provides the primary context in which learners integrate theory, skills, and professional values in line with HCPC and BPS standards. In accordance with BPS doctoral expectations, learners undertake practice-based learning across all three years, totalling at least 300 days, and work that reflects the generic role of the Educational Psychologist. They state that their programme delivers a clearly sequenced developmental model. In year one of the programme, it includes foundational practice-based learning in a community setting (often CAMHS) and a local authority Educational Psychology Service (EPS). Year two involves a three-day-per-week EPS placement with increasing complexity and responsibility, and Year three continues at the same intensity, with a stronger emphasis on autonomy, organisational work, and systems-level practice.
 - They reflect that this developmental structure mirrors the academic curriculum. Additionally, it is supported through teaching approaches such as workshops, experiential groups, supervision, case-based learning, and the integration of service-user perspectives. They detailed how learners are supported to make explicit links between theory and practice, ensuring that psychological concepts are critically understood before application in complex, real-world contexts. Furthermore, they demonstrate that practice-based learning is fully aligned with programme learning outcomes and regulatory standards. Providing rich opportunities for supervised practice, ethical reasoning, reflective development, and professional identity formation. Feedback from learners, supervisors, and placement providers consistently highlights the effectiveness of this scaffolded model, particularly when combined with high-quality relational supervision.
 - The education provider reflected on how significant sector-wide pressures increasingly affect placement availability and supervisory capacity. Financial constraints, rising demand, and workforce shortages within CAMHS and local authority EPSs have reduced placement opportunities, while wider systemic issues such as SEND funding deficits and cost-of-living pressures have intensified resource challenges. At the programme level, NHS financial pressures, service restructures, limited growth in DfE funding for ITEP, and reduced

supervisory capacity in CAMHS have further constrained practice-based learning, while unfunded increases to learner bursaries have placed additional strain on EPS partners within the consortium.

- They have detailed how, in response, the programme has implemented a range of proactive strategies to sustain placement quality and capacity. These include;
 - diversifying Year one practice-based learning into third-sector and community settings,
 - strengthening consortium-level collaboration on funding and capacity planning,
 - highlighting the mutual benefits of learner involvement for placement providers,
 - and subsidising supervision training to enhance supervisory capacity.
- The education provider reflected on how robust placement approval and quality assurance processes support safe and developmentally appropriate learning experiences. They also reflect that despite ongoing challenges, the programme continues to meet professional expectations and regulatory requirements through partnership-based solutions, diversified placement models, and a strong commitment to reflective, high-quality practice-based learning, with further enhancements planned to ensure long-term sustainability.
- The visitors found the education provider to have demonstrated how their programme delivers a developmentally sequenced model of practice-based learning. This, they found to be clearly detailed and evaluated within the submission. They were therefore satisfied with the education providers' performance in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Strategic approach to feedback –**
 - The education provider has explained how the programme uses a structured, multi-layered approach to collecting and using stakeholder feedback. This is used to assure and enhance programme quality, aligned with their validating bodies, (the University of Essex) Annual Review of Courses (ARC) framework and external expectations such as BPS accreditation. At the institution level, annual course monitoring combines student survey data, course team self-evaluation, and action planning through a Course Development Plan. These reports feed into portfolio- and trust-level overview reports considered by governance committees and the validating university, enabling good practice to be shared and enhancement priorities to inform strategic planning. Improvements to the DET Student Survey process have resulted in higher response rates and improved access to actionable data.

- At the programme level, feedback is gathered from a wide range of stakeholders, including learners, service users, practice educators, employers, professional bodies, commissioners, and external examiners. The central mechanism is the programme Stakeholder Committee, which meets twice yearly and brings together learners, alumni, practice educators, employers, and service user consultants. They state that this Committee provides a transparent forum for dialogue, reflection, and accountability, explicitly foregrounding ethical, culturally responsive, and anti-racist practice. This, they reflect, is complemented by additional feedback loops via practice educator meetings, regional and consortium-level employer forums, national Programme Director networks, and engagement with professional bodies.
- The education provider stated that their evaluation indicates that triangulating feedback across academic, placement, and professional domains strengthens responsiveness and relevance. Stakeholder input has led directly to improvements in delivery, supervision structures, placement guidance, and workload management. Feedback is used strategically as well as reactively, informing medium- and long-term planning. For example, concerns about learner workload prompted a specific review of this area that led to clearer expectations around core and optional learning tasks, earlier provision of materials, and greater use of varied learning formats beyond reading.
- While the overall framework is robust, challenges remain in coordinating multiple feedback streams across local, consortium, and national levels, and in managing the workload implications of new institutional feedback initiatives. Risks associated with changes to the timing and structure of learner and module surveys are being mitigated through portfolio-level planning and alignment with existing programme processes. Overall, the programme demonstrates a coherent, data-informed approach to feedback that supports continuous improvement, inclusivity, and practice-relevance, with planned actions focused on improving efficiency, consistency, and strategic oversight across feedback systems.
- The visitors noted the range of mechanisms for learner and stakeholder feedback. Additionally, they recognised how the education provider consistently uses data and a range of methods to support ongoing improvement. They therefore found the education provider to be performing satisfactorily in this area.
- **Learners –**
 - The education provider explained how learner feedback is a core component of their quality assurance and enhancement approach. They reflect that this has been significantly strengthened since their last performance review. They reflect that the programme's handbook now provides a clear, structured framework for how feedback is gathered, reviewed and acted upon, detailing principles, processes, and formal mechanisms such as module and placement feedback. Furthermore, it details their year three review processes and learner–staff engagement structures. They state that the effectiveness of these arrangements is reflected in the 2024–25 DET Annual Student Survey,

which reported 100% overall satisfaction, strong domain scores across learning, assessment, digital resources, practice-based learning and research skills, and no formal learner complaints during the period.

- They explained how feedback is collected and responded to through multiple complementary routes, including the learner–staff liaison group, senior leadership review, governance committees, external examiner input, and collaboration with NHS and regional consortium partners. Alongside positive headline outcomes, critical evaluation highlights areas for ongoing development, particularly around learner engagement, workload and sense of community. Recognising the structural realities of a full-time professional doctorate. Complaints are managed through a learner complaints procedure, which was recently updated and supported by the appointment of a dedicated Student Complaints, Conduct and Appeals Officer. Senior Trust committees receive anonymised complaints data to support institutional learning and ensure proportionate, responsive improvement.
- The education provider reflected that their learner feedback processes demonstrate depth, breadth and reflexivity, with feedback treated as an active dialogue that informs improvement rather than a passive data exercise. They state that multiple mechanisms operate across the learner journey to capture individual, group and anonymous perspectives, promote co-produced action planning, and embed feedback within formal governance and programme development structures. They state that recent innovations include the expansion of the Trainee–Staff Liaison Group (TSLG), supervisory health-checks, and systematic use of Qualtrics for event and module feedback. They reflect that these have strengthened responsiveness and transparency. Furthermore, that these approaches also support learners critical engagement with feedback, helping them understand competing priorities (such as academic workload and practice-based learning) and develop insight into group dynamics and evidence-informed decision-making.
- The education provider reflects that programme success is particularly evident in the evolution of the TSLG, which has become a participatory and dialogic forum that enhances learner agency, peer learning and staff reflection. Alongside strong satisfaction outcomes, the small number of less favourable feedback received by programme staff has been responded to and resolved through appropriate procedures. They reflect that this demonstrates the effectiveness of existing feedback routes and the programme’s capacity to learn from concerns raised. The education provider has stated that they also recognise areas for further improvement, including increasing response rates, reducing duplication and improved triangulating of feedback across sources. They reflect that sustained progress is evident in how learner perspectives inform planning and delivery. Furthermore, that these reflections, together with learning from complaints, are embedded within the ARC process and underpin the programme’s development plan for the 2025–26 academic year.
- The visitors noted the range of mechanisms for learners to feedback on the programme. They noted how learner feedback has been used of

drive development on the programme during the review period. The visitors therefore found the education provider to be performing satisfactorily in this area.

- **Practice educators –**

- The education provider has described how the programme engages with a wide and diverse range of practice educators across community, health and local authority contexts. They explained how in year one of the programmes this includes community and CAMHS practice-based learning, and Fieldwork Tutors (FWTs) in local authority Educational Psychology Services. In year two and three these include EPS practice-based learning across the SEEL/SEAL region. Practice educators, predominantly but not exclusively educational psychologists, contribute feedback through surveys, stakeholder representation at committee level. Regular meetings are also held and ongoing professional dialogue ensures that practice-based learning remains responsive, high quality and sustainable.
- The education provider reflected that feedback from year one of the programme's community placement educators highlights the programme's strengths in widening participation and diversifying the learner cohort. As well as the development of innovative practice-based learning that support multidisciplinary working and system-level understanding. Additionally, at the same time, supervisors have raised practical concerns regarding the one-day-per-week placement model, supervisory capacity pressures within clinical teams, and clarity around expectations for learner quality improvement projects. These insights, they reflect, have informed ongoing review of practice-based learning structures and capacity planning.
- Furthermore, Year ones Fieldwork Tutors reported positively on the partnership approach but identified challenges with the piloted block practice-based learning model. Particularly around sequencing, task clarity and alignment with learners' concurrent practice-based learning. They also sought clearer links between statutory frameworks for practice, teaching, and learner readiness to take on the role of a learner educational psychologist within a local authority context. In response, the programme has revised timetabling, clarified practice-based learning task guidance and strengthened self-directed learning and teaching input on statutory frameworks.
- Feedback from the second and third year EPS placement educators indicates strong satisfaction with the programme's integration of anti-racist and EDI principles, the quality of learner work, and the responsiveness of programme leadership. Termly meetings, the Placement Handbook and targeted CPD opportunities were viewed as particularly effective, with supervisors emphasising the value of protected time for peer discussion and reflection. Building on this, the programme has identified further actions to enhance supervisor development, increase placement flexibility, and strengthen stakeholder collaboration, ensuring continued alignment between practice educator expertise and programme development.
- The visitors noted the range of mechanisms for stakeholders to provide feedback on the programme and how this is used to drive

improvements and changes on the programme. They therefore found the education provider to be performing satisfactorily in this area

- **External examiners –**

- The education provider explained how their programme continues to benefit from a strong and constructive external examination relationship. Regular engagement is maintained throughout the year through sharing internal verification reports, samples of assessed work and feedback, the examiners participation in examination boards and formal reporting. Their examiner was also fully consulted on the May 2025 amendment request to their validating body, providing timely and helpful feedback that informed programme-level decision-making.
- The education provider reflects, that since their last performance review, progress has been made in strengthening learner engagement with the External Examiner. Learners across all three-year groups now meet with them annually, enhancing transparency and shared understanding prior to receipt of his report. They reflect that the programme has also benefited from staff acting as External Examiners elsewhere, with a secure reciprocal arrangement now in place with the University of East London, supporting broader sector engagement and calibration of standards.
- The education provider reflected on how their July 2025 External Examiner report highlighted multiple strengths, including the programme's distinctive focus on self-awareness and relational understanding. Furthermore, a strong alignment with HCPC requirements and BPS expectations, and a well-integrated model of academic, research and practice-based learning. Assessment design and marking feedback were commended as inclusive, transparent and developmental, and significant progress was noted in embedding equity, diversity and inclusion through teaching, assessment and reflective frameworks. They reflect that the report also identified areas for enhancement, particularly around alignment between tutor and practice-based learning supervision, orientation activities and extenuation processes. They discuss how these queries have been formally responded to and inform current action planning.
- They reflected that overall, the external examination process continues to provide robust quality assurance and a valuable independent perspective. The programme uses both commendations and recommendations to inform programme development. It has meant planned actions focused on strengthening placement educator induction, improving access to supervisory guidance, and enhancing dialogue and CPD with placement providers. It also means better integrating orientation tasks into the curriculum and working collaboratively with Academic Quality colleagues on procedural refinements.
- The visitors noted the range of mechanisms for stakeholders to provide feedback on the programme. They found the education provider to have demonstrated how they involve external examiners and how their input is utilised. The visitors found the education provider to be performing satisfactorily in this area

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learner non continuation:**
 - The education provider has stated how programme continuation and progression rates are strong. This has been improved by the introduction of in-year resubmissions in academic year 2024–25 and they reflect it has been further strengthened by enabling any additional assessment requirements to be addressed before the end of the academic year, supporting uninterrupted progression. They reflect that overall the outcomes indicate a robust and effective doctoral training programme with well-integrated academic, pastoral and institutional support.
 - The education provider reflects that non-continuation rates remain below sector benchmarks for full-time doctoral research learners. This, they reflect, reinforces the effectiveness of their recruitment approach, assessment design and support structures. This includes responsive management of extenuating circumstances, targeted adjustments and extensions where appropriate, and proactive monitoring by senior staff. They have discussed how they will continue to review outcomes annually, enhance placement equity and learner support, and sustain the practices underpinning of learner achievement. They have stated that they will continue to explore further opportunities to co-create aspects of the learning experience with learners.
 - The visitors noted the processes the education provider has in place to collect and analyse data. The visitors are satisfied with the processes in place and were able to assess this data as part of this performance review. The visitors are satisfied that the education provider is able to produce and supply externally verified data to the HCPC on an annual basis.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - The education provider reflects that from academic year 2024–25, they as a provider submit an independent HESA learner data return, replacing the previous arrangement where data was returned via the University of Essex (the validating body). This change ensures that outcomes for the programme are reported directly under the Tavistock and Portman name and will contribute to the graduate outcomes' dataset going forward. For learners who successfully complete the programme, they reflect that 100% are in work post-qualification. Graduate employment, they reflect, is actively monitored as part of the contractual requirements with the Department for Education (DfE).
 - They have detailed how the programme tracks graduate employment annually for two years (2019–2023) and three years (from 2024 onwards) post-qualification, beginning three months after completion. They reflect that this longitudinal approach provides a more detailed and reliable picture of career readiness and sustainability than the

national graduate outcomes survey, which captures responses once at 15 months and sees declining response rates over time. The data demonstrates that learners are well prepared for professional practice and supported to sustain their careers, reinforcing the programme's effectiveness and informing ongoing curriculum development, placement partnerships, and targeted CPD and alumni provision.

- The visitors noted the processes the education provider has in place to collect and analyse data. The visitors are satisfied with the processes in place and were able to assess this data as part of this performance review. The visitors are satisfied that the education provider is able to produce and supply externally verified data to the HCPC on an annual basis.

- **Learner satisfaction:**

- The education provider has explained how their programmes do not participate in the National Student Survey (NSS) or Postgraduate Research Education Survey (PRES). Instead, they conduct an annual in-house learner survey for all programmes. The HCPC-approved programme reports consistently high overall satisfaction, at 96% in academic 2023-24 and 97% in 2024-25. This substantially exceeds the average PRES overall satisfaction rates of 79% (2023) and 81% (2024). These survey data feed directly into their Annual Review of Courses conducted with the University of Essex, where learner performance and feedback are systematically analysed to identify strengths, areas for enhancement, and inform a detailed programme action plan.
- The education provider reflects that the satisfaction scores for the programme supports their conclusion that the programme delivers a robust and effective doctoral training experience. Satisfaction on their programme is markedly higher than the Trust-wide average, highlighting the quality of teaching, learner engagement, and academic leadership provided by the programme team. They reflect that ongoing actions focus on delivering the agreed course action plan, sustaining high-quality provision through collaborative working, and sharing good practice across the education provider to enhance the wider learner experience.
- The visitors noted the processes the education provider has in place to collect and analyse data. The visitors are satisfied with the processes in place and were able to assess this data as part of this performance review. The visitors are satisfied that the education provider is able to produce and supply externally verified data to the HCPC on an annual basis.

- **Proposal for supplying data points to the HCPC:** The education provider has detailed how they will supply the required data across three areas, based on the above internal data collections. These being our required sections regarding learner continuation / non-continuation rates, graduate outcomes and overall learner satisfaction. They state that these will be submitted annually, will be metrics-based and anonymised. Their approach to these areas are detailed below:

- The education provider has detailed their process to monitor learner non-continuation rates. They explained how they measure learner non-continuation by analysing the outcomes of the Exam Boards. These are undertaken jointly with the University of Essex during July and evaluating the outcomes for each student at the Board. This data is verified through the External Examiners at the Boards and through the Annual Review of Courses procedure undertaken with their validating partner, the University of Essex. They explained how they add to this data by collecting their re-registration data so they can measure how many learners are moving directly from one year of study to the next. This data is provided in an anonymised format in percentage rates and can be broken down by year of study.
- The education provider has detailed their process to monitor graduate outcome rates or the outcomes for those who complete programmes. They explained how their learner outcomes are measured on an annual basis and reported to SEEL / SEAL as part of their contract to deliver the programme. Learner outcomes, they reflect, are followed and reported on for up to three years post-award depending on the relevant DfE ITEP contract, starting at three months post-qualification. They explained how currently they are not part of the Graduate Outcomes Survey as an institution but are included through the University of Essex's return. They explained that they are expecting to be directly included in the Graduate Outcomes Survey in the future once their individual HESA return is established. Furthermore, at this point, this data is provided directly to HCPC in an anonymised format in percentage rates.
- The education provider has detailed their process to monitor learner satisfaction rates. They explained how their learners are not included in the NSS, Post Graduate Taught Education Survey (PTES), or Post Graduate Research Experience Survey PRES surveys. Instead, they undertake an equivalent in-house learner survey on an annual basis during the spring and summer terms. This, they reflect, follows standard sector practices, as used in the NSS, PTES and PRES. They explained how they ask learners to give a numerical score for their satisfaction under a variety of areas as well as an overall satisfaction score. This data is then collated and the satisfaction of learners on their programme can be measured and reported on, both across all programmes (including non-approved programmes) and with regards to individual programme performance. This survey data is verified through their Annual Review of Courses with their validating partner, the University of Essex. Annual survey results, both as aggregate score for education provider and for the approved programme specifically, will be provided to HCPC; this presents anonymised percentage rates.
- The visitors noted the processes the education provider has in place to collect and analyse data. The visitors are satisfied with the processes in place and the education providers ability to supply the required verified data.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval or focused review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2029-30 academic year

Reason for next engagement recommendation

- Internal stakeholder engagement
 - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider included learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations and external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with the professional body across practitioner psychologist professions, the British Psychology Society during the review period. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision
 - The education provider did engage with other relevant professional or system regulator(s) (OfS) during the review period.
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way
- Data supply;
 - Through this review, the education provider established how they will supply quality and performance data points which are equivalent to those in external supplies available for other organisations. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas moving forward
- What the data is telling us:
 - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.
- The education provider noted their ongoing merger, which will impact their provision from the 2025-26 academic year. We will need to review the impact of this once the merger has been completed and data / feedback has been collected. We have determined that a four-year ongoing monitoring period to

monitor this feedback and data, followed by a Performance Review which will be in the 2029-30 academic year to provide sufficient flexibility and time for the merger to be completed and thoroughly assessed / reviewed by the education provider.

- In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a four-year monitoring period is:
 - To recognise that the education provider has demonstrated good performance against the portfolio areas, showing a focus on quality assurance and enhancement in the review period.
 - This will also allow sufficient time for their ongoing merger to be completed, and to collect further feedback and insights on this merger, to reflect on its development and successes
 - It will also allow for the other changes and updates reflected on in this review to be implemented.
 - The education provider has introduced mechanisms and reporting systems to generate and supply the verified data required to enable a review period beyond 2 years. The education provider has committed to submit this data to us annually

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2029-30 academic year

Reason for this decision: The education provider and its programmes will next engage with the performance review process in four years. The Panel agreed with the visitors' recommended monitoring period, for the reasons noted in the report.

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on the next steps for the provider. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation (including their reasons) and any referrals.

Education provider	Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust		
Case reference	CAS-01874-H6W6Z4	Lead visitors	Joanne Lusher, Lyn McLafferty
Review period recommended	4 years		
Reason for recommendation			
• In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a four-year monitoring period is: ○ To recognise that the education provider has demonstrated good performance against the portfolio areas, showing a focus on quality assurance and enhancement in the review period. ○ This will also allow sufficient time for their ongoing merger to be completed, and the changes and updates reflected on in this review to be implemented. A four-year ongoing monitoring period allows the education provider to collect further feedback and insights on this merger and to reflect on its development and successes. ○ This time period also recognises the work the education provider has conducted and implemented regarding their approach to data. They have introduced mechanisms and reporting systems to generate and supply the verified data required for HCPC processes. We will require the education provider to submit these to us annually. This allows us to grant a longer than two-year ongoing monitoring period.			
Referrals			
No referrals			

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
Doctorate in Child, Community and Educational Psychology (D.Ch.Ed.Psych.)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Educational psychologist		01/01/2005

