
Performance review process report

University of Lancaster, 2018 - 2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of University of Lancaster. 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 our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Undertook quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed

Through this assessment, we have noted.

- The areas we explored focused on:
 - How the education plans to or has worked to embed the new standards of proficiency. This was explored via quality activity (see quality theme one for more information), here they detailed how there isn't a single implementation plan. Instead, different members of staff responsible for the different areas (such as those that work with service users) have worked to embed policies in their area.
- The education provider should next engage with monitoring in 4 years, the 2026-27 academic year, because:
 - The visitors were satisfied the education provider is performing well in the majority of areas but note some areas for improvement. They recommended a four-year monitoring period because they agreed this was an appropriate length of time, relative to performance and risk. This will give the education provider adequate time to implement action plans detailed within their submission and evaluate the results of changes to reflect upon in their next performance review.

Previous consideration	This is the education provider's first engagement with the performance review process. The outcome of this process will determine their future ongoing monitoring period
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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

Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:

- Subject to the Panel's decision, the providers next performance review will be in the 2026-27 academic year.
- Subject to the Panel's decision, we will undertake further investigations as per section 5.

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.....	5
The education provider context.....	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider.....	6
Institution performance data.....	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	9
Portfolio submission.....	9
Quality themes identified for further exploration	9
Quality theme 1 – Integration of the new Standards of Proficiency (SOPs)	9
Section 4: Summary of findings	9
Overall findings on performance	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	14
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.....	22
Referrals to next scheduled performance review	23
Development of IPE	23
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	23
Assessment panel recommendation	23
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution.....	25

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:

Lyn McLafferty	Lead visitor, Practitioner Psychologist, Educational Psychologist
Natalie Fowler	Lead visitor, Clinical Scientist
Mohammed Jeewa	Service User Expert Advisor
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 2 HCPC-approved programmes across one profession. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2020.

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	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	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	30	30	2022	<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.</p> <p>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 explored this by making the visitors aware of this ahead of their review. The visitors determined there was no further reason to explore this further.</p>
<p>Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>2%</p>	<p>2019-2020</p>	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has dropped by 2% (as has the benchmark)</p> <p>We found the provider to be performing well and did not require additional exploration.</p>
<p>Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study</p>	<p>94%</p>	<p>95%</p>	<p>2019-2020</p>	<p>This HESA data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has improved by 1%.</p>

				<p>We found the education provider to be performing well in this area and determined we did not need to explore this further.</p>
<p>Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award</p>	<p>Gold</p>		<p>June 2017</p>	<p>The definition of a Gold TEF award is “Provision is consistently outstanding and of the highest quality found in the UK Higher Education sector.”</p> <p>We note this is the highest award the education provider can achieve and determined we did not need to explore this further</p>
<p>National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)</p>	<p>77.6%</p>	<p>84.1%</p>	<p>2022</p>	<p>This NSS data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has dropped by 2%.</p> <p>We explored this by requesting clarification from the education provider on how they receive learner feedback and how they utilise this feedback.</p>

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 – Integration of the new Standards of Proficiency (SOPs)

Area for further exploration: We noted from the education providers submission, they have recognised the introduction of the new standards of proficiency. They indicated they were working towards implementing these, but that they are not yet at the time of submission. The visitors noted the importance for the education provider to implement the SOPs by September 2023. We therefore chose to explore this via a quality activity to ensure these would be in place by September 2023 to be ready for delivery to learners.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this area by requesting a documentary or email response from the education provider detailing their plan for implementation. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider responded with explanations and clarifications in the form of a narrative explanation. They detailed how they have no single implementation plan, but instead that of the relevant development and implementation groups have covered implementation. Those responsible for the different areas have worked to implement the associated SOPs.

The education provider detailed that they run a session for all new learners at the onset of the programme to introduce and familiarise the learners with the SOPs. Through this exploration, the visitors did not have any further concerns about this area.

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 discussed their recent successes with regards to being recommissioned to provide clinical psychology training in the North-West of England by NHSE England (formerly Health Education England, HEE). This project was led by a team comprised of the Programme Directors, the faculty academic structures and their finance partner. This means they were able to 'cost-out' the resources required for this in accurate terms. The new tender is for a three-to-five-year period, from 2023-24 to 2026-27 (plus a possible further two years). Commissioning levels may vary and there is an anticipated and planned reduction in commissions from 2026.
 - The education provider reflected on how the faculty which manages the HCPC provision is being fully endorsed and supported by the rest of the wider institution. They are supporting their business case which will mean an increase in overall staffing for the department. They reflected on how following this, and when commissioning levels decline (2026), they will aim to gradually scale back on staffing numbers through redeployment or redundancy. They will therefore look to design future posts that may be required as time limited contracts.
 - The visitors noted the education provider's reflections in this area. They noted the recent commissioning by stakeholders indicates sustainability with regards to potential reductions in the future. The visitors are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The education provider reflected on how over the review period, they have been focussing on placement provision and governance. They stated they have been successful in their ability to work closely with colleagues on the other Northwest based programmes (Manchester and Liverpool) in terms of governance processes. They explained they have a history of working together and have different processes which they have jointly agreed and applied to ensure quality and governance of placements. They will continue with their systems of open dialogue with local prospective employers. They invite engagement with the programme and offer opportunities for employers to connect with learners and present themselves as potential career destinations.
 - They have a joint policy for responding to and addressing concerns as well as a Quality Assurance (QA) checking process that is used prior to a learner starting a practice placement. This includes checking;
 - a supervisor's HCPC status;

- that clinical governance processes are in place in the placement setting;
 - that the placement is accessible;
 - that the placement will provide a good learning environment;
 - The education provider discussed how this QA process has included checks on covid guidance for practice placement providers. They reflected on how this process has been successful in terms of ensuring quality of placement provision as well as establishing a positive, supportive relationship with practice placement providers.
 - Through clarification, the education provider detailed how their key relationship is with Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust (LSCFT). The relationship is governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), which highlights the roles and responsibilities of each organisation in the delivery of the programme. The recent review of the DClinPsy Programme highlighted that the MoU should be reviewed itself and this was in progress at the time of their submission.
 - Following this expansion, the visitors had no further questions on this area and found the education provider to be performing satisfactorily in this area.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - The education provider developed their assessment suite to ensure assessments were corresponding with up-to-date practice, readily manageable by students and not too burdensome in terms of marking. They stated how the new suite of academic based assignments was developed in reflection of the changes that have taken place across the profession in terms of skill acquisition and professional development. This will improve the quality and quality assurance of the assessment processes.
 - The education provider used the re-developments of their assessments as an opportunity to develop an assessment schedule which incorporated the new Standards of Proficiency (SOPs), standards of education and training (SETs) and the British Psychological Society (BPS) accreditation criteria. This led to an establishment of 10 domains which all academic assignments (with the exception of the thesis) are marked against. This ensures that learners are assessed across the full range of established expectations.
 - They reflected on how placement assessment is based on the BPS competencies. They have introduced a system of gaining supervisors feedback from service users and factoring this into the assessment process. They explained how this is important because it ensures the voices of people who interact with learners are represented and are present in the assessment process. They have implemented a process to observe supervisor practice and for learners to be observed more as part of the redevelopment of their placement audit paperwork. This is completed by learners and signed off by practice placement supervisors to ensure that observations take place in the placement setting. They have introduced a thesis preparation assignment to support the development of the thesis from the start of the programme to facilitate thesis completion rates.
 - The visitors found reflections on changes to assessments following HCPC criteria and the need to improve completion rates due to issues

identified with coursework-based assessment and timings. The visitors noted the incorporation of feedback from service users for the learners and agreed this was an appropriate introduction. The visitors are satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.

- **Interprofessional education –**

- The education provider has reflected on the importance of interprofessional education (IPE) and of professions learning with, from, and about each other. They found the value this adds is to improve lifelong commitment to working collaboratively and empathically, to ultimately improve people's experience of care and services. The education provider discussed the opportunities they have presented to learners including forums and sessions alongside medical and social work learners.
- They have faced challenges in facilitating these sessions, mostly around resourcing. This included ensuring they have facilitators to deliver the sessions and facilities to hold them in. Learners have the opportunity to feedback on these sessions and this feedback is used to improve future sessions.
- The education provider has identified a key outcome from their IPE sessions. This being the developments of strong relationships across faculties. They reflected on how this collaboration has led the innovations being developed and the development of a new guidance document for educators intending to design ethics-orientated IPE for health and social care learners.
- Through clarification, the education provider was able to expand on the challenge they have faced with facilitating IPE. This is because they only have one medical orientated programme (medicine) to work with. IPE is currently in place between learners of the HCPC approved and medicine programmes and the education provider is exploring the possibility of working with other HEI's.
- The visitors noted this clarification and noted that this is still being developed. The visitors recommend the education provider continues with plans to develop this and reflect on this at their next performance review.

- **Service users and carers –**

- The education provider reflected on the networks they have in place to facilitate service user and carer (SU&C) involvement. The Lancaster University Public Involvement Network (LUPIN) was introduced in 2008 and has remained a stable part of their SU&C involvement ever since. The network aims to offer advice and guidance to stakeholders, to audit and increase public involvement in all aspects of the programme.
- The education provider has discussed how their SU&C's have reported positively on their involvement on the programme / network with several having been members for several years. They reflected on the benefits of directly involving service users, including the positive feedback received from learners, and reflections from other LUPIN members.
- They have systems in place to monitor their SU&C involvement polices and update their structures. Regular reports have been developed to audit the network and identify key areas for development. There are plans to conduct an evaluation during the 2023-24 academic year to

better understand the programme's response to the pandemic, the increase in trainees, and how to further develop the network. Learners have reported the positive nature of engaging with SU&C's from the first stage of interview panels, through to teaching and engagement with research.

- The visitors noted the long standing and well-established involvement of the LUPIN group and how this shows significant SU&C's involvement and that this has been beneficial to the programme and learners. It is monitored through audit and actions have been taken on points raised in the monitoring, for example a change to more strategic position of the committee members.
- Through clarification, the education provider detailed how they will conduct future audits based on their current practices. The education provider explained how they are planning to expand and increase involvement with their LUPIN network. They have completed a review and development away day with LUPIN. Their key focus was to increase involvement and recruit new members.
- Following this clarification, the visitors had no further questions and found the education provider to be performing satisfactorily in this area.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider has discussed the different groups / individuals they have in place to monitor and feedback on equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) issues and to ensure policies are followed through. This includes their 'Inclusivity Development and implementation group'. This is comprised of a subgroup of staff, learners and LUPIN representatives and feeds into their overall programme management processes. Specific tasks the groups are responsible for are outlined in their programme handbook. They also have an Anti-Racism Accountability Group (ARAG) and a social justice research subgroup.
 - They have an established a role focussing on EDI issues in the programme, supporting and monitoring inclusivity. The role includes reviewing the curriculum and how it is delivered with a focus on decolonisation across the programme.
 - The education provider also holds an annual 'Inclusivity Event' delivered by the learners. This is a mandatory part of the curriculum and is facilitated by tutors. They also hold a specific one-day teaching sessions on power, privilege and positionality in clinical psychology and another on anti-racist practice.
 - The visitors noted the education providers detailed reflections and submissions on this area. The groups, activities and innovations demonstrated a strong sense of inclusion and equality as part of this programme. The visitors agreed the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - Through the portfolio submission, the education provider discussed challenges, developments and successes relating to their programme, particularly in light of their attempts to expand the programme. The key challenge they have identified for expansion will be staffing the programme. They have the full support of the wider institution to do so and in appropriately tendering / costing for their re-commissioned programme. They have identified recruiting staff may be a challenge in

the future due to many other counselling psychology programmes across the country are also aiming to expand. They reflected on how having limited-term contracts may help with this.

- The education provider has worked with NHSE and their programme was recommissioned. Going forward, their contract with NHSE specifies the development of a dual accreditation route in systemic therapy. This will entail the development of the curriculum and recording of relevant placement experience. Their current team are not experienced in this area so will recruit an additional member of staff to a post which focusses on this area specifically and can support the wider team. They are also supported significantly by NHS colleagues to help deliver this.
- The visitors noted good reflections of the education provider dealing with fluctuations in commissioned numbers, this being the numbers of learners NHSE has commissioned their programmes for. They have acknowledged the challenges the future is presenting them and have identified the need to recruit additional staff to support their provision.
- Through clarification, the education provider explained how they plan to recruit an additional member of staff. The wider institution is supporting their business case for the additional staff member and this new staff member will bring the much-needed skill set. The visitors were satisfied with this clarification and found the education provider to be performing satisfactorily in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
 - The education provider has reflected on the different areas of the new SOP's and the work they have undertaken to embed these. They have worked cross-programme with their social work and medical provision to embed the new standards, offering opportunities for interdisciplinary learning and reflection.
 - Activities utilised to bring these in have included online learning modules based on the new standards for learners. They also have dedicated groups of learners who reflect on and critique opportunities for improving learner wellbeing. They reflected on this is driving positive change and developments for inclusivity and wellbeing along following the guidance of the new SOPs.
 - The visitors found the education providers reflections demonstrated their acknowledgement and understanding of the new standards of proficiency. But not that these are in place as required for the start of the 2023-2024 academic year. We therefore explored this further via quality theme [one](#).
 - Following this, the education provider detailed that they do not have a single, unified plan that has been used to integrate the new SOPs. Instead, each area of the SOPs has been introduced by an associated

team responsible for this. For example, their group responsible for managing and developing policies associated with service users and carers will be responsible for embedding those associated SOPs.

- The education provider also runs a session for all new learners at the onset of the programme to introduce and familiarise the learners with the SOPs.
- The visitors are satisfied with the education provider performance in this area.
- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - The education provider has reflected on the challenges they have faced regarding the ongoing continuation of research during the height of the pandemic. This principally concerned collection of data for projects because many services relating to specific projects became unavailable. To mitigate this, they implemented several national guidelines for evaluating the research skills of learners. This included allowing learners to use smaller sample sizes for their research surveys. Making these adjustments allowed learners to progress to completion of the programme.
 - They reflected on how they were already introducing online teaching methods at the onset of the pandemic utilising MS Teams. They were able to deliver teaching and some group work via digital methods. Learners reported satisfaction with their efforts during the pandemic to ensure learning continued.
 - The visitors noted the range of changes the education provider implemented to allow learners to progress through the programmes throughout the pandemic. They considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The education provider reflected on how the pandemic required and push the embracing of new technology. This included delivering teaching via Microsoft teams after moving teaching online. Key team members became proficient in using MS Teams and were able to provide Teams training to colleagues and external lecturers. Teams' channels were created to enhance communication, whilst working remotely. Where possible, all teaching sessions were recorded were used as a resource for learners.
 - The education provider discussed their use of One Drive as another technological advancement that had supported learning. This has been utilised in relation to teaching; signing up to small groups for teaching, sharing large media files that cannot be sent via email, working collaboratively on documents, sharing teaching recordings.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have adapted well to the pandemic with the increased use of online forums and software. This aided teaching and improving resources and communication whilst working remotely. The visitors considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - The education provider does not deliver any apprenticeship programmes within HCPC's remit and do not plan to do so in the

future. The name of their approved provision does not currently have an apprenticeship route being a doctoral-level programme.

- The visitors have no concerns on this area and considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
 - The education provider stated that there are no specific benchmarks for clinical psychology within the QAA's Quality Code for Higher Education. The subject relevant standards are set by the British Psychological Society (BPS) and their last accreditation visit was in 2018. The standards laid out in the BPS accreditation criteria are in alignment with QAA standards for doctoral research. Their internal development and review processes for doctoral study ensure that they meet quality standards.
 - The education provider reflected that their graduates demonstrate how they meet Level 8 standards in order to progress the programme to completion and will continue to meet other industry-wide standards (SOP's).
 - The visitors noted the education provider's reflections on this area and on the visit the BPS conducted at the education provider in 2018. Through clarification the education provider detailed how they were working on a draft form of the latest BPS standards and how they expect their next visit to be in 2024-25 academic year. They also maintain their existing internal monitoring which includes scope to review updating with regards to PSRB requirements.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - The education provider stated that they have not participated or been subject to an assessment by external bodies. They have stated that this section does not apply to them and is not relevant to them.
 - Following some clarifications, they expanded and reflected on how they do not routinely receive reports from the Care Quality Commission (CQC). The majority of their placements take place within the NHS and are governed by the CQC. Certain, short term 'community' placements may involve working in charities. These would be governed by charity commissioners, but they do not access reports relating to these. All placements are quality approved through their programme processes.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider to have performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
 - As outlined in the data table above, the NSS data was sourced at the summary. This means the data is at the provider-level public data. This shows the education provider is performing above the benchmark.

- The visitors recognised that the approved programme is not included within this data as it is a post-registration qualification.
- The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - The education provider has reflected on the Office for Students' (OFS) revised B conditions and how they are integrated into their Annual Programme Review (APR) and programme approval. They are also the questions external examiners are asked to respond to in their annual reports.
 - The APR process and external examiners' feedback is considered at their Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) meetings. An annual quality report drawing on these, and other sources, is considered at ASQC and approved by their Senate and University Council, having been reviewed by their University Executive Board.
 - An annual report to University Council assesses their status against the OFS' conditions of registration, including the B conditions. These papers, and the APR process, are informed by their programmes' performance against OFS B3 thresholds, which are internally monitored by student data dashboards.
 - Their Manual of Academic Regulations and Procedures (MARP) will be updated in September 2023 with specific reference to the revised B conditions.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider discussed how the BPS have commended them on their SU&C strategy in their recent assessment. Specifically on their involvement of service users, their inclusivity and their innovative placements.
 - One condition for ongoing accreditation was highlighted. This related to ensuring that all learners must undertake observation of their clinical supervisors and that this be recorded in clinical portfolios. This is something already encouraged consistently and has been maintained. They have made this a clear agenda item for mid-placement visits by clinical tutors going forward.
 - The visitors found the submission to show good levels of evidence of extensive reflection and responsiveness. Key items for development are included, with a clearer response to feedback. The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily 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 has discussed their upcoming adjustments to their curriculum relating to the drive for dual accreditation as set out by NHSE. They have a formalised route regarding the acknowledgement of training in cognitive analytic therapy (CAT) by ACAT (Association for Cognitive Analytic Therapy) and are working towards the same for family / systemic therapy. They already teach regarding the latter, but do not currently have the systems in place to permit that teaching to be accredited by the AFT (Association for Family Therapy and Systemic Practice). At the time of their submission, they were recruiting a new tutor to focus specially on this.
- The education provider reflected on the revisions they were making to their handbook to take account of the changes to the SOPs. They discussed how their training is similar to these changes and they were reviewing their learning materials to ensure these are up to date.
- The visitors found the education provider's reflections indicated that the SOPs are being integrated and are being embedded into their processes. This appears to be an 'in progress' moment and not something that is complete or will be in place in time for the September 2023 deadline. We explored this via quality theme [one](#).
- Following this the visitors are assured this is in place and therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider has no changes to report for this section from the review period. They were engaged in a professional body visit in 2018 and have implemented the advice / recommendations from this visit. They are now reviewing draft of the new professional body standards that are to be implemented in 2024. They are continuing to engage with their professional body and plan for a future visit from them.
 - Through clarification, the education provider has explained that whilst the last visit was in 2018, they have been advised of the new criteria from the professional body and have worked to embed this. They are now preparing for the next visit (due 2024-25) and are working with a draft of the new standards. The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider discussed the challenges that have arisen in their geographic location in terms of securing practice placements. This is in part due to the growth of the overall number of learners on clinical psychology programmes. To mitigate this, they have changed their placement structure by introducing a competency focused development framework. The placements focus on direct skills (year 1), indirect skills (year 2), influencing, and leadership (year 3) with each placement building on the skills gained in the previous one. This will enable them to continue to access high quality placements in a way that scaffolds learning and offers a better matching process with practice placement offers. Their practice placement supervisors have given them positive feedback on this.
 - The education provider reflected on their use of existing networks to ensure placement capacity and maintaining ongoing dialogue with

other HEI's in their area that provide similar programmes. The three programme leads have regular meetings and the ongoing collaboration between them allows for successful negotiation about placement identification.

- The visitors noted the big increase in learners and it was not clear how this will impact on placement availability. Through clarification, the education provider detailed how they were ensuring capacity of practice-based learning. They changed the placement structure from specialist based five placement system to a competency based three placement system, with further short-term community-based placements. This means fewer placements per learner are required. Increased efforts have been made to identify new placements and the new structure allows for inclusion of placements not previously available.
- Following this the visitors are assured this is in place and therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily 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 discussed how at the end of the year a summary report is compiled from end of programme exit interviews at which general comments about the programme are sought. From this they gain valuable insight from the learners and identify areas they can develop.
 - They have detailed how learners have regular meetings with cohort tutors, where questions can be raised, and feedback given as a group. Learner representatives sit on various development groups relating to the full range of programme activities. Feedback provided is used to develop the programme further.
 - Through clarification, the education provider explained the extensive and comprehensive systems they have in place to receive learner feedback. They have a system that requires regular tutor meetings. Feedback is collected from learners after every session and exit interviews are conducted and allow another avenue for learner feedback. The visitors found this clarification to provide a much more comprehensive account and are satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The education provider has detailed how feedback on placement input is gathered from supervisors (practice placement educators) at the end of placements and where appropriate at mid-placement visits. This is an opportunity for supervisors to feedback on any pertinent issues.
 - The education provider has instigated a region wide consultation regarding their new placement system. The proposals were well

received. Some supervisors preferred the new system as it allowed a more flexibility and meant that they could be included as placement providers when this has previously been difficult. This led to them being more confident with implementing their new approach.

- The education provider delivers regular training to their practice placement educators including four compulsory training days and advanced training days for experienced educators. The training provided has a feedback system where attendees rate whether training goals have been met and this feedback is used to inform future sessions.
- Through clarification from the education provider, we understand how the new system for practice placement educators works. They detailed how it involves focussing on core clinical competencies that transfer across specialisms. A range of specialist work is still expected, but the emphasis changes through each year. Year 1 focussing on direct clinical skills, the second on indirect working and in the final year leadership. The visitors found this clarification to provide a much more comprehensive account and are satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider explained how they have two main external examiner processes. Firstly, they appoint some external examiners for four years whose main priority is to review marking and assessments. The education provider utilised the external examiner reports to inform on changes going forward.
 - They reflected that the feedback they have received from recent external examiner reports has been positive. The external examiners have confirmed the appropriateness of their assessments and highlighted certain innovative practices. The external examiners also described the education provider as well organised and responsive
 - The education provider appoints an external examiner for each of their learners' theses. These will be experts in the field of the learners' research and provide vital feedback and guidance to learners. Examiner's provider feedback via their reports but are also surveyed each year on how well their expectations were met regarding the organisation of examining, and on the quality of work they have seen. This information is collated and then reviewed by the Board of Examiners. Through this system the examiners had identified some positive areas of feedback. This includes the timely provision of guidance, a smooth admin process, and the standards of theses and defence of thesis in the viva situation.
 - Through clarification the education provider explained their approach to appointing external examiners which follows institution-wide procedures. They discussed how curriculum and assessment issues are reviewed by examiners appointed for a period of four years. These are clinical psychologists working on other doctoral clinical psychology programmes. The visitors found this expansion to provide a much more comprehensive account and are satisfied with their performance 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 reflected on how it is rare for learners not to complete the programme. This would then create a non-continuation rate of between 1-2%. They explained how this occurs for one of two reasons. Firstly, due to a learner failing the programme and secondly due to a fitness to practise issues.
 - They reflected on how the fitness to practice factors are challenging due to the administrative burden involved, the time taken for these to be investigated and the cost involved. Going forward the education provider are budgeting for this and will continue to monitor events per year.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - The education provider reflected that they have high completion rates with almost all learners completing and progressing to work in the NHS. They have worked across the review period to tackle is the rates at which learners complete to the Programme schedule. By this they closely monitor the rates at which learners continuing with the programme go out of their contracts of employment with the partner NHS trust and continue their studies beyond three years (for full timers).
 - They reflected that non-completion of the programme is usually the result of a combination of factors for each individual. This includes coursework failure and resubmission, illness, maternity periods and other life events. They note that much of this is out of their hands, but have as discussed changed the assessment system, timing, and nature of research tasks in order to allow more timely completion.
 - The education provider has also introduced 'research hubs' to support learners and provided a greater focus on 'off the shelf' projects or at least well-defined project areas. This enhances the rate at which materials for research (e.g. research proposals for review and ethics documentation) can be developed with learners.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Teaching quality:**
 - The education provider was awarded a gold rating at their last TEF review, and they stated this demonstrates their adherence to excellence across teaching and learning.
 - They have received several positive points of feedback in this review. Including.
 - Their strategic learner engagement, making learners feel valued, supported and academically stretched.

- Their culture of research-stimulated learning, ensuring that all learners are significantly challenged and acquire knowledge, skills and understanding.
 - their institutional culture that places emphasis on teaching excellence alongside research
 - their outstanding digital and physical resources, actively used by students.
 - their strong infrastructure for careers support, including a range of co-curricular opportunities, ensuring outstanding employment outcomes.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - The education provider has an institutional level NSS score but have discussed that their learners on the approved programme do not partake in this as they are level 8 (not undergraduate) learners. They have reflected on the feedback mechanisms they have in place for learners. This includes.
 - learners having the opportunity to feedback on each teaching session.
 - regular cohort / tutor meetings for learners to discuss their experiences.
 - learners being represented across implementation groups in the programme to ensure their voices are heard at all meetings.
 - The education provider also utilises the post-graduate research experience survey (PRES). The data from this which shows a reduction in their rating which they attribute to the pandemic. Problem areas seem to relate largely to the research component of the programme. Ratings for research culture and skills are reduced. The education provider will utilise their research hubs to better support learners and improve these scores.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The education provider has discussed their current learner numbers, this being 52 learners. They plan to retain this number of learners and manage this number of learners going forward.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have performed satisfactorily in this area.

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).

Referrals to next scheduled performance review

Development of IPE

Summary of issue: We noted that the provider has policies and ambitions to further develop their approach to interprofessional learning / education (IPE). We also noted that this is still being developed and the education provider has had past challenges in securing partners to enable IPE. We are recommending the education provider continue with their plans to develop this and embed IPE. We are referring this matter to their next performance review and recommend the education provider reflect on this at their next 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 2026-27 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 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 include learners, service users, external examiners and their programme's associated professional body.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with professional body during the review period. This being the British Psychological Society (BPS). They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - The education provider did not engage with other relevant professional or system regulator(s) (eg NMC, OfS)]. They did not consider the findings of other regulators in improving their provision.
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
 - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
- 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.

- In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a 4-year monitoring period is:
 - We want to recognise the good work the education provider done across the review period and acknowledge their engagement across this process. We are referring the ongoing development of the education providers approach to IPE to their next performance review. We note their ambitions to further develop their approach to IPE and the related policies but have found this currently to be still a work in progress. The education provider has also discussed a past challenge in securing partners to engage in IPE with but have worked to mitigate this. We find 4 years to be a sufficient time for them to develop and embed new practises. This is sufficient time to receive feedback from learners and partners on IPE and to reflect upon their new approach to IPE.

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 2026-27 academic year

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

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/2000
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)	PT (Part time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/09/2020

Appendix 2 – summary report

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

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
The University of Lancaster	CAS-01257-Y4P0J7	Lyn McLafferty Natalie Fowler	4 years	4-year recommendation. Less than 5 due to ongoing development of the education provider approach and policies for IPE. 4 years deemed long enough for developments to be implemented and review first feedback / reflections on new IPE approach.	Development of IPE, continuing with existing plans to develop and enhance IPE