

Performance review process report

Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, 2018-21

Executive summary

This report covers our performance review of the programmes offered by Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust. During this review, there were two referrals made to the education providers next performance review regarding learner satisfaction and service user involvement. Several areas of good practice were identified by the visitors with regards to interprofessional education, some equality and diversity initiatives and their partnerships with other organisations.

This education provider constitutes a low risk to how the approved programmes continue to be delivered. However, there is a lack of comparable data points to inform us of progress, therefore our recommendation for the performance review period is two years. This report will now be considered by our Education and Training Panel who will make the final decision on the on the review period.

Previous consideration There are no previous considerations for this education provider.

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
- whether issues identified for referral through this review should be reviewed, and if so how

Next steps Subject to the Panel's decision, the education provider's next performance review will be in the 2023-24 academic year

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	3
About us	3
Our standards	3
Our regulatory approach	3
The performance review process	3
Thematic areas reviewed	4
How we make our decisions	4
The assessment panel for this review	4
Section 2: About the education provider	5
The education provider context	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	5
Institution performance data	5
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	6
Portfolio submission	6
Quality themes identified for further exploration	6
Quality theme 1 – Clarification on regarding programme stability	7
Quality theme 2 – Addressing differences in learner cohorts regarding equality and diversity	7
Quality theme 3 – Addressing low learner satisfaction rates	8
Quality theme 4 – Addressing shortage of education psychologists	9
Quality theme 5 – Limited service user and carer involvement	9
Quality theme 6 – Evidence of effective engagement with practice placement educators	10
Section 4: Summary of findings	11
Overall findings on performance	11
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	11
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	14
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	15
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	15
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	16
Data and reflections	17
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	18
Referrals to next scheduled performance review	18
Review of support provided to learners with education needs/ disabilities	18
Review of the advances of service user and carer involvement into programme development	18
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	18
Assessment panel recommendation	18
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution	20

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.

Education 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 education 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
- Education provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Education 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:

Beverley Cherie Millar	Lead visitor, Clinical scientist
Gemma Howlett	Support visitor, Paramedic registrant
Anne Johnson	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer
Sophie Bray	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers one HCPC-approved programme across one profession. It is a NHS Foundation Trust and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2005.

Tavistock and Portman are different from most HCPC education providers in that they are not a higher education institution (HEI), a further education institution (FEI), or a private or specialist education provider. They are an NHS Trust providing a single HCPC-approved programme, as part of consortium with University College London (UCL), The UCL Institute of Education, University of East London and Southampton University. The consortium is referred to as SEEL and is providing professional training across the South, Southeast and London regions of the country.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The education 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2005

Institution performance data

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

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	10	16	2022	The education provider supplied a breakdown of numbers of learners over the review period, showing they have consistently supported a cohort of between 15-16 learners each year. The visitors were satisfied the education provider has the resources to ensure this is viable and stable.

Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	N/A	2018-19	This data is not available; however, the education provider outlines how only one learner has not continued with study. After reviewing, the visitors were satisfied with this performance.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	93%	N/A	2018-29	This data is not available, and the visitors were satisfied with the providers statement of a high proportion of learners continuing to further study or employment.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	N/A	N/A	As a non-HEI, this data is not collected by the Office for Students (OfS), and it is therefore marked not applicable.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	N/A	N/A	N/A	As a non-HEI, this data is not collected by the Office for Students (OfS), and it is therefore marked not applicable.
HPCP performance review cycle length	N/A	TBC	2018-21	We have recommended a review period of two years after reviewing the providers portfolio and being satisfied with their performance but limited by the number of data points available. This will be confirmed once the report has been submitted to the Education and Training Panel who will make the final decision

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.

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 defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider was performing well against our standards.

The visitors sought out clarification on each quality theme via email communication to allow the education provider to elaborate on previous information they had sent or send further evidence documents to answer the queries.

Quality theme 1 – Clarification on regarding programme stability

Area for further exploration: The education provider has been awarded funding from the department of education (DfE) which assures viability of their programmes. In their annual review of courses (ARC), the education provider states there have been some management, staffing, finance and administrative issues. It was unclear what sort of issues this refers to and the effect of these issues on the stability of the programmes. The visitors explored these issues further, requesting for the education provider to elaborate on the statement made so they were able to review the effect these issues may have on performance. It is important the education provider can reflect on challenges they have encountered by describing how they are addressing them moving forward to show they can overcome challenges to ensure stability for learners.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider supplied the action plan attached to the ARC form which describes the management, staffing, finance and administrative objectives, actions and how they will measure success. The provider was concerned about ensuring quality control processes are in place for effective programme management and administration. They intend to ensure appropriate management and resources are available for the delivery of the programme.

The action plan outlined how the education provider intends to ensure appropriate management and resources are available for the delivery of the programme within the context of the education providers' current strategic review. This includes clarification on staff roles and responsibilities, and budget assignment. They have also appointed a new course director who is directly addressing the staffing, finance, and administration issues. The visitors were satisfied the new staff appointment and activities outlined in the action plan will appropriately address the issues with finance and administration relating to any structural issues which have been identified.

Quality theme 2 – Addressing differences in learner cohorts regarding equality and diversity

Area for further exploration: The visitors recognised best practice by the education provider with regards to their developments with anti-racism and culturally aware practice. Although good practice has been recognised, there was a lack of narrative around a 'reasonably positive diversity profile' stated by the education provider. The education provider stated for the protected characteristics of disability, the difference in application acceptance rate to the programme found a rejection rate is of less than 3% and no applicants with 'Learning Difficulties/Disability' disclosed were rejected. The visitors requested clarity on the education provider's findings and further detail on the course development plan's additional equality action plan. They requested the provider reflects on the reasons for the difference between learner cohorts with protected characteristics and how the provider intends to address this. It is important

the provider continues to monitor and address potential differences in learner support and achievements regarding equality and diversity.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider outlined protected characteristics are monitored through learners' application to the programme. With regards to the achievement outcomes for learners, the education provider stated the difference between learners who declare protected characteristics and those who don't was on average less than 3%. They outlined how it is a key issue to ensure they can address the difference in progression for disabled learner and their non-disabled peers. There is an action plan in place to ensure that reaching a satisfactory level of performance in terms of competency and proficiency in applied practice is the standard. The visitors were satisfied the education provider is actively addressing these areas and performing appropriately.

The education provider intends to combine their course development plan with their equality action plan to better support their recent anti-racist statement and reflect their commitment to anti-racist working. The visitors were satisfied the education provider is performing well in relation to their race equality commitments. They were reassured the education provider is embedding innovative practice into their programme development plan and all aspects of the teaching curriculum, assessment and feedback. The visitors agreed the education provider has a commendable action plan to address this issue and were satisfied this is being dealt with.

Quality theme 3 – Addressing low learner satisfaction rates

Area for further exploration: The visitors agreed learners appear to be involved well in the programme. They are given a lot of opportunities to provide feedback on the programme and placements. It is reported in the ARC that 64% of learners are satisfied with the organisation and management of the programme and 40% are satisfied with the level of engagement in relation to decision making about the course. Further to this, the equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) results in the survey data of the ARC are of concern, with only 54% of respondents satisfied. The visitors explored how the education provider has responded to and addressed these lower than satisfactory results. It is important the education provider is acknowledging and appropriately addressing areas of concern to support learners and ensure they are satisfied with the programme.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider outlined the 54% learner satisfaction rate relating to EDI has since improved to 65% satisfaction. This represents an increase in satisfaction, however they acknowledge there is ongoing work to do in this area. To address the low satisfaction rates, the education provider has conducted a further learner evaluation which has indicated an improvement in satisfaction. From learner feedback, they established the primary reasoning impacting on satisfaction relating to EDI was related to reading materials. This was outlined in the EDI action plan they provided to the visitors, which the visitors considered as robust and were satisfied it is addressing the issues. The education provider highlighted the overall satisfaction from the ARC survey was 67% and they have no immediate concerns about the level of engagement on this programme. They explained the lower value of 40% represents the learners who completed the

survey which they put down to a general drop in engagement during the pandemic. The visitors were satisfied with the providers response, justification and actions moving forward to ensure they are addressing learner feedback.

Quality theme 4 – Addressing shortage of educational psychologists

Area for further exploration: The education provider has highlighted key drivers which will require increased resources to fulfil the shortage of educational psychologists. The need for more educational psychologists is acknowledged by the education provider, however it was unclear if the education provider is intending to increase cohort sizes in response to this. The visitors explored how the education provider is reacting to the issues relating to workforce numbers. As an education provider who is training learners into a profession which is facing a shortage, it is important that they are responding to national needs in an appropriate and sustainable way.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider has recognised the issues relating to workforce are national in nature and there is a need to increase the number of education provider training places. The education provider has referred to the department of education's (DfE) SEND Review: Right support, right place, right time which outlines how the number of funded educational psychologist trainees have increased. Further to this, the DfE have commissioned a workforce survey from Warwick University which will inform consortia arrangements for education provider training. These developments will inform consortia arrangements for the education provider, and numbers of placements. The education provider is beginning negotiations with the DfE for future training and subsequently intentions to increase numbers which is related to joint discussions and agreements with the consortium partners and the DfE regarding funding. The visitors were satisfied the education provider has a clear understanding of the national needs for professionals from their programmes and have acknowledged the DfE initiatives which will drive an action plan response.

Quality theme 5 – Limited service user and carer involvement

Area for further exploration: The education provider has highlighted multiple opportunities and examples of interactions between learners and service users and carers (SU&C). The visitors agreed this is an area of good practice for the education provider, however the strategy and intentions of SU&C involvement were unclear from the portfolio. The education provider acknowledged there are further opportunities for SU&C involvement on the programme therefore the visitors enquired about the education providers plans to implement these opportunities. They requested to review the education provider's Public and Patient Involvement and service user strategy.

It was not clear how SU&Cs are able to feedback into the programme or how they are involved in programme development. The visitors explored what mechanisms are in place to obtain SU&C feedback and how the education provider addresses this to ensure continual development of their programmes. It is important there are appropriate processes to receive feedback and action it where necessary.

In their portfolio the education provider referred to the use of a SU&C who is also a paid member of the teaching team. The visitors were concerned about a potential conflict of interest (COI), leading them to explore how many SU&C are involved in the programme and how they address potential COI. This also led to the visitors requesting more information about the involvement of SU&C in the stakeholder group and how they are involved in the programmes. It is important for the education provider to clearly outline the role of SU&Cs and ensure learners are meeting learning objectives.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider stated SU&C involvement and feedback varies as part of their current programme, providing several examples. All consultation, assessment, intervention, training and therapy-based work on all placements is negotiated and evaluated with SU&C. SU&C are involved with projects during placements and are able to feedback through regular meetings and discussions. The education provider has identified SU&C involvement is an area for development on the programme. The visitors were satisfied after viewing the Public and Patient Involvement and service user strategy, the education provider is appropriately addressing this issue.

The education provider assured the visitors there was no conflict of interest regarding the use of service users on the programme. They will continue to ensure this is the case by following follow the HCPC Code of Conduct, Performance and Ethics, the British Psychological Society (BPS) Ethics Code and any other relevant professional guidance. Module leads are responsible for ensuring informed consent from SU&C and providing them with adequate support.

Quality theme 6 – Evidence of effective engagement with practice placement educators

Area for further exploration: The education provider carries out a placement education provider survey annually which is considered at executive level to ensure placements are supported appropriately. They provided limited information in their portfolio, so it was unclear how placement educators are involved in the programmes, supported by the education provider and able to give feedback. The link between the education provider and placement educators was not outlined in enough detail for the visitors to make a judgement on performance. The visitors explored how the education provider is involving placement educators in the programme, including obtaining and addressing feedback from them.

They requested more information on how the education provider is supporting placement educators, and how they maintain an ongoing relationship with them to ensure learners are suitably supported during placements. This is important, as placement educators will be directly supporting the education provider's learners while on placement and therefore their involvement in the programmes is valuable.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider outlined how the arrangements for placement educator engagement/links are informed by the national Practice Placement Partnership Framework [PPPF]. This includes arrangements for liaison and feedback between the training education providers and the placement educators. Placement educators are supported by a placement handbook and termly

meetings with a training education provider representative and the trainee. They also meet termly with the education provider's programme representative. During these meetings they can give feedback, and also reflect on successes and challenges which the education provider can use to develop the programme. New placement educators are offered a buddy or peer mentor from experienced educators. The visitors were satisfied there is adequate support in place for placement educators and they are involved in the programme appropriately, as outlined by the education provider's response.

Section 4: Summary of 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:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability:**
 - The education provider outlined that the HCPC programme is part of a consortium of the Tavistock and Portman, University of Central London (UCL), University of East London (UEL) and Southampton University, referred to as SEEL. They state that through winning the contract with the department of education (DfE) to train educational psychologists they have gone through a rigorous process and the contract which ensures there are appropriate resources and financial stability. The education providers DfE/consortium contract has recently been extended to provide the funds for training up to the 2023 intake.
 - The education provider does not anticipate a drop in learner cohort numbers due to the national shortage of educational psychologists and limited number of education providers delivering this type of programme. The education provider has outlined how they have an action plan to ensure quality control processes are in place for effective course management and administration, explored in [quality theme 1](#). In response to this action plan, the visitors agreed it would be pertinent to consider resolution of the course staffing and structural issues identified at the next performance review.
 - Learner numbers have been consistent over the review period and the education provider reported and evidenced they are confident about the financial sustainability of the programme. As a result the visitors were satisfied and reassured that the education provider has financial stability.

- **Partnerships with other organisations:**
 - The education provider is part of the SEEL consortium which meet three times a year to review performance and delivery of training. The consortium has representation with the joint professional liaison group

(JPLG) a group which makes recommendations to training courses in liaison with the British Psychological Society (BPS) and Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP).

- The programme has a stakeholder group with Principal Educational Psychologists (PEPs) and trainee reps to help direct the programme. Placements for learners are facilitated either internally or through partnership with Local Authority Educational Psychology Services. The consortium has representation with the JPLG a group which makes recommendations to training courses in liaison with BPS and AEP. Field supervisors are seconded from London, East and South East (SEEL) local authority placements for year one placements.
 - Some tutors are provided through service level agreements with services whilst most are employed by the education provider. The visitors were satisfied the education provider has suitable partnerships in place to ensure the programme allows learners to meet learning objectives and they are communicating with relevant professional bodies.
- **Academic and placement quality:**
 - The education provider outlines several different methods they use to collect data on this area and use to inform course development planning. These include:
 - an annual review and development plan,
 - placement surveys,
 - learner surveys,
 - placement policy underwritten by National Association of Principal Educational Psychologists (NAPEP),
 - annual module evaluations,
 - external examiner reports, and
 - periodic reviews and revalidation with Essex University.
 - The education provider also monitors national and legislative changes which might inform planning. The range of placements and existing experiential training/placements and partnerships continue to be maintained and strengthened whilst new partnerships are being expanded.
 - The visitors reviewed evidence supplied regarding these mechanisms to ensure academic and placement quality. They agreed there has been positive feedback from external examiners, and good results from revalidation. The education provider also gave clarity on the strategies they have in place to ensure learners can experience all placements, including novel ones. The visitors were reassured numerous strategies have been implemented to ensure all learners can experience from valuable placements throughout the educational programme.
 - **Interprofessional education:**

The education provider states that the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) placement in year one provides opportunity for learners to be supervised by and work alongside several other professions in a clinical context. The programme learners have opportunities to work with other education providers and professionals

through shadowing, joint work, supervision, discussion groups, research groups, seminars and role play. The education provider state that specialist professionals' also input into the programme. The visitors were satisfied there are multiple opportunities for learners on this programme to experience interprofessional education and agree this is comprehensively done and an example of good practice.

- **Service users and carers (SU&C):**

- The education provider states that SU&C involvement is central, intrinsic, and substantive throughout the education provider and programmes. They state they have policies and procedures in place which outline involvement and ensure ongoing monitoring, which we further explored in [quality theme 5](#). The visitors were satisfied this ongoing development of SU&C involvement is supported by a Public and Patient Involvement and SU&C strategy, a learning and teaching committee and continued professional development (CPD) for staff. The visitors agreed there are many opportunities and examples of interactions between the education provider, learners and a variety of SU&C which are pleasing to see. They were satisfied these interactions ensure optimum healthcare delivery to SU&C, as well as valuable considerations for programme development, personal development and fulfilment of SOPs.
- Their programme is based within a clinical setting, involving procedures for working with parents, carers and patients. They further outline how the policies and procedures impact on the course and learners and how monitoring is carried out. They outline who they define as service users and what types of work can be done with them. They provide direct examples of service user input throughout the programme, one example linked to a service user who also works as a programme consultant. The visitors were satisfied the education provider has acknowledged there is room for improvement here and are addressing this appropriately.

- **Equality and diversity:**

The education provider monitors data for equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) on application of learners and can therefore comment on their percentages of learners who fall under protected characteristics categories. The visitors recognised some good practice highlighted by the education provider, including open evenings for underrepresented groups, work on anti-racism and culturally aware practice. The visitors agreed the education provider ensures EDI is included throughout the teaching and placement programme structure. The education provider supports EDI through mechanisms such as research, projects, placement activities and an improved curriculum. In [quality theme 2](#) the education provider outlined the actions and plans in place to continue to improve their approach to EDI and offer equal opportunities to all learners.

- **Horizon scanning:**

The education provider has highlighted the potential growth in their programmes due to a national shortage of education providers delivering on the government's SENDA (Special Educational Needs and Disability Act) and mental health agendas. The education providers DfE/consortium contract has recently been extended to provide the funds for training up to the 2023 intake. Bidding for the provision for cohorts after that is likely to begin shortly. The visitors were satisfied the education provider is aware of the national requirement to increase education provider training places. This awareness is following the publication of the findings of the DfE commissioned workforce survey from Warwick University. The visitors agreed this will drive an appropriate action plan response from the education provider, as explored in [quality theme 4](#).

Risks identified which may impact on performance: The education provider highlighted some issues regarding staffing and structural issues which they provided an action plan to address. The visitors recommended the progress and resolution of the course staffing and structural issues are reviewed at the next performance review.

The visitors also noted within the areas of service user involvement and approach to equality and diversity the education provider has acknowledged areas for improvement and have put action plans in place. The visitors recommended these be reviewed in the next performance review to evaluate the impact and advances the education provider has made with support provided to learners with education needs or disabilities and service users input into the programme development.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:

The course is situated in a clinical setting, so multiple opportunities for interprofessional education for learners on this programme. The visitors agreed this is comprehensively done and an excellent example of a good educational practice.

The visitors identified the education providers approach to anti-racism and work on culturally aware practice as a good example of education practice to be commended.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Impact of COVID-19:**

The education provider stated that engagement and progression were maintained during the pandemic, and restrictions were followed by adapting placements and programme content. They started working remotely with consultations, meetings, and programme delivery. They also introduced a non-detriment policy during this time. The responsiveness of the programme team during the pandemic was commended in the November 2021 Periodic Review by the University of Essex. The visitors agreed it was good to know the education provider has embraced lessons learnt through the pandemic and they

are further implementing blended and online provision. They were satisfied with the education provider's performance.

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

The education provider expanded their use of current systems such as Moodle and given asynchronous access. They developed webinars, delivered vivas remotely, and adapted assignments and simulations where appropriate. They are employing a new Student Support and Engagement Lead role, beginning in Feb 2023, will also be looking at how they deliver learner support and engagement online and face-to-face with learners, with a more joined-up approach to good practice. The visitors agreed this is a good initiative for the development and implementation of new learner support. The visitors were 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: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education:**

Quality assurance of programmes will be driven by wider university policy, but the visitors were satisfied the programmes appear to be in adherence of all relevant monitoring.

- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies:**

The education provider states there are Care Quality Commission (CQC) reports that can be made available, and how although they impact a small part of the course it impacts more on the education providers overall policy and practice. The programme delivers the British Psychological Society (BPS) core curriculum and meets the BPS quality standards for accreditation. The visitors were satisfied there is appropriate assessment of practice education providers by external bodies.

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 states how their programme meets requirements of BPS accreditation through partnership and HCPC registration requirements. They detail the areas covered by the programme, and some information on how the learners, tutors and

trainees work. The visitors agreed the teaching team of lecturers, researchers and publishers are very academically competent. The education provider has an optional multidisciplinary module in hospital neuropsychology but are considering making this available for all subject to availability. The visitors agreed the education provider has performed well in relation to curriculum development and show good examples of educational practice.

- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance:**
The education provider states their programme has been recently audited by HCPC and meets the revised standards. They have contributed to the development of the BPS accreditation requirements and state they aim to incorporate these changes over the next two-year period. The visitors were satisfied the education provider is reflecting and actively contributing to changes in professional body guidance.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning:**
The education provider states that placements have increased with increasing learner numbers. The placement opportunities appear varied through the years of the programme and regularly monitored, over a multi-agency clinical setting. They state that there has been no shortage of quality placements. The visitors were satisfied the education provider is ensuring there is appropriate capacity of practice-based learning.

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 contribution of the education provider to the developing of BPS accreditation requirement was considered an area of good practice by the visitors.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learners:**
 - The education provider states that the Annual Review of Courses acknowledges and responds to feedback through the learner survey. This informs the course development plan. They have a complaints procedure for learners and year representatives that attend meetings. The visitors explored the low learner satisfaction rates in [quality theme 3](#), and the education provider gave some justifications including a low response rate. They have recommended the education provider considers further plans and measures in place to increase both learner participation and satisfaction. The education provider stated there is a relatively high number of learners with moderate to more profound disabilities/medical conditions and their progression is a priority.
 - Linked to this they provide additional supervision, additional planning meetings, adaptations and modifications, extenuations, reasonable

adjustments and Statements of Reasonable Adjustments (SORAS). The visitors considered learners appear to be involved well in the programme. They are given a lot of opportunities to provide feedback on the programme and placement, including involvement in curriculum review groups. Programme team appear to work collaboratively with the learners. The visitors were overall satisfied with learner involvement and are satisfied the education provider has acknowledged areas for improvement.

- **Practice placement educators:**

SEEL carry out a survey of placement supervisors on behalf of the consortium and data is collected annually to be used by the education provider to ensure their programme prepares and supports placements appropriately. They provide liaison and training three times a year. The visitors further explored the involvement of practice placement educators with the programme, support offered to them and how they feed back. The education provider reassured the visitors in quality theme 6, outlining examples of involvement, regular support opportunities and mechanisms for obtaining and addressing feedback. The visitors were satisfied the education provider is performing well in this area.

- **External examiners:**

The education provider states that external examiners consistently report positively on the standards and content of the course. They feedback that the programme makes an excellent contribution to the profession. The education provider uses feedback from examiners to improve standards of feedback on the assignments to trainees and informs programme development. The visitors agreed there is excellent external feedback and the education provider has a 'good critical friend relationship'.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: The education provider outlined a learner satisfaction rate of 64% which the visitors explored in more detail in [quality theme 3](#). They were satisfied the education provider had some actions in place to address this lower than optimal value, however recommended the education provider considers further plans and measures in place to increase both learner participation and satisfaction.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

The education provider was not able to provide many data points, limiting the annotations that can be made with regards to these. The education provider made the following statements with regards to data points:

- Although the education provider does not have data on the number of learnings not continuing, they confirmed there has only been one withdrawal

from the course in recent years. This shows generally good continuation of learners.

- They state they are collectively proud of their learner completion rate and the quality of our trainees when they enter the profession, however, provide no values here.
- No reflection provided on TEF award or NSS score, as these are unapplicable to this type of education provider.
- They propose no other methods of data points they can supply for HCPC

Risks identified which may impact on performance: There are limited available data points both internal and external which the education provider can supply to demonstrate performance. This is common for this type of education provider; however, we recommend exploring potential data points for in the future.

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).

Referrals to next scheduled performance review

Review of support provided to learners with education needs/ disabilities

Summary of issue: The education provider has received low learner satisfaction rates in relation to equality, diversity and inclusion. In response to this, and a further exploration in [quality theme 2](#), the education provider has acknowledged these low scores. They have input an action plan to address these issues, and the visitors recommended the outcomes of these initiatives, particularly relating to the support provided for students with educational needs/disabilities, be explored in their next performance review.

Review of the advances of service user and carer involvement into programme development

Summary of issue: The education provider acknowledged that service user and carer involvement in programmes is an area of weakness in their performance. This was explored by the visitors in [quality theme 5](#), and have begun to implement a Public and Patient Involvement and service user strategy. The visitors recommended the outcomes of this strategy be explored in their next performance review.

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 2023-24 academic year
- The issues identified for referral through this review should be carried out in accordance with the details contained in section 5 of this report

Reason for this recommendation: Overall, the portfolio was completed with a satisfactory level of narrative and detail and showed good reflections from the education provider. It clearly showed their progress and performance during the review period and highlighted a few areas for improvement. Due to the lack of comparable data points available for this education provider, we recommend the maximum review period of two years.

Appendix 1 – 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