Performance review process report

Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, 2018 - 2021

Executive summary

This is a report of the ongoing process to review the performance of Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust. This report captures the process we have undertaken to date 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

- recommended when the institution should next be reviewed.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
  - Maintaining the quality of the programme with large-scale expansion. It was noted there had been an increase in Health Education England (HEE) commissions. Further information was therefore requested on how this impacted resources and how the quality of the programme was maintained. In their response, the education provider explained the factors they had considered during this period and provided examples.
  - How learner feedback had been gathered and actioned. Further reflection was requested on the learner feedback mechanisms and evidence of improvements. The education provider explained how feedback was analysed and discussed at the curriculum committee meetings and thereafter a report was prepared outlining the areas of improvement and actions taken.

- The provider should next engage with monitoring in two years, the 2023-24 academic year, because:
  - Visitors are satisfied with the submission and confirmed the education provider is performing to a satisfactory standard. There are no risks or issues identified, however due to the lack of comparable data points available the visitors recommended a review period of two years.

Previous consideration	Not applicable. The education provider is engaging with the performance review process for the first time.

Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: • when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be.
Next steps	Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2023-24 academic year.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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

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

Our standards

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

Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

The performance review process

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

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

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

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

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

The assessment panel for this review

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

Garrett Kennedy	Lead visitor, Practitioner Psychologist, Counselling Psychologist
Sarah Hulme	Lead visitor, Practitioner Psychologist, Educational Psychologist
Sarah Hamilton	Service User Expert Advisor
Saranjit Binning	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 private education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2000.

Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust provides social care services to people across Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Swindon, Wiltshire, Bath and North East Somerset and deliver their services through hospitals, community bases and clinics. The Oxford Institute of Clinical Psychology Training and Research is part of the Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust and hosts the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology. This programme is validated by the University of Oxford.

The British Association for Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapies (BABCP) and Association for Family Therapy and Systemic Practice (AFT) courses are involved with the delivery of the programme, however are not part of the HCPC provision and HCPC registration also does not apply.

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 Psychology	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2000

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 programmes.

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	15	36	2022	The enrolled number of learners across all HCPC approved provision is higher than the approved intended numbers we have on our record. The provider has reflected on this in the portfolio and provided a programme level breakdown

				of learner numbers. Visitors were satisfied with the information and reflection provided in the portfolio by the education provider.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	N/A	N/A	2019-2020	This data point is from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). The value for this data point is not available due to them being a private provider.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	N/A	N/A	2019-2020	This data point is from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). The value for this data point is not available due to them being a private provider. The education provider did, however, supply us with internal data in relation to employment rates, but this data was not externally verified and was therefore not sufficient.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	N/A	2022	This data point is from the Office for Students (OfS). The value for this data point is not available due to them being a private provider.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	N/A	N/A	2022	This data point is from the Office for Students (OfS). The value for this data point is not available due to them being a private provider.

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 – Maintaining the quality of the programme with large-scale expansion

Area for further exploration: Visitors noted key developments in relation to a new competency framework and the increase in Health Education England (HEE) commissions. They acknowledged how this large-scale expansion impacted various parts of the programme, which included resources. Given this expansion, visitors requested further information on how the quality of the programme had been reflected upon and maintained through this period.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email clarification from the education provider. The visitors considered the email clarification would be the most effective method for the education provider to respond to the queries they had.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained the factors they had considered to ensure quality was maintained while numbers increased. For example, they reflected on how they included a variety of professionals, e.g., counselling psychologists, to act as supervisors to expand the supervisor pool. In addition to this they also increased the number of placement opportunities available to learners. These developments ensured the education provider had sufficient resources for their learners to maintain the quality of the programme. Other quality assurance mechanisms included the requirement for all new supervisors to be two years post qualified and for them to complete the supervisor induction course. Feedback from learners was also used to address concerns raised in relation to the quality of placements.

Visitors were satisfied with the explanation and evidence provided and considered the quality activity adequately addressed the issues raised. The visitors had no further questions.

Quality theme 2 – Demonstration of how learner feedback had been gathered and taken forward

Area for further exploration: Visitors acknowledged the education provider had developed an alternative trainee feedback form which was more suited to their purpose and taken other measures to collect feedback. They also adjusted project approval processes to take account of feedback. It was noted no reflections were provided on the mechanisms for feedback and the resulting action for enhancement. Visitors therefore requested a reflection on what formal learner feedback mechanisms there were and evidence of improvements. For example, if there was a

programme enhancement group or learner feedback group where feedback and responses to the feedback are formally noted and if so, are minutes from these meetings available.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email clarification from the education provider. The visitors considered the email clarification would be the most effective method for the education provider to respond to the queries they had.

Outcomes of exploration: In the response provided, the education provider confirmed learners provided feedback at the end of the taught sessions. This feedback was analysed and discussed at the curriculum committee meetings with staff, trainees and external representatives. Based on this feedback, a report was prepared for the University of Oxford, who are the education providers validating body, which outlined the areas where improvements had been made and where further improvements are ongoing. For example, feedback was received in relation to standardising feedback on assessments for learners. The education provider responded to this issue and revised the assessment feedback template to ensure standardisation. Guidelines to provide feedback were also introduced and checks to monitor the volume of feedback were increased. Minutes from the curriculum committee meetings were included in the response.

Visitors were satisfied with the explanation and evidence provided and considered the quality activity adequately addressed the issues raised and the visitors had no further questions.

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 recognised the challenges experienced with the increase of commissioned places and the decrease in the funding per learner, which impacted them financially. This resulted in the education provider requiring additional space and staff to accommodate the numbers. Developments in both areas took place and staffing levels increased and a larger teaching space was secured.
    - It was noted how new staff would have experience of or an interest in research supervision or activity, which would ensure appropriately qualified staff were recruited. Some of the new staff starting from

September 2023 will be joint appointments with the trust and the education provider. This was a point of clarification.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Partnerships with other organisations** –
    - The programme was a taught postgraduate doctorate up until 2019, when it changed to a research doctorate. This was confirmed in 2018 but applied to the cohorts from 2016 onwards. This change took place to support graduates with eligibility for funding and employment. To implement these changes a joint appointment was made across the education provider and the trust. The purpose of the role was to develop partnerships and increase practice-based learning.
    - The education provider demonstrated good working relationships with the partners where placements had been offered to learners. It was noted how challenging this was due to the increase in learner numbers, which was explored in Quality theme 1.
    - From September 2023 a new partnership agreement will be introduced, which will enable the education provider and the trust to use research degree programme funding for joint appointments and other programme related activities.
    - The Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust provided financial support and assisted with the recruitment of additional staff. The trust and the education provider demonstrated their commitment to the programme with the establishment of a new partnership agreement to strengthen the programmes sustainability.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Academic and placement quality** –
    - Challenges to maintain quality with the placements and the taught programme were noted, such as the increase with the Health Education England (HEE) commissions. The COVID-19 pandemic and staff shortages in specialised areas were the main reason for this.
    - In response to the challenges, the education provider developed new placement models, new placement providers and recruited more supervisors. In addition to these, new guidelines were also developed to enable learners to work safely online during the pandemic. It was noted the curriculum committee also met four times a year to discuss supervisor priorities.
    - A new competency framework was introduced, which applied to all specialisms. The purpose of this framework was to provide guidance for learners and supervisors linked to the competencies in the individual specialisms. This is a hybrid framework, as the core placement model has also been maintained.
    - Some of the successes noted were learners had been offered individualised training, which allowed them to develop their career interests. Other successes included the training of staff to improve teaching quality based on the feedback obtained from learners.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Interprofessional education** –

    - Working in multi-disciplinary teams was noted as a challenge for learners, as their training was a single subject training experience. Therefore, organising working with other professions was challenging for them.
    - The education provider recognised the importance of this and offered learners opportunities to shadow other professionals and share teaching across other professions. The taught sessions covered areas such as domestic abuse and medication and were delivered by professionals from the police, psychiatrists, and general practitioners (GPs).
    - Visitors noted interprofessional learning was limited on the programme due to it being a single subject training experience. They, however acknowledged how the bespoke experience allowed the programme to be more suited to individual learner needs.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Service users and carers** –
    - The Peoples Experience Group (PEG) were involved with the design and development of the programme, admissions and placements. They were also involved with trainee research and Project Approval Panels. They met four times a year to feedback to the programme team on their experiences with the learners.
    - To support the Peoples Experience Group, a service user and carer coordinator was employed and named leads were identified to lead on service user and carer involvement in the individual areas of the programme i.e. teaching, admissions and research.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Equality and diversity** –
    - The education provider demonstrated their commitment to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) with the development of the course mentoring scheme and encouraged mentees from ethnic backgrounds to apply. The aim of this was to increase learner numbers from ethnic minority groups, as they recognised these groups were underrepresented on the programme.
    - In addition to this staff were also involved with various meetings where EDI discussions took place on how it can be included in the delivery of the programme. These discussions have enabled the team to consider the inclusion of EDI content at all levels, which visitors noted.
    - Developing Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) and implementing these changes is ongoing work. Due to limited resources, the team have therefore focussed on developing specific areas, such as de-colonising the curriculum.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Horizon scanning** –
    - The education provider acknowledged the increase with learner numbers in the past four years had been a challenge and had impacted staffing levels. They noted how they were able to increase staffing levels and placements in line with learner numbers.

- They recognised how successful they had been with the work they undertook to increase placements. For example, the move away from traditional core placements to a CORE competency model.
- They also recognised how their horizon scanning mechanisms had identified the requirement to include the British Association for Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapies (BABCP) and Association for Family Therapy and Systemic Practice (AFT) accreditation in the programme. Reflections outlined how this had a success. This accreditation allowed the education provider to be prepared for the Health Education England (HEE) tendering process.
- We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Impact of COVID-19** –
  - During the pandemic all teaching was moved online. To ensure learners were supported during this period, staff engaged with individual cohorts to provide them with regular support and keep them engaged with the programme. There was also a significant increase with the use of technology, which learners and staff were not familiar with and because of this additional support was offered to learners and staff.
  - Visitors noted how the education provider used digital technologies to manage learning online and overcome the challenges of online delivery.
  - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** –
  - In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the education provider increased the use of technology. They described using a hybrid model where some sessions were delivered online and others face to face, demonstrating an awareness of learner needs. The benefits of this approach were acknowledged, alongside the flexibility that the pre-recorded videos provided.
  - Several new applications were introduced to enhance online learning for learners, such as Padlet. In addition to this there were also plans to offer Q&A sessions online. The benefits and flexibility of the use of technology were recognised.
  - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Apprenticeships** –
  - The education provider currently has no plans to develop apprenticeships in the HCPC regulated professions.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education** –
  - The education provider was unable to provide a reflection in this area, due to the nature of their provision.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies** –
  - The education provider received a good rating in the Care Quality Commissioning report in 2019. This demonstrated the education provider is performing appropriately in this area.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes** –
  - The programme is taught at postgraduate level and therefore the education provider does not engage with the National Student Survey (NSS) and instead, they gather feedback internally.
  - This was noted by the visitors and no issues were highlighted.
- **Office for Students monitoring** –
  - Due to the nature of their provision, the education provider does not engage with the Office for Students, as their programme is a post-registration course. This was noted by the visitors and no issues were highlighted.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies** –
  - They have reflected on obtaining British Association for Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapies (BABCP) accreditation at level 2, and Association for Family Therapy and Systemic Practice (AFT) accreditation at foundation and intermediate level. This has allowed the education provider to develop more opportunities for learners and an increase in learners.
  - Other challenges noted was the BABCP level 2 course accreditation, where an increase with learner numbers was experienced. Due to this increase, some challenges were experienced with obtaining 40 hours of supervision for learners on the programme, as there were not enough BABCP accredited placement supervisors.
  - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well 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 recognised the continued need for the programme to reflect changes in line with demand and Health

Education England (HEE) priorities. To facilitate discussions on these changes the curriculum committee, which comprised of staff, learners and service users and carers met four times a year. Some of the changes noted, included an increase in the taught sessions on diversity issues, homelessness and mental health.
    - It was noted the curriculum remained detailed and varied. Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance** –
    - The challenges with maintaining British Psychological Society (BPS) standards for accreditation due to the various requirements were noted. Some of the challenges were the requirement for supervisors to be at least two years post qualified and for them to complete induction training with the education provider.
    - The focus on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) by both the BPS and the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) was welcomed. The education provider, however, did note the amount of work and consultation that had been required to ensure EDI was embedded in the programme. Alongside this they also provided staff with anti-racist training to ensure they were able to provide learners with the relevant support in relation to EDI issues.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning** –
    - The increased learner numbers impacted placement capacity significantly over the last two years. To resolve this issue the education provider made changes to the placement model and moved away from traditional placements. This was replaced with a CORE competency model, which recognised the competencies gained through the duration of the programme and not just placements. The purpose of this approach was to reduce some of the pressure with identifying placements and placement supervisors.
    - The benefits of working with the Association for Family Therapy and Systemic Practice (AFT) course were acknowledged by the education provider. Linking with the course enabled them to develop additional systemic placement opportunities for learners to work in different specialisms. This included learners being given the opportunity to work in family clinics. The development of these new placement opportunities was recognised, and it was noted how they enhanced the learner experience.
    - To support learners in placement, the education provider introduced a competency e-log, which learners were required to complete. The e-log allowed staff to access the data learners had entered, which was reviewed for placement planning purposes. In addition to this Problem-Based Learning sessions were introduced. The purpose of these sessions was for learners to discuss and reflect on issues and difficulties they had experienced in practice.
    - The education provider clarified how the same process used to quality assure the NHS placement was used to quality assure the third sector

placements. They also confirmed the same placement agreements and placement tariff arrangements applied to both sectors.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well 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** –
    - It is noted the learners on the programme are NHS employees and do not complete 'standard student feedback', as this would not capture the relevant learner satisfaction feedback. The education provider is therefore 'developing a bespoke trainee satisfaction survey in collaboration with the Medical Sciences Division of the University of Oxford'.
    - Using the current mechanisms, the education provider acknowledged satisfaction levels reduced during the pandemic. This was addressed by increasing the number of qualified supervisors, providing detailed feedback on coursework, and improving communication between learners and staff.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Practice placement educators** –
    - Due to the demand for placements, placement supervisors had placed under pressure. As a result of this, they requested for all placement related documentation to be streamlined. This request is currently under review.
    - Placement visits were reduced from three to one visit, which placement supervisors objected to at first because they saw this as a reduction in support from the education provider, however when this reduction was implemented it was accepted. Much of this was because it was evident to placement supervisors that the reduction in the number of visits did not impact the support, they received from the programme team. The team continued to provide them with support when there were concerns about learners and offered additional visits to discuss and resolve concerns.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **External examiners** –
    - The education provider demonstrated good working relationships with the external examiners. There were processes in place to ensure external examiners are involved with the teaching and assessment of learners and provide appropriate feedback.
    - We were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well 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: Due to the nature of their provision, the education provider were unable to supply us with any externally verified data. In the portfolio, in the proposal for supplying data points to the HCPC section, the education provider stated they report on the relevant data points to Health Education England (HEE) and the University of Oxford. Visitors requested to review this report and data, but this was not shared. The education provider had not initially understood the request for data, however after explaining the importance and impact of the data, they made every effort to supply us with the data points they had access to. They also expressed a willingness to work with the HCPC to develop data points for future reporting purposes.

We noted the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award, and the National Student Survey (NSS) did not apply to the education provider, as they were a private education provider delivering post-registration programmes.

Based on the information received about learner numbers, it was clear they had increased significantly over the last four years. The education provider reflected on this throughout the portfolio and demonstrated they had sufficient resources to support these learner numbers and identified the challenges with this increase.

Visitors noted the reflections provided in the portfolio and did not highlight any specific areas, however they were mindful of the fact there were gaps with the data points. We were sent internal data relating to completion and employment rates. Unfortunately, this data had been internally produced without outside verification. In addition, the data was also not fully comparable to the externally sourced data we require from education providers to gain reassurance of quality over an extended monitoring period.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

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

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

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

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in 2023-24 academic year

Reason for this recommendation: Visitors were satisfied with the submission and confirmed the programme regulated by the HCPC was performing to a satisfactory standard. There were no risks or issues identified that have been referred to another process. Due to the lack of comparable data points available for this education provider, which are outlined in the Data and reflections section, the visitors recommend a review period of two years.

Education and Training Committee decision

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

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

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2023-24 academic year

Reason for this decision: The committee agreed with the findings of the visitors during this review and were satisfied with the recommended review period.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin Psych)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/2000