Performance review process report

University of Edinburgh, Review Period 2018-2023

Executive summary

This is a report of the ongoing process to review the performance of the University of Edinburgh. 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:
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Undertaken quality activity to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed
- The areas we explored through quality activity:
  - How the education provider ensures that feedback from service users is appropriately implemented;
  - How service user involvement works at the operational level.

- The visitors considered that the education provider had reflected appropriately in these areas. They agreed they are performing well across all portfolio area. They also engaged well with the performance process. Both their initial portfolio submission, and their responses to the quality activity and requests for clarification, were comprehensive and reflective. The information we reviewed shows there has been effective strategic oversight of the programme. There are no ongoing issues or processes which pose risks that we will need to review specifically before 2028-29.

Previous consideration	N / A as this case did not arise from a previous process.
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 2028-29 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
Rosemary Schaeffer	Lead visitor, Practitioner psychologist
Mohammed Jeewa	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer
Sue Elves	Advisory visitor, Practitioner psychologist

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has

performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we required professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because there were areas within the portfolio which the lead visitors could not make judgements on with their professional knowledge or expertise.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 2 HCPC-approved programmes across 1 profession. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1995. They previously delivered a Pg Dip Music Therapy programme until 2005.

The education provider has not engaged with processes so far in the current model of quality assurance. The education provider engaged with the annual monitoring assessment process in the legacy model of quality assurance in 2019.

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	Arts therapist	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	1995
	Practitioner psychologist	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2002

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[1].

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary

---

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

Numbers of learners	55	46	December 2023	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission. The education provider is recruiting learners below the benchmark We explored this by considering the sustainability of the programme and the level of strategic support for its ongoing viability.
Learner non continuation	3%	2%	2020-21	This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects. The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 1%.
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	93%	2020-21	This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects

				The data point is equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 1%.
Learner satisfaction	78.7%	77.6%	2023	This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the subject level. The data point is broadly equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms.

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 –Process for implementation of feedback from service users

Area for further exploration: In their portfolio, the education provider gave some examples of how they gathered feedback from service users. They noted that they had various mechanisms for gathering such feedback and for considering the findings. The visitors found this helpful as a starting point for their understanding of performance. However, there was a limited reflections about how feedback from service users would be used to prompt the education provider's reflection on how to develop and improve the programme. There was insufficient information about the mechanisms used to translate feedback into action.

The visitors therefore asked to explore these areas in more detail, in order to gain a clearer understanding of how the education provider would reflect on feedback from service users. This would enable them to make an informed determination of the education provider's performance in using feedback for programme development.

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

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider submitted a detailed explanation of how they implemented feedback from service users. They noted that oversight of feedback implementation sits with the Advisory Panel of Experts by Experience (APEX). The APEX itself is part of the programme governance structure, and is a subcommittee of the Joint Training Committee (JTC). The JTC has the power to make changes to the way in which the programmes operate, and can give instructions to relevant programme committees, such as a programme team meeting. Proposals requiring significant change to the programme have to go through a defined process where they can be considered by senior leadership.

Several examples were given of programme changes made through this pathway in response to service user feedback. These included a more comprehensive screening of applicants for strong interpersonal skills, and a requirement for learners to work more systematically with service users during the programme.
The visitors considered that this was an appropriate response overall, which enabled them to gain a better understanding of how the education provider reviewed and implemented feedback from service users. The education provider had clearly reflected on the best ways to implement suggestions and feedback from service users.

Quality theme 2 – Operationalisation of service user strategy

Area for further exploration: In their portfolio, the education provider gave some clear information about their high-level strategy for involving service users in the programmes. The visitors considered that the education provider clearly had good mechanisms through which to reflect on their service user involvement. However, there was limited reflection on how the strategic vision for service user involvement was implemented at the level of specific activities on the programmes. Without this information, they could not make a full decision about performance in this area.

They therefore explored with the education provider how they ensured that routine service user involvement was appropriately aligned with the higher-level goals set out in the portfolio.

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

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider submitted a detailed explanation of what service user involvement on the programme looked like at the operational level. This included a description of the activities in which service users were involved, as well as reflection on changes that had been made to service user involvement in the post-COVID landscape to ensure that service users continued to be involved appropriately in the programme. The education provider noted that service users were involved in, for example, admissions, teaching, programme development and assessment.

The ways in which they had sought to maintain service user involvement after the pandemic were additional support with using technology, and a new recruitment drive to replace or re-engage those who had ceased involvement.

The visitors considered that this was a good response, which demonstrated that the education provider was engaged in ongoing reflection on their service user involvement. They considered too that the education provider's performance was itself good, based on the information about service user involvement in operational activities.

Section 4: Findings

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

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Resourcing, including financial stability** –
  - The education provider noted through their reflection that they are well-positioned in terms of sustainability. They state that they have been increasing learner numbers, working with ten health boards across Scotland, and entered into partnership with a new health board during the review period. This means that there is strong support for their programmes across Scotland, adding to their viability and sustainability. Their Department of Clinical & Health Psychology is well-supported at the institutional level.
  - They have also recruited additional staff for the programme, as a result of their considerations of how best to maintain the programme's continuing viability. Strategically the programme is important to Scotland, so government-level support will continue for the foreseeable future.

- o The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because they had seen reflections on the education provider's ability to use its internal reflection processes to maintain and develop the fitness for purpose of the HCPC-approved programme.
- **Partnerships with other organisations** –
  - o The education provider reflected on how their different programmes interacted with relevant partner organisations, including NHS Health Boards, professional bodies, and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC). They explained how they had used specific committees to maintain and grow key relationships during the review period. They also reflected on how relationships had delivered effective improvement. For example, they had undertaken a Quality Enhancement and Standards Review with the Scottish Government, which had commended several parts of their provision and also identified areas for improvement.
  - o The education provider reflected on their new Principal's attempts to reset and improve relationships with local partners following the disruption caused by COVID-19, and to adapt to changing health and social care expectations and arrangements. COVID-19 had disrupted local arrangements by making it difficult to renew formal partnership arrangements, but this was now being addressed.
  - o The visitors considered that the education provider was performing well in this area. This was because they saw a detailed reflection on how the education provider managed the relevant partnerships with different organisations. This information showed that the education provider had reflected on the best way to develop and maintain their relationships with partners.
- **Academic quality** –
  - o The education provider reflected on how it uses three key mechanisms to ensure programme quality. These include:
    - o Institution-Led Review (ILR),
    - o institutional enhancement and annual monitoring process (IEAM);and
    - o External Performance Review processes (EPR).
  - o Several developments and improvements in programme quality were delivered through these mechanisms during the review period. The education provider noted how they improved the use of real-time data for monitoring quality. They also introduced digital sign-off for clinical placement, and a new level of quality reporting to ensure that such reporting was relevant to individual programmes. Additionally, they introduced a more flexible approach to quality reporting so that programmes could choose the most appropriate method.
  - o The key challenge identified during the review period was the need to make quality monitoring and reporting more streamlined, and more digital-based. The education provider was addressing this by the measures noted above.
  - o The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly reflected well on the best ways to monitor and develop programme quality.
- **Placement quality** –
  - o The education provider reflected on the challenges and developments that had occurred in this area during the review period. One challenge

they had considered was the ongoing pressure on NHS placement capacity for their learners, which was making it harder for them to secure good quality placements. Additionally some learners were reporting problems with practice educators, resulting from conflicting expectations around supervision, and requesting additional guidance about what experiences they should be seeking out in practice-based learning.
- o The education provider responded to these issues by improving the training and support for practice educators, and developing new guidance for learners and practice educators around what exactly is required for learners in specific placements.
- o The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had shown evidence of reflection on challenges faced, and had taken action to improve quality in line with that evidence.
- **Interprofessional education** –
  - o The education provider gave a description of the role of interprofessional education (IPE) on their programme. The main way in which they deliver IPE is through regular cross-disciplinary events, and through modules specifically designed to incorporate IPE. Learners are required to collaborate with learners on other relevant programmes on case studies and study days.
  - o They reflected on some of the developments and challenges in this area during the review period. Developments included a more flexible timetabling system to bring learners together more, and experiments with hybrid learning and other alternative forms of learning. Challenges included the difficulties involved in bringing learners together because of the wide dispersion of the learners . This has been mitigated by the innovations in delivery noted in the academic quality section above.
  - o The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because they had seen clear reflection on how the education provider was developing its IPE and overcoming challenges.
- **Service users and carers** –
  - o The education provider reflected on some of the difficulties they had faced in their service user involvement during the review period.Generally service users have been involved in programme design and development and in assessment. This is overseen by the APEX group. (Advisory Panel of Experts by Experience). Their special expertise is used to ensure that the learners are prepared to deal with the public in an appropriate manner. This is achieved through direct interface with learners in designated sessions.However, the COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted their ability to have face-to-face interaction with service users, because of lockdowns and social distancing, and they are still recovering from this disruption.
  - o The education provider's portfolio was very transparent about their ongoing need to reinvigorate service user involvement. They noted that it was a priority for them to reintroduce full involvement as soon as possible. They were seeking to increase service user numbers to pre-COVID-19 levels, and to restore the full range of face-to-face involvement.

- o [Through quality activity](#), the visitors explored how the education provider implemented feedback from service users and carers, and how they ensured that operational use of service users and carers reflected strategic intentions. The response to this quality activity demonstrated that the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Equality and diversity** –
  - o The education provider included some thorough and transparent reflection on how they ensure that equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) policies are followed and respected.
  - o The mechanisms for doing this include a high-level institutional EDI Committee involving senior management, and the appointment of an Associate Dean with special responsibilities in the EDI area. The EDI Committee had a very expansive and appropriate remit, and the new Associate Dean had already started on several projects during the review period.
  - o Specific measures included Report + Support – a means for encouraging learners to highlight incidents of discrimination – and Athena Swan membership, which indicates the education provider achieving a particular level of compliance with standards around equality and diversity. The portfolio also reflected on the education provider's identification of "unconscious bias" as an important area for staff and learner development.
  - o The visitors considered that performance in this area was good as the education provider was clearly able to reflect appropriately on their approach to EDI issues, and had demonstrated an appropriate attitude towards meeting their EDI goals.
- **Horizon scanning** –
  - o The education provider outlined future challenges that they had identified. These included: issues with funding in the sector, the cost-of-living crisis affecting learners and staff, recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic, and advances in technology (including AI). They also noted that ongoing industrial action by staff would affect their provision.
  - o The education provider had established a Focus programme which was intended to deliver solutions in important areas of transformational change – learner experience, digital transformation, and organisational effectiveness. This programme was important because it provided a framework for investigating future challenges and defined the mechanisms by which such challenges would be addressed.
  - o The portfolio identified its "greatest challenge" as pressure on placements and NHS supervisor availability, programme staff recruitment, appointment of external examiners and university estates provision. A large institutional project with several separate workstreams was underway to address these possible future difficulties.
  - o The visitors considered that this was good evidence that horizon-scanning was taking place, and that the education provider had considered changes that might need to take place.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
  - The education provider submitted extensive reflection on how they had considered the revised SOPs, and whether changes needed to be made to their provision to incorporate the revised SOPs. The main areas where they considered that they needed to make changes were around leadership, equality and diversity, and further centring the service user.
  - For example, they have adapted the Evaluation of Clinical Competence form to ensure that learners with additional needs or from disadvantaged backgrounds can ask for further support or reasonable adjustments. The same form has also been adapted to further emphasise to learners the need to centre the service user in their practice. Additionally all practice educators will received further EDI training. Practice educators will also received additional training in developing leadership skills in learners. The existing Leadership and Influencing Competence Framework has been updated to reflect the specific requirements of the revised SOPs.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had clearly reflected thoroughly on the revised SOPs and considered what changes they might need to make.
- **Learning and developments from the COVID-19 pandemic** –
  - The education provider's reflection focused on the move to more virtual teaching technologies, and more virtual assessment required by the pandemic. They had also specifically reflected on whether assessment was affected by the pandemic and concluded that learners' scores had held up well.
  - They also reflected on the specific issues created by difficulties with placements during the pandemic. Their core response to this was to condense online teaching sessions and to record and repeat sessions for learners who had not been able to attend. They also adopted a more flexible approach to learning and teaching activities in general, for example by allowing different start and finish dates for placement than normal.
  - They co-operated with the Scottish Government to ensure learners were not adversely affected by the pandemic changes, wherever possible. They reflected on how they had achieved this, by reporting on how learner completion and achievement did not seem to have been affected.
  - Their reflection on both of these measures indicated that the initiatives had helped to expand access to learners whose learning had been disrupted during the pandemic. A certain amount of learning loss had been unavoidable in the initial stages, but the measures enabled them to help learners catch up in subsequent phases of the programme.

- o The visitors considered that the reflection was evidence that the education provider had managed well during the pandemic. They also considered that the education provider was taking seriously the opportunity to develop their offer in the new post-COVID-19 conditions.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** –
  - o The two key areas of reflection in this area were the growing issue of artificial intelligence, and adaptation to the COVID-19 pandemic and its consequences.
  - o The education provider clarified how they would best use virtual leaning environments (VLEs) in the post-COVID "new normal" to support learners in their programmes. They listed various ways in which they had added more flexibility for learners and staff. It was clear that they had considered which was the best approach to VLEs to support their particular learning needs.
  - o The visitors considered that this reflected an effective and appropriate approach to technology and so they considered that performance was good.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education** –
  - o The education provider reflected briefly on the Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) process by which the Quality Assurance Agency (Scotland) (QAAS) monitors their provision.
  - o There was limited reflection in this area, so the visitors sought additional clarification. Overall, they considered that there did not seem to be any concerns about performance, but they could not make a clear judgment without additional information.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies** –
  - o The key area of reflection in this area was the recent subject review by the British Psychological Society (BPS). The education provider stated that they received a number of commendations, but also highlighted the areas in which they had been encouraged to develop / improve the programme. These included reviews of assessment strategy, their approach to EDI, and ensuring an appropriate availability of teaching and learning spaces.
  - o The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. However, they did wish to clarify what future plans the education provider had for responding to the BPS review. The education provider submitted this clarification and the visitors considered that it showed that the education provider had a clear plan in place.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Curriculum development** –
    - The education provider reflected on how they had responded to changes in the standards of proficiency (SOPs), as regards their curriculum. They noted that they had amended their curriculum in line with the new requirements, and provided evidence of how they had considered what might need changing.
    - In the review period they did not have any additional curriculum development, other than adapting to the new clinical psychology SOPs.
    - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly reflected on how best to ensure that the curriculum continued to reflect required standards and content.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance** –
    - The education provider noted in their reflection that the British Psychological Society standards are currently under review. Although this process is not yet complete, they have begun to consider the likely outcomes of the review, based on professional trends. The education provider are aware that the standards around equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) are likely to be amended, and so have already begun to review their approach to EDI.
    - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider was clearly willing and able to reflect on what was likely to happen and get ahead of the game in terms of their adaptation.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level)** –
    - The education provider reflected on how they had used their established mechanisms to ensure ongoing appropriate capacity. For example, they were closely monitoring the areas of specialism for which their learners were seeking placements. There were changes during the review period on the kind of settings that learners were asking for, and so the education provider had adapted its approach to supervision and support of learners in those settings. They had also sought new settings in those specialisms.
    - The education provider also reflected on potential future increases in the number of learners coming on to the programme, as part of changes in the commissioning landscape. They detailed the steps taken to ensure that more capacity would be available.
    - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had shown clear evidence that there were aware of challenges and trends around practice-based learning.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Learners** –
    - The education provider submitted detailed reflection on how they gather and implement feedback from learners. For example, they discussed the results of a learner survey, asking the learners whether they would recommend the programme to others. They also noted the learners' feedback on their tutors and on their placement experience. They noted actions taken in response to this feedback, and also set out actions to be taken in the future. These include a survey of recent graduates and an informal programme guide more clearly tailored to learner needs.
    - The education provider also noted actions that they are taking to address problems arising, such as learners feeling inhibited from giving honest feedback about supervision, and falling response rates to learner surveys. Such actions include re-iterating the anonymised nature of feedback, and offering learner surveys in more formats.
    - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider was clearly reflecting comprehensively and honestly on learner views.
- **Practice placement educators** –
    - The education provider reflected on how they were managing relationships with practice partners. Issues highlighted included updates to IT systems to enable better communication, expansion of placements in growing specialisms, and the education provider seeking to gain protected development time for their practice educators.
    - Across all of these areas, the education provider had set out a potential problem that had been identified, and described a specific response to that issue. In some of these areas the action taken was in response to particular feedback from practice educators.
    - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, as the education provider was able to demonstrate appropriate reflection, and actions taken in response.
- **External examiners** –
    - The education provider noted specific actions that had been taken after reflection on external examiner feedback. For example, the external examiner had raised a query about the appropriateness of language used in some programme documents, and another about consistency of feedback from the programme team. The education provider explained how they had implemented this feedback, and strengthened the programme.
    - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. This was because the education provider had an open and constructive relationship with the external examiner, and was able to act on feedback from them.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learner non continuation:**
    - The data suggests that there is a non-continuation rate of around 2%, which is the benchmark figure. We considered that this was reasonable and not a cause for concern, in the context of the specific programmes at the education provider.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
    - The education provider is performing overall at benchmark, and the score has increased. This data point indicated that education provider performance in enabling learners to move on to next steps was good.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
    - Learner satisfaction is a little below benchmark. However, in their review, the visitors consider that overall, learners had good input into the programme and the education provider had clear pathways for implementing their feedback.
- **Programme level data:**
    - The programme is not currently recruiting to the level at which it is approved to do so. However, the visitors considered that the programme was sustainable based on all the information considered.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

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

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

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year.

Reason for next engagement recommendation
- Internal stakeholder engagement
  - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders, with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users and practice educators.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engaged with the British Psychological Society (BPS). They considered BPS findings in improving their provision
  - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply 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.

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 he education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year.

Reason for this decision: The Panel agreed with the visitors' recommended monitoring period, for the reasons noted through the report.

Appendix 1 – summary report

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

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
University of Edinburgh	CAS-01378-Q9L5W1	Garrett Kennedy Rosemary Schaeffer	Five years	The education provider is performing well across all portfolio areas and there are no ongoing issues that will need monitoring or reporting on during the next five years. The education provider engaged appropriately and fully with quality activity.	N / A

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/1995
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)	FLX (Flexible)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/2003