
Performance review process report

University of Glasgow, Review Period 2018-2023

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of the University of Glasgow. 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 to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities
- Undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
 - Quality activity 1: The visitors noted that the education provider had reflected well on short- and medium-term challenges. However, they asked the education provider to reflect in more depth on how they considered long-term challenges, and mitigated the associated risks. The education provider responded with information concerning various processes and organisations involved in their long-term horizon scanning. Their reflection indicated that they had not identified any significant threats to the sustainability of the programme.
 - The provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2028-29 academic year, because:
 - 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.
 - The education provider engaged with one professional body, the British Psychological Society. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
 - 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.
-

-
- From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes.

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.....	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	8
Portfolio submission.....	8
Quality themes identified for further exploration	8
Quality theme 1 – Horizon scanning and identification of challenges in the longer term.....	9
Section 4: Findings	10
Overall findings on performance	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	14
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection.....	15
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	16
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions.....	17
Data and reflections	19
Section 5: Issues identified for further review.....	20
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	20
Assessment panel recommendation	20
Education and Training Committee decision	20
Appendix 1 – summary report.....	22
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution.....	24

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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

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

Our standards

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

Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

The performance review process

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

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

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see,

rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

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

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:

- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- 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, Counselling Psychologist
Rosemary Schaeffer	Lead visitor, Occupational Psychologist
Sara McAnulty	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer
Sue Elves	Advisory visitor, Clinical Psychologist

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers one HCPC-approved programme across one profession. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running an HCPC approved programme since 1995.

This performance review is the education provider's first engagement with the HCPC's revised quality assurance model. In the legacy model, they engaged with our annual monitoring audit and declaration processes, and in the most recent cases visitors considered they were meeting the standards of education and training.

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	1995

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes¹.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	23	16	06/02/24	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.

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

				<p>The education provider is recruiting learners below the benchmark.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider was maintaining the sustainability of the programme. We considered that the programme was sustainable.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	N/A	2020-21	<p>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.</p> <p>The education provider's total HCPC learner numbers are too low to generate a statistically meaningful figure.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider supports learners to continue on the programme. We asked them to clarify their reflections in this area and they noted that the last non-continuation numbers available – the 2022-23 cohort lost three learners – were unusually high and related to individual circumstances.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	94%	2020-21	<p>This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery. 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,</p>

				<p>the education provider's performance has dropped by 2%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider supports learners in moving to additional education or professional practice. We concluded that performance in that respect was good.</p>
Learner satisfaction	78.0%	81.7%	2023	<p>This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score 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>The visitors considered the education provider's performance here and were satisfied with the education provider's reflection.</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 – Horizon scanning and identification of challenges in the longer term

Area for further exploration: The portfolio contained detailed reflection on some challenges that had been identified in the short- and medium-term. These included an increase in learner numbers on the programme, the “return to normal” following COVID-19, and efforts to improve the diversity of the learner population. The visitors considered that the reflection in all these areas was appropriate and useful. However, the portfolio did not include evidence of reflection on possible longer term challenges, for example changes in the political landscape. It is a requirement of performance review portfolios that there is long-term reflection in the portfolio.. Without this type of reflection the visitors could not full make a full judgment about the reflection in this area. We therefore explored this further with the education provider, to address the risk that the education provider was not looking sufficiently far forward.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: To further explore this area, we undertook an email exchange with the education provider to gain additional information. We considered this the most effective way for us to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider expanded significantly on their approach to horizon-scanning. Changes in the profession or in the wider health education landscape are considered internally through the Programme Strategy Group, and externally through the education provider’s membership of, and contribution to, the UK Group of Trainers Group in Clinical Psychology (UKGTGCP). Programme staff contribute to UKGTGCP committees considering the future of reasonable adjustments in clinical psychology training.

Additionally, the programme staff are required to be involved in university-level processes considering the effectiveness of particular learning and teaching methods, and the profession-wide picture. This is part of the University Learning & Teaching Strategy. Strategic planning is also part of the University Annual Review (UAR) which all programmes must undergo. The UAR identifies strategic challenges that individual programmes should take into account. The programme is also represented by its programme leader on the Heads of Psychology Scotland (HOPS) group, which has a forward-looking and strategic remit. Other sources of information and discussion about long-term challenges include practice educators, who are asked to identify upcoming changes in clinical practice or professional expectations. This intelligence can be incorporated into future planning. Several specific issues had been reflected on. These include the Scottish government’s long-term workforce planning, which looks forward into the 2030s, and trends in how allied health professionals are being prepared for practice given changing professional expectations.

In light of the extra reflection, the visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had several different defined pathways for gaining information and insight about longer-term challenges, and acting upon such information and insights.

Section 4: Findings

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

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
 - The education provider reflected on recent developments in this area, which might have an impact on the sustainability of the programme. These included the Scottish government's decision to increase the cohort size of the programme, requiring new staff recruitment, and restrictions on healthcare spending in Scotland. Additionally, they noted inflation and uncertainty in the psychology academic job market as possible challenges.
 - Another point highlighted in the reflection was that the the faculty in which the programme is situated – the College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences – has recently adopted a new strategy,, with new requirements for the structure and delivery of programmes. It was possible that this might affect the delivery and assessment on the programme.
 - The education provider outlined their responses, whether complete or in progress, to these issues. For example, with regard to the new College strategy, they noted that the DCLinPsy programme has had its long-term future reconfirmed by senior leadership, with secure funding and a commitment to staff development. The programme has also secured new premises for teaching and learning.
 - We requested clarification of how they were managing the increased cohort size. The education provider noted several areas in which they had taken specific steps to do so. For example, they had increased and improved the teaching and learner spaces available. They had also liaised with local health boards to ensure that increased numbers of learners could be integrated into existing practice-based learning settings. Additionally, they reviewed their programme delivery, to ensure that they were set up to manage large cohorts. They considered, following this reflection, that their staffing arrangements and teaching space were appropriate to accommodate the additional learners.
 - From this discussion and reflection, the visitors considered that performance was good. This was because the education provider had demonstrated that they could identify issues affecting resourcing and stability and address them in a coherent way.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The key challenge identified in the reflection in this area was the need for additional capacity in practice-based learning following the expansion of the programme cohort from 2021 onwards.

- As part of this,, the education provider reflected on how they were expanding into new settings for practice-based learning and using their partnerships to involve service users more closely.
- The education provider reflected on how they had used existing professional networks in Scotland to reach out to prospective new practice-based learning providers identified by programme staff. As such, new partnerships have been established with, for example, the Golden Jubilee Hospital in Glasgow and the Argyll and Bute region of the Highlands.
- The education provider reflected on how they used their partnerships with existing placement partners to deliver more placement capacity. This was done in various ways: by making better use of existing practice educators and placements through better organisation, and by being more innovative in where and how learners' clinical skills were assessed.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had demonstrated their reflection on how to use existing partnerships to sustain and develop access to practice-based learning.
- **Academic quality –**
 - The education provider reflected extensively on how they delivered quality assurance during the review period. Notably they identified, from regular reviews, and staff and learner feedback, areas where improvement or development were required. These included the need for upgraded teaching spaces with better technology integration, expansion of the pool of expertise available for programme delivery, and more use of digital tools to make resources available for learners. They also stated that they consider it necessary to ensure that their curriculum keeps pace with social and political change that may affect learners' professional practice.
 - These issues have been addressed through additional investment in teaching spaces and technology, through more proactive recruitment and advertising, and through a large-scale curriculum and delivery review. The education provider noted through this section of the portfolio and in the 'Learners' section below that they have received good feedback from learners and programme staff about how these changes have improved programme delivery.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had demonstrated that their reflection incorporated views from a large range of stakeholders, including commissioners of healthcare places. They had a clear mechanism for putting this feedback into action.
- **Placement quality –**
 - The education provider reflection focused on a number of key challenges for the maintenance and monitoring of placement quality, and how these had been addressed and managed. These included:
 - The disruption caused by COVID-19, which severely affected clinical supervision and practice-based learning;
 - Uncertainty about lines of responsibility for learners' supervision, welfare, wellbeing and assessment while they were in practice-based learning;

- Inadequate preparation for learners in understanding the purpose and significance of particular placements.
 - The steps taken to resolve these issues were set out in the portfolio. The education provider worked with placement partners to deliver virtual placements, and to assess clinical skills remotely. A form of this working has been retained even after the end of the pandemic. Roles and responsibilities have been clarified for learners and practice educators, and a curriculum review has led to a clearer and more effective preparation of learners for their practice-based learning.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had reflected on how well they were monitoring placement quality, and made relevant and appropriate changes as necessary.
- **Interprofessional education (IPE) –**
 - The reflection in this area focused on three different areas where the education provider has determined improvements were needed in recent years. These were:
 - Communication and interpersonal skill training with dental learners (one of the key IPE partners for the programme), which were affected by the pandemic.
 - Stress, burnout and wellbeing problems with final year learners.
 - The effectiveness of IPE in the context of practice-based learning.
 - The education provider identified steps that had been taken to address all these areas. They have rebuilt and redesigned the IPE with dental learners following the pandemic, and introduced a new hybrid approach to that aspect of IPE. Dental learners were chosen because they are available at the education provider, and because they have similar requirements to the DClinPsy learners for communication with service users, and will have similar experience with handling pressure and stress.
 - They have provided more support and resources for learners in the final year, and throughout the programme, and trained staff in supporting learners in those areas. They have also initiated new protocols for IPE in clinical settings to ensure that what learners are being taught is integrated with their IPE activities.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had a clear overview of the challenges and developments.
 - **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider involves service users from the Experts By Experience group across many different parts of their HCPC-approved programme, including assessment, admissions and the delivery of teaching and learning.
 - Their key area of reflection in the portfolio was how best to ensure an appropriate diversity among service users. In this context they mean diversity of experience, of background, and of medical history. The main way they did this was to establish a lived experience advisory panel (LEAP) with oversight of how well the Carers and Service Users of Psychology (CUSP) group was reflecting the broader population.

- They also noted that during the review period, , they had made considerable changes to the structure of service user involvement. Service users were more closely involved with admissions and teaching. A new role had been created, Director of Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion, to oversee service user involvement. The research curriculum was updated to consider stakeholder involvement in research, and learners were required to undertake a mandatory reflective practice task involving CUSP service users. This was the result of education provider reflection on the best way for service users to have input into learners' professional practice.
- The visitors requested some additional reflection on how People With Lived Experience (PWLE) were trained and prepared for their contributions to the programme, and how the CUSP group was co-ordinated. The education provider clarified that PWLE were trained with peer mentoring and with sessions delivered by programme staff, and that they had ongoing relationships with their trainers to aid ongoing development. Co-ordination of the CUSP group was a defined responsibility of module learners and the LEAP group.
- In light of this, the visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had demonstrated their ability and willingness to review and adapt service user involvement.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider identified a number of key areas for reflection in this section. They noted that they were seeking to amend their curriculum and their teaching practice to take account of “anti-racism, decolonisation of the curriculum, improving access to the profession for under-represented groups, and the equitable access to learning opportunities for people living with disabilities.” They undertook a large-scale curriculum review in 2022-23, to consider how well their programme incorporated such imperatives. They note that they have included their admissions, programme content, learner support and management in this review.
 - Outcomes of this review included more explicit references to EDI and its impact on clinical practice, and more opportunities for learners to reflect upon and discuss their own experiences. They also appointed an EDI lead and reviewed their reasonable accommodation policy to ensure all learners who needed such accommodations could access them.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider was clearly able to reflect on or oversights in their curriculum and governance related to EDI.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The key area of reflection was the education provider's desire to improve the diversity of their learners, over the medium-term. They state that the imperative is to ensure that the psychology profession reflects the society it serves. They also note that, especially after COVID-19, preferences among learners for how to access the programme have changed, and that they wish to accommodate these as far as possible so as not to exclude anyone from the programme.
 - We further explored this area through [quality activity](#) above. The education provider responded to our exploration of their longer-term

horizon scanning by submitting extra evidence about the process used and the issues identified.

- Following the quality activity, the visitors considered that performance in this area was good, as they had seen good evidence of the education provider considering and anticipating future developments.

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 noted they had reflected on how best to integrate the revised SOPs into their programme and gave examples of how this had been done.
 - For example, with regard to the increased emphasis on leadership, they explained that they had amended certain modules, including one that was designed to improved teamwork. Changes were made to assessment, and to the learning outcomes.
 - Regarding the safeguarding of registrants' mental health, the education provider noted that they did not need to make significant revisions to the teaching or assessment of the programme. They worked with their occupational health and university disability advisors to amend the curriculum. However, their reflection did note that they made changes to how their programme supports learners with persistent health conditions affecting mental health and wellbeing.
 - The education provider reflected on their SOPs integration in some other parts of the curriculum. With regard to promoting public health, they noted that their School of Health and Wellbeing have developed a specific curriculum to encourage all learners in health professions to consider public health. Another example, in connection with EDI, is the introduction of informal "drop in" sessions to discuss the implications for psychology of topics such as "whiteness" and anti-racism. Learners are also encouraged to develop their personal reflection on EDI issues using specific models.
 - The visitors requested some additional clarification in this area,, as the initial reflection was limited. The education provider expanded on their portfolio, noting that they had used their annual review process to consider how to meet the revised SOPs. Their conclusion was that they were already meeting the revised SOPs in those two specific areas, as both leadership and a self-critical mental health focus had been part of the programme for some time.
 - In light of this, the visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had a clear pathway for reviewing the revised SOPs and how they should be integrated into the curriculum.
- **Learning and developments from the COVID-19 pandemic –**

- Reflection in this area focused on the education provider's adaptation to the pandemic, and also their adaptation to the "new normal" in the post-pandemic world. The education provider noted that the programme was significantly disrupted initially, with in-person learning and practice-based learning coming to a halt. However, they reflected extensively on their adaptations, including greater use of technology, innovations in organisation of placement and more extensive support services for learners who felt isolated. These included small groups for learners.
- Some of these mitigations were continued after the pandemic, notably the support groups and the flexibility in delivering hybrid teaching and learning opportunities. The education provider reflected on how best to incorporate certain changes. For example, they held internal discussions to better understand what mix of in-person and virtual learning was best for learners.
- The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had carefully considered what they could learn and retain from the changes forced upon them by the pandemic.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The reflection focused on two key themes. The education provider considered how best to continue to support a specific group of learners. These were learners with disabilities or additional needs who had been learning remotely during the pandemic and struggled with the transition back to a mix of in-person and virtual delivery. The education provider consulted with the university disability group to determine the best ways to support learners back to the optimal way to learn, and to identify appropriate reasonable adjustments involving technology.
 - Additionally, the education provider noted the launch of a new virtual learning environment, ePortfolio, which streamlined submission, assessment and the provision of teaching resources. The education provider trained staff and learners in the use of ePortfolio, and their reflection showed that this had gone well.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had shown the ability and willingness to review their use of technology during the 2018-23 period.

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 reflected on their adherence to appropriate quality codes. There have been recent reviews and their internal processes have determined that they meet these codes appropriately. Additionally, they note that the "DClinPsy programme adheres to the Clinical Psychology and Applied Psychology (Clinical Associate) Scotland (2006) benchmark statement."

- The visitors considered performance in this area was good because there was evidence that the education provider had considered in detail which standards they needed to adhere to.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider reflected on the British Psychological Society (BPS) re-accreditation in 2019. This event led to them being required to improve in certain areas: speed of assessment, staffing, improvement of digital resources, and better clinical feedback for learners in placement.
 - The education provider described how they had incorporated these enhancements into the programme. Some of them were addressed by institutional action, like additional recruitment and a move to new premises. They note that several of their staff members are involved with the BPS, which means the programme benefits from their knowledge and enables them to understand BPS requirements.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly engaged with the suggestions for improvement made by the professional body.

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 focused in this section on how they incorporated the revised SOPs into their programme. They gave several examples of how they had determined where changes needed to be made, and how they had made changes where necessary.
 - There was limited reflection on other curriculum developments. They discussed elsewhere in the portfolio, notably in the section below, how they had responded to changes in the guidance from the British Psychological Society (BPS).
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had demonstrated a clear ability to reflect on the needs of their curriculum in light of changing expectations and requirements.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider reflected in some depth on their response to a BPS initiative to encourage more rigour, clarity and accessibility in recording of clinical placement competencies. The key innovation here was a nationwide digital tool, developed in partnership with other HEIs and with NHS Education Scotland (NES). Learners and practice educators fed back, favourably on the use of this tool to improve their clinical experience.
 - The BPS also issued new guidelines around assessment of the development of therapeutic competence, and around quality assurance

of placements. The education provider responded to these developments by reviewing their delivery of competencies in both the academic and clinical settings, and by reviewing their quality assurance of practice-based learning.

- The visitors considered the education provider was performing well in this area, because they had demonstrated in-depth engagement with professional body requirements and recommendations.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**
 - In their reflection the education provider note that it has been challenging to grow placement capacity at the same rate as the increase in cohort size. Specifically, the education provider faced a challenge in gaining the right kind of placements as well as sufficient numbers. The key mechanism for achieving this has been the Local Area Tutors (LATs), embedded within Health Boards. The LATs are tasked with maximising and expanding the range and type of placements available, co-operating closely with relevant stakeholders. Education providers are expected to communicate to the LATs their particular needs.
 - An action plan was formulated to ensure that the LATs and the education provider could work together effectively and appropriately. This plan involved workshops and local discussions.
 - The visitors considered the education provider was performing well, in light of this clear and coherent plan to ensure sustainable placement capacity.

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 reflected on the most common themes in the feedback received from learners. They noted that most of this feedback was related to programme delivery, especially the use of technology platforms and the right balance of in-person and virtual learning sessions. They had responded to such feedback by providing additional training where necessary, and by adopting a more mixed model of delivery. In this model, “sessions that are suitable for entirely online delivery...are provided online and other sessions where interaction and skills feedback is needed (e.g. clinical skills workshops) are designated as in person/face to face sessions.”
 - The education provider highlighted three specific changes that they made in response to reflection on learner feedback. These were the introduction of teaching sessions that involved different cohorts on the programme, improvements to the induction sessions at the very start of the programme, and continuation of the aspects of training that received praise from the learners.

- Following the clarification, the visitors considered performance was good, as they had seen evidence of reflection on different aspects of learner feedback, and action taken in response to that feedback.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The education provider reflected on several aspects of the feedback they had gained from practice educators, and on their process for gaining that feedback. During the review period, they began to require the completion of an “evaluation of clinical placement” form from every practice educator after every module. Information from this form would be used to improve learners’ preparation for placement and to amend the programme where necessary, for example in better preparing the academic curriculum to meet clinical needs.
 - Practice educator feedback also indicated the need for the education provider to improve communication with practice educators. Practice educators reported feeling uncertain and stressed about the details of their role. They noted that they did not always feel they understood the programme or their role within it, and that they did not feel connected to the programme. In particular the practice educators did not understand changes that were taking place within the programme.
 - The education provider responded to these concerns by establishing regular “supervisor update workshops” between programme staff and practice educators. During the pandemic, these were especially important in maintaining communication channels. They also developed clearer and more precise guides to the programme to enable practice educators to gain a clearer understanding of their role and purpose.
 - The visitors considered performance was good because the education provider had shown in detail how they gathered and acted upon feedback and perspectives from practice educators.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider reflected extensively on the feedback received from the external examiners. The external examiners are supplied with sample portfolios of randomly selected learners, and have opportunities to meet one another in a confidential setting to discuss their oversight and moderation of assessment. They also submit reports to the University Senate.
 - The education provider noted some areas where they have made improvements to the programme in light of external examiner feedback. For example, they focused on learners being better prepared to undertake systematic evidence reviews. The education provider noted that external examiners stated that learners’ systematic reviews are improving, although there remains room for further improvement.
 - Additional reflections in the portfolio highlight two other areas:
 - External examiners asked the education provider to ensure that learners fully understood the impact and importance of equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) in their professional practice;
 - External examiners commended the education provider for their administration and organisation of assessment.
 - In response, the education provider considered how to develop their EDI work, and how to build on their successes in assessment. This

took the form of ongoing discussions and regular programme level review of assessment.

- Overall, the visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider was clearly engaging constructively with their external examiners and making specific changes in response to feedback.

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:**
 - We explored this by considering how well the education provider supports learners to continue on the programme.
 - The visitors requested additional clarification around how the education provider was seeking to understand the causes of fluctuation in learner continuation rates. The education provider noted that three learners had left the programme during the 2022-23 academic year.
 - They reflected that learner departures were due to learners either not being able to meet programme requirements, or occasionally personal issues or changed career ambitions. They noted that they use exit interviews to understand such departures and implement better support if necessary. They showed that they had reflected on the outcome of these interviews by noting changes made in response.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - We explored this by considering how well the education provider supports learners in moving to additional education or professional practice.
 - We concluded that performance in that respect was good. Learner satisfaction was strong and the education provider was working closely with the national government on workforce issues.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - Learner satisfaction data was significantly above the benchmark and learner feedback was being considered and implemented in an effective and systematic way.
 - We considered performance in this area was good.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The education provider did not provide significant additional reflection here, as they only have one HCPC-approved programme.
 - However, we noted through the process that the programme is expanding its learner numbers. We are confident based on this review that they can manage that expansion.

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 other relevant professional or system regulator(s) (eg the British Psychological Society (BPS)). They considered the findings of the BPS 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.

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 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 Glasgow	CAS-01371-S8M2J0	Garrett Kenedy Rosemary Schaeffer	Five years	<p>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.</p> <p>The education provider engaged with one professional body, the British Psychological Society. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes.</p>	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 (DClinPsy)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/1995