
Performance review process report

Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, Review Period 2021-2023

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of Tavistock and Portman NHS 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 against quality themes and found that we needed to undertake further exploration of key themes through quality activities;
- reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities;
- undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed; and
- recommended when the institution should next be reviewed.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on quality theme 1 – there was limited reflection on how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors sought greater reflection and detail on service user and carer engagement in programme delivery and how this is embedded within the curriculum. They sought clarification on how the trust-wide service user forum meetings have enabled greater service user involvement and how this has been measured.
 - The education provider should next engage with monitoring in two years, in the 2025-2026 academic year, because:
 - The visitors were satisfied with the overall performance of the education provider across the themes. The education provider responds to recommendations from external regulators and professional bodies. The education provider has progressed service user and carer engagement in the programme.
 - We do not have established data points for the education provider. Without these established data points, we cannot grant an ongoing monitoring period of over two years.
 - We shall work with the education provider to embed established data points and produce usable data before their next performance review.
-

Previous consideration The education provider completed their performance review for the period 2018-2021. This concludes the two-year ongoing monitoring period since their last review.

Decision The Education and Training 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 education provider's next performance review will be in the 2025-2026 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	7
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	8
Portfolio submission.....	8
Quality themes identified for further exploration	8
Quality theme 1 – Limited service user and carer involvement	9
Section 4: Findings.....	10
Overall findings on performance	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	15
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	16
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection.....	17
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	19
Data and reflections	21
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	21
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes.....	22
Assessment panel recommendation.....	22
Appendix 1 – summary report	23
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution	24

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; and
- 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:

Garrett Kennedy	Lead visitor, Practitioner psychologist
Rosemary Schaeffer	Lead visitor, Practitioner psychologist
Catherine Rice	Service User Expert Advisor
Louise Winterburn	Education Quality Officer
Lisa Marks Woolfson	Advisory visitor, Practitioner psychologist

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we required professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because there were areas within the portfolio which the lead visitors could not make judgements on with their professional knowledge or expertise. These areas were thematic reflection, embedding the revised HCPC Standards of proficiency, profession specific reflections and developments to reflect changes in professional body guidance.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers one HCPC approved programme across one profession. It is an NHS Trust and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2005. The Trust's primary academic partner is the University of Essex (UoE), and it is UoE who validate the Doctorate in Child Community and Educational Psychology. The programme is accredited by the British Psychological Society (BPS).

The education provider has not engaged with processes so far in the current model of quality assurance.

In 2019, the education provider engaged with the annual monitoring assessment process in the legacy model of quality assurance. After considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence, we were satisfied that the standards continued to be met and recommended that the programme remain approved.

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	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 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	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	16	16	2024	<p>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 was presented by the education provider through this submission.</p> <p>The education provider is recruiting learners at the benchmark.</p> <p>We did not explore this as the education provider's performance in this area is equal to the benchmark.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	N/A	2020-21	<p>There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment. The education provider has confirmed they are open and willing to provide data for future performance review cases.</p>

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

Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	N/A	2020-21	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment. The education provider has confirmed they are open and willing to provide data for future performance review cases.
Learner satisfaction	N/A	N/A	2023	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment. The education provider has confirmed they are open and willing to provide data for future performance review cases.

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.

Quality theme 1 – Limited service user and carer involvement

Area for further exploration: The education provider reflected on their last Performance Review report which referred to service user and carer involvement as a quality theme. They reflected on how they have prioritised service user involvement since then within the programme and at a strategic level. The visitors noted the education provider's reflections in this area and that they are aware of the continued developmental need. However, they noted that there was only minimal service user and carer involvement where service user is defined as patients or clients as part of the curriculum, and this was mainly focused on the selection of learners. The visitors sought to understand through further reflections on how service user and carer involvement has been developed further in relation to programme delivery and embedded within the curriculum. They sought clarification on how the quarterly trust-wide service user forum meetings have enabled greater service user involvement and how this has been measured.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We explored this through email clarification and additional evidence as we considered this the most appropriate way to address the issue.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider submitted a detailed explanation of how service users and carers are involved in the programme and its curriculum. They stated that, as part of the Child Assessment, Intervention and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities module, they have service users who are experts by experience. These include parents, patients, etc. who are invited into teaching sessions to share their lived experiences and perspectives with learners. They reflected on their new Patient Public Involvement Lead (PPI) who has been working across programmes and trusts to develop a standardised process on clinical service user feedback through experience of service questionnaires (ESQs) and to ensure this is built on for further service user development.

The education provider reflected that the quarterly trust-wide service user forum meetings are being developed further. The programme lead for service user involvement has used the meetings to propose the establishment of a curriculum consultation group where advice and guidance can be given to programme staff on curriculum content and process. They have also proposed that the forum have members who could sit on the programme Stakeholders Committee, and this could be supported by patient and public involvement (PPI) where relevant. Feedback from the trust-wide service user forum has also enabled the education provider to amend language and terminology used across the programme as regards diversity and inclusion.

The visitors were satisfied with the detailed reflection provided. They acknowledged that feedback in this area had been sought and acted upon and there are processes in place for developing service user and carer involvement further. We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

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:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability**
 - The education provider reflected on the pressures and challenges on the programme. These include the cost-of-living crisis for learners, recovery from the pandemic and wider national and socio-political developments and impacts on public finances. They reflected that feedback from learners suggests they were concerned with low bursary amounts given the increased challenges of living costs.
 - The education provider, collaborating within a consortium with other education providers and local authority educational psychology services, secured a funding contract to ensure the programme's financial stability. The contract between the Department for Education (DfE) and the consortium partners ensures the financial stability of the programme for the next three years. They reflected this ensures there are sufficient high quality practice placement experiences for learners. This also allows bursary funding to be available for learners in Years 2 and 3 of the programme.
 - They reflected on how there had been a Trust-wide Strategic Review, Enabling senior leadership reflection on programme sustainability at institutional level. The Strategic Review also identified and addressed other resourcing issues which had been previously impacting on the programme. For example, there are new posts for Head of Library and Digital Services, Student Support and Engagement Leads and a full time Programme Director role to support programme delivery.
 - The visitors were satisfied that the education provider has performed well in this area. This is because their reflection and clarification showed that their financial and resource planning has ensured stability and sustainability of their provision. This is further supported by their contract with DfE.
- **Partnerships with other organisations**
 - The education provider reflected on how they work in partnership with key organisations, such as the University of Essex (UoE), who validate the programme. They reflected that this partnership with UoE brought mutual development opportunities for shared learning and innovation. This was

across teaching and research. This also led to a reconfiguring of the programme to better meet the needs of learners.

- They reflected that partnerships with practice placement providers are also crucial to the sustainability of the programme. This is because they are vital for learning and for employment. Their contract with Department for Education (DfE) specifies that all graduates undertake a least two years employment in a local authority in England.
- The new Programme Director carried out a review of the programme's Stakeholder Committee. New terms of reference were devised, and membership was extended to include greater representation from learners, programme staff, local authority educational psychology services and principal educational Psychologists.
- They reflected that the project to remap the revised BPS doctoral standard competencies and the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) involved working with colleagues from University of Southampton and Newcastle University. The Programme Director has also made new links with Trust-wide Clinical Professional Lead for Psychology to ensure revised SOPs and related HCPC guidance is shared.
- The visitors were satisfied the education provider is performing well in this area. This is because their reflection showed they have continued to manage existing partnerships whilst also working to develop new relationships and partnerships.

- **Academic quality**

- The education provider reflected how they use learner feedback by module and at a programme level to assess academic quality. They also use other processes including internal verification of summative assessment, Programme Committee, external examiners, and accreditation arrangements with British Psychological Society (BPS) to assess academic quality.
- They carried out a programme wide survey of the research module and reflected on the data collected. This enabled them to review and make changes to the module. They sought advice from external examiners on assessment which fed into the process.
- Work led by the Programme Director, involving current learners, staff and alumni, enabled the education provider to more clearly articulate their programme strategy and design. This included identifying their core approach to learning and teaching. They reflected how they were able to use this to inform curriculum delivery, assessment and learner professional development planning.
- The visitors were satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area. This is because of the robust arrangements in place to assess academic quality on the programme, including systems for learner and external examiner feedback.

- **Placement quality**

- The education provider reflected that challenges within the National Health Service (NHS) led them to carry out a Strategic Review. Through the review they were able to identify the challenges as:
 - Financial challenges
 - Systems challenges, with moves to integrated systems
 - Diversity challenges, becoming an inclusive and anti-racist organisation
 - Operational challenges
 - Data and impact challenges

To meet these challenges, they worked on organisational restructures and reorganisation. They reflected that work is ongoing, as healthcare remains a financially complex area with local and national drivers. This has also impacted on sufficiency of placements.

- The education provider reflected on their 2023 British Psychological Society (BPS) accreditation which highlighted their approach to Year 1 practice placements. They were commended for offering a unique training experience where a key element is collaboration with service users. The positive impact of this was recognised by service users and by placement providers.
- Placements in Years 2 and 3 are allocated via a South East, East and London (SEEL) Placement Panel allocation process. The Panel allocate practice placements based on learners expressing five preferences. The education provider reflected that this process enables most learners to be placed according to their preference. However, they reflected that there are sometimes a small number of learners allocated a lower preference place. Quality assurance is also held at SEEL level. All placements include a midway and end of year evaluation of both learner performance and placement quality.
- The visitors were satisfied there are a range of quality assurance processes in place for monitoring and improving practice placement quality. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **Interprofessional education**

- The education provider reflected on their commitment to ensuring that learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other disciplines. They do this at programme level by facilitating learning through a variety of mechanisms such as the use of external speakers. They use Year 1 clinical placements to provide opportunities to learn from other disciplines, including clinical psychology, psychiatry, family therapy.
- They reflected their new unit called Endings and New Beginnings: Transitions from Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) to Newly Qualified Educational Psychologist (NQEP) has supported learners on interview performance directly through employers. Learner feedback will

inform delivery in 2024-2025 academic year. The Unit ensures learners can articulate transferable skills and recognise how they are using this learning to inform their future practice.

- The education provider reflected the Trust's Strategic Review and restructure created opportunities to further develop interprofessional education. They changed where the programme was positioned within the organisation to align more closely with other professional doctorates and leadership development programmes. This enabled colleagues from other Trusts' training programmes to share their skills and expertise with learners by contributing to research, teaching and internal examining.
- The visitors were satisfied the education provider has a range of interprofessional education opportunities across their programmes and they continue to respond to challenges. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **Service users and carers**

- The education provider reflected on the implementation of the Public and Patient Involvement and Service User Strategy. They also developed and implemented a Service User Involvement and Placements Cohort 2023 document. The documents set out their approach and emphasis on service user involvement in the programme and directly with learners.
- They reflected on their last Performance Review report which referred service user and carer involvement as a quality theme. They reflected on how they have prioritised service user involvement within the programme and at strategic level via the Stakeholder's Committee.
- The visitors noted the education provider's reflections in this area and that they are aware of the developmental need. However, they felt that there was only minimal service user and carer involvement as part of the curriculum, and this is mainly focused on the selection of learners. The visitors sought to understand reflections on how service user and carer involvement has been developed further in relation to programme delivery and embedded within the curriculum. This was explored under quality theme 1.
- Following this, the visitors were satisfied the education provider has identified ways to appropriately address the challenges relating to service user and carer involvement within the programme. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **Equality and diversity**

- The education provider reflected on their developments in this area during the review period. Low scores in learner satisfaction rates relating to the support provided for learners with additional educational needs had been a quality theme during their last performance review. To address and improve in this area they put in place an action plan. The action plan was linked to the Programme Development Plan. They focussed on accessible recruitment by changing interview questions and access strategies. They

provided questions in large text format and ensured reasonable adjustments were put in place prior to interviews.

- They made sure that all learners were aware of the process for sharing a disability and accessing support. They now include this as standard in all Admissions Letters to successful applicants. They also reflected on how they established an information-sharing protocol between the Disabilities Support Officer (DSO) and the programme team. This enables the clear sharing of information between learners and tutors.
- The education provider reflected that resourcing the programme (financial and staffing) has impacted on the pace of change for some of their developmental work. Some strategic work on the Programme Development Plan has been impacted by staff vacancies, administrative issues and learners who submitted late requests for support. They reflected that work remains ongoing in this area.
- The visitors were satisfied with how the education provider showed improvement since their last performance review to ensure equality, diversity, and inclusion policies are complied with and developments made. Therefore, the visitors considered the education provider has performed well in this area.

- **Horizon scanning**

- The education provider reflected on the complex challenges within the public sector as a whole. This includes financial challenges both in the NHS and within local authorities and is further complicated by high referral rates to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and by processes which are resource and time intensive.
- They reflected that their biggest risk was a perception by learners that the bursary amount is too low. This may discourage people from applying, limit diversity in the profession and make the experience of training more challenging. The education provider also reflected that there is a lack of understanding about the role of Educational Psychologists and their work. To mitigate this, they aim to better promote the role and plan more engagement within the sector.
- To address issues longer term the education provider is in the process of merging with another Trust. Their aim is for the new partner organisation to be established by April 2025. They reflected that in the short term they have identified five key strategic ambitions, including their role as an education provider.
- The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's planning for long term challenges and opportunities. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: Details of the merger process remain unclear. It is not clear what this is or what impact there may be on programmes.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:

Academic quality – The visitors noted good practice and year on year improvement indicated by the positive results of the Annual Review of Courses (ARC) Survey data for 2022-2023 indicated an overall average of 93%, as benchmarked against 85% for all programmes.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs)**
 - The education provider reflected on how they had used their national Initial Training in Educational Psychology (ITEP) group to review the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) in advance of their introduction in September 2023. They did this alongside the revised British Psychological Society (BPS) doctoral standards. This enabled them to re-map shared competencies and SOPs across all programmes.
 - They reflected on how the revised SOPs would impact on programme learning outcomes, curriculum delivery, assessment and partnerships. They identified and made changes to documentation to reflect these changes.
 - The education provider reflected that learners are already engaged in looking at how they actively implement all standards in their work and how they can improve and develop. They do this through learner reflection and self-assessment from the start of their programme. Learners are encouraged to reflect on standards and competencies and to assess their learning against them using the SOPs and programme learning outcomes.
 - They reflected that teaching from Year 1 includes reflections on self and self-care. Learners create maintenance and self-care crisis plans that emphasise empowering and enabling themselves and colleagues to manage their own mental health and wellbeing. These plans are used as relevant across the programme.
 - A new reflective learning event has been introduced into the timetable where learners reflect upon project work further centralising the service user. A reference group composed of academic staff, Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) lead and service user consultants are invited to join.
 - Through clarification, it was understood that more training was provided by the Deputy Director for Placement and Supervision on further centralising the service user. They did this by sharing and reflecting on the revised SOP and using factsheets as a training resource with practice placement providers. They reflected together on how the revisions were being addressed and placement providers also shared their own experiences in peer-to-peer learning groups.
 - They developed a Digital Education Strategy which underpins and supports future developments in this area. They made changes to

handbooks and self-assessment tools to reflect changes related to revised SOPs. They also created an online forum for asynchronous learning.

- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods**
 - The education provider reflected on how they have used their 'Digital Education Strategy 2023-2026' to underpin current and future developments at strategic level. They have focussed on four priorities. These are, digitally fluent staff, an inclusive digital environment, a programme re-design framework and student support services and processes. They reflected that work had begun with the implementation of the Digital Fluency Group which is looking to support the development of both learner and staff digital capabilities.
 - They reflected on their use of technology in teaching, learning and assessment. Tutors use digital tools such as 'Kahoot' and 'Padlet' and learners have access to a virtual learning environment called 'Moodle'. They reflected that the most recent cohort of learners have made greater use of the discussion forum component on Moodle than previous cohorts. Learners, through their own initiative, have used it to share reflections and ideas on aspects of their programme. Learners are also able to make use of digital stories, blogs, and Video Enhanced Reflective Practice (VERP) as tools for learning.
 - The education provider also reflected on the challenges of digital technology, specifically around the use of simulation and artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching and learning. Their reflections highlighted the benefits of using these tools, but they have also reflected that care must be taken to ensure that AI is not used uncritically in teaching and assessment.
 - The visitors were satisfied the education provider has effectively embedded use of technology across their programmes, and assessments. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing 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:** We did not ask the education provider to reflect on this area due to the nature of their provision and institution type. However, the visitors were satisfied the programmes adhere to all relevant monitoring.
- **Office for Students (OfS):** We did not ask the education provider to reflect on this area due to the nature of their provision and institution type.

- **Performance of newly commissioned Allied Health Professional (AHP) provision in Wales:** Not applicable to this institution.
- **Other professional regulators/professional bodies**
 - The education provider reflected on their successful accreditation with the British Psychological Society (BPS) in March 2023. They received four commendations and three areas of good practice. They reflected on how they had taken actions to address areas for development. This included providing the BPS with an action plan outlining how they would address any gaps in training provision against the revised accreditation standards. They reflected how module leaders and senior staff had re-mapped competencies onto programme content and delivery and how this was integrated into programme handbooks. The re-mapping process allowed them to identify and close any gaps in the curriculum.
 - The visitors noted the education provider's reflections on actions taken to address areas for development following the BPS accreditation. However, there was no reflection of engagement with them or other professional bodies beyond this process. The visitors sought greater reflection on how engagement with the BPS, or with other professional bodies, has impacted provision and any actions taken or areas of development.
 - Following clarification, the visitors understood that the education provider works closely with partner institutions within the South East, East and London (SEEL) consortium and the Department for Education (DfE). They do this to develop the programme in line with regulatory and professional standards and developments. This takes place through formal structures, such as termly meetings of the executive committees, as well as informally through direct liaison with research leads across the SEEL consortium on developments in research teaching and assessment. They also engage and work with the Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP) and the BPS Division of Educational and Child Psychology.
 - Following this, the visitors were satisfied there are clear and detailed processes in place to manage engagement with professional bodies. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.

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 reflected on how they have developed the curriculum primarily in response to the revisions made to the HCPC

Standards of proficiency (SOPs) and the revised doctoral standards via the British Psychological Society (BPS).

- They reflected on how they had used a visual representation of the BPS ten core competencies which reflect the integration, synthesis, and application of competencies and knowledge to inform their own vision of the programme. This allowed them to reflect on what they are already doing, such as working to further embed equality, diversity and inclusion within the programme. This increased their confidence that they are delivering the curriculum in line with the HCPC revised SOPs.
- The visitors were satisfied how the education provider is performing relating to this area as appropriate processes are in place. The visitors were satisfied the education provider is continuing to respond to external influences on their curriculum development.

- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance**

- The education provider reflected that updated guidance from the British Psychological Society (BPS) coincided with the revisions to HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs). As a result, the Programme Director as part of a working group re-mapped the SOPs and the BPS competencies across all programmes. They did this by reflecting on the ways in which the revised SOPs would impact, focussing on learning outcomes, curriculum delivery, assessments, and partnerships. They reflected on how they had updated relevant documentation including module mapping, placement handbooks, programme specifications and programme handbooks.
- They reflected on how they had made further changes and enhancements to programmes because of the updated BPS guidance. They worked on identifying gaps in areas relating to the impact of poverty, knowledge, race, religion and gender as relevant to professional practice. They also used the BPS guidance on teaching and assessment of ethics as an opportunity to further embed ethics more overtly within the programme.
- The visitors were satisfied with how the education provider is performing relating to this area.

- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme/profession level) –**

- The education provider reflected upon the national and regional challenges of funding practice placements. The Department for Education (DfE) contracts offer funding for 16 places per year for each institution within the consortium. This funding relates only to a Year 1 bursary payment, meaning the funding for Year 2 and 3 practice placements is sourced from Local Authorities. The education provider reflected that currently this need is met. However, moving forward to develop, grow, and sustain placement capacity remains a challenge for them and for Local Authorities.
- They reflected on the success of a newly appointed Deputy Director for Placements and Supervision. This role operates across all three year groups and includes the leadership and management for all placements across programmes. They sought feedback from practice educators to

better understand their needs in liaison between the practice placement and training providers. Where necessary they also liaise on any issues arising regarding sustainability, capacity, or any quality issues.

- The visitors were satisfied with how the education provider is performing 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:

- **Learners**

- The education provider reflected on the challenge of investigating and responding to an informal complaint. This was received from five learners regarding one research teaching and assessment component of the programme. The education provider reflected that in response they carried out a programme-wide revision of the process for gathering, reflecting, and acting on learner feedback across modules which now feeds into their current approach. They reflected how they had sought opinions from their external examiners on this issue and included their reflections into a programme development plan for making changes to the module.
- They reflected that another challenge they are continuing to work on is the efficiency and effectiveness of their learner feedback mechanisms. Learners are asked to provide feedback annually via the Annual Review of Courses procedure. They are also required to provide module specific feedback by year group. Year group representatives attend the bi-annual Stakeholder Committee where further feedback regarding learner experience is given. The education provider reflected that this may result in learner 'feedback fatigue' and impact negatively on the time available to reflect on and process feedback. They are continuing to work on plans to address this.
- The visitors were satisfied how the education provider is performing relating to this area. They have processes in place to collect feedback from learners and take appropriate actions in response to that feedback.

- **Practice placement educators**

- The education provider reflected that they recognise practice placement educators as key elements of programme leadership. A Deputy Programme Director has been appointed, whose role includes gathering feedback from practice placement educators and acting as the link between learners and practice educator groups. Feedback from Year 2 and 3 practice placement providers have allowed placements supervisors meetings to be better focussed on the distinctive needs of each year group. These meetings also now include a learner feedback loop allowing

placement supervisors the chance to hear more learner voices within the programmes. Further developments around peer 'supervision on supervision' and offering continuing professional development (CPD) to placement supervisors is being worked on.

- The education provider has reflected that financial challenges which impact the public sector have also impacted on staffing and resources for practice placement educators. This was around whether staff can allow the time and space to attend meetings, and how suitable and appropriate practice placements can be offered. Work is ongoing with the Trust to mitigate these challenges.
- They reflected on how they had followed up on one recommendation from the 2015 British Psychological Society (BPS) accreditation to explore Fieldwork Tutor attendance at training days. They surveyed Fieldwork Tutors about their attendance at trainer provider meetings and the extent to which these were valued. They reflected on positive results which were used in the subsequent BPS 2023 accreditation.
- The visitors were satisfied the education provider appropriately supported placement educators. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **External examiners**

- The education provider reflected on the challenges of meeting external examiners face to face and including them in meetings with learners. This was due to the impact of the pandemic and social distancing measures as well as the increase in workloads, such as moving to online learning. To overcome this the education provider has already established contact with their new external examiner and have set up meetings between them and groups of learners.
- They also recognise the challenges of Trust staff acting as external examiners to other initial training in educational psychology (ITEP) programmes regionally and nationally. Whilst this builds relationships with other partners and extends transferable skills, it also impacts upon Trust resources. The education provider is working on plans to widen the pool of tutors on the programme who can act as external examiners to address resource issues.
- The education provider has reflected on positive feedback from external examiners, particularly around learning and assessment strategies and in the range of assessment methods used with high quality feedback provided to learners.
- The education provider is addressing external examiner feedback appropriately and working to improve on any areas highlighted. We were satisfied how the education provider is performing 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 submitted data showing learners continuing to programme completion. They stated that their data source is submitted to the University of Essex (UoE), as their validating partner institution. They stated that the learner non-continuation rate is 0% and all learners continue to completion.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - The education provider submitted data reflecting learner outcomes upon completion of the programme of 100%. They reflected that completion of the programme provides the qualification required to register.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - The education provider does not collect National Student Survey (NSS) data as this is for undergraduate programmes only. They have conducted learner surveys internally which are reviewed by UoE. The learner satisfaction rate is 96% compared to the overall satisfaction from the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) Advance HE of 79%. This was across all postgraduate researchers in 2023.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The education provider submitted data reflecting they recruit learners to the full capacity of the programme. This is 16 learners per year over the three years of the programme. They stated that all 16 places are filled each year and that all learners progressed onto the following years of the programme and all learners were awarded.

Proposal for supplying data points to the HCPC: The education provider stated once they are able to establish an ongoing data reporting process, they will be able to provide annual equality, diversity, inclusion (EDI) data and student survey data which they submit to UoE for annual review of programmes. The data covers learner non-continuation rates, outcomes for trainees who completed the programme and learner satisfaction rates. This can also be reported annually to the HCPC.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: There are limited available data points which the education provider can supply to demonstrate performance. This is common for this type of education provider.

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 Panel that:

- the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2025-2026 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 were local NHS Trusts, local authorities, learners, practice educators, other education providers and external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with a number of professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision
 - The education provider engaged with Department for Education (DfE), British Psychological Society (BPS), Care Quality Commission (CQC) and Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP). They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - 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 within the review period.
 - We do not have established external data points for the education provider. Without these established data points, we cannot grant an ongoing two-year monitoring period. We shall work with the education provider to embed established data points and produce usable data before their next performance review.
- 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.

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 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	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Tavistock and Portman NHS Trust	CAS-01407-C8B1W1	Garrett Kennedy Rosemary Schaeffer	two years	The visitors were satisfied with the overall performance of the education provider across the themes. The education provider responds to recommendations from external regulators and professional bodies. There were no risks identified which could suggest the need for an earlier review.	Not applicable

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