

---

## Performance review process report

Institute of Arts in Therapy and Education, 2018-21

### Executive summary

This report covers our performance review of the programmes offered by the Institute of Arts in Therapy and Education. During this review there were no referrals made to other processes, and no risks identified which may impact performance. One recommendation was made during the process, with regards to creating a service user and carer policy. This was accepted by the provider, who are already beginning to action this. This provider constitutes a low risk to how the approved programmes continue to be delivered. However, there is a lack of comparable data points to inform us of progress, therefore our recommendation for the performance review period is two years.

This report will now be considered by our Education and Training Panel who will make the final decision on the on the review period.

---

<b>Previous consideration</b>	There are no other ongoing or recent cases of note relating to this education provider
-------------------------------	--

<b>Decision</b>	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be</li><li>• whether issues identified for referral through this review should be reviewed, and if so how</li></ul>
-----------------	---

<b>Next steps</b>	Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2023-24 academic year
-------------------	--

---

## Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment .....	3
About us .....	3
Our standards .....	3
Our regulatory approach .....	3
The performance review process .....	3
Thematic areas reviewed .....	4
How we make our decisions .....	4
The assessment panel for this review .....	4
Section 2: About the education provider .....	5
The education provider context .....	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider .....	5
Institution performance data .....	5
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes .....	6
Portfolio submission .....	6
Quality themes identified for further exploration .....	7
Quality theme 1 – Stability of programmes .....	7
Quality theme 2 – Developing an apprenticeship programme .....	7
Quality theme 3 – Clarity of interprofessional learning opportunities to learners .....	8
Quality theme 4 – Implementing equality and diversity policies at programme level .....	8
Quality theme 5 – Responding to UK Quality Code developments .....	9
Quality theme 6 – Development of programme curriculum .....	9
Quality theme 7 – Policies regarding service user and carer involvement .....	10
Quality theme 8 – Processes to gain and address feedback from practice placement educators .....	10
Section 4: Summary of findings .....	11
Overall findings on performance .....	11
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	11
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 .....	18
Section 5: Issues identified for further review .....	19
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes .....	19
Assessment panel recommendation .....	19
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution .....	20

## 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 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:

John Crossfield	Lead visitor, Arts therapist
Rebecca Khanna	Lead visitor, Occupational therapist
Catherine Rice	Service User Expert Advisor
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh	Education Quality Officer
Sophie Bray	Education Quality Officer

## Section 2: About the education provider

### The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers one HCPC-approved programme across one profession. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2007.

The Institute is a Higher Education College of 30 years standing, an Academic Partner of University of East London, member organisation of The UK Council for Psychotherapy and HCPC. One of the leading counselling schools.

They run two master's degree programmes, several Diploma courses, a Postgraduate Certificate in The Therapeutic Arts and Certificate programmes. Their MA in Integrative Arts Psychotherapy is the only art therapy programme in the country to qualify learners to work in the NHS as an art therapist (HCPC) and as an arts psychotherapist with UKCP.

The provider previously engaged in our previous annual monitoring process and completed their audit in 2019-20. Following the completion of this audit the standards were all found to still be met and ongoing approval was granted by the Education training panel.

### 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2007

### Institution performance data

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

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	20	25	2019-20	The number of learners recruited each year is a maximum of 25, but the provider indicated each year between 20-25 learners are enrolled. This sits in line with the number the programme was approved

				to intake or slightly higher, but the provider has shown stability of the programme throughout their portfolio submission.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	3%	2019-20	The benchmark value here is provided through Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), which is a nonapplicable data point for this provider (they are a higher education college, not university). The provider however has provided internal data, which shows the percentage of learners not continuing is also around 3%. This indicates the programme is sustaining their learner numbers at an appropriate level.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	93%	N/A	2019-20	The provider did not provide any internal or external data in relation to learners going into employment/ further study. They state the majority of their learners go into relevant employment.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	N/A	2019-20	The provider is not included in the TEF award data point.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	N/A	N/A	2019-20	The provider is not included in this data point, and they have provided no internal or external data as an alternative. Office for Students does not hold this data on them.
HCPC performance review cycle length	N/A	TBC	2018-21	We have recommended a review period of two years after reviewing the providers portfolio and being satisfied with their performance but limited by the number of data points available. This will be confirmed once the report has gone to the Education and Training Panel who will make the final decision

### 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.

We sought out clarification on each quality theme via email communication to allow the provider to elaborate on previous information they had sent or send further evidence documents to answer the queries.

### Quality theme 1 – Sustainability of the programme due to the ongoing relationship with the validating university

**Area for further exploration:** The provider is an Academic Partner of University of East London (UEL) but have outlined challenges they have had with this partnership. There have been issues with communication and obtaining information from UEL, which the provider has made ongoing attempts to resolve. However, it is unclear how these issues will affect the stability of the programme, particularly with regards to revalidation of programmes. The visitors explored how the provider is addressing the breakdown in communication reported with UEL. It is important for the provider to take appropriate/remedial action to prevent these communication and engagement issues negatively impacting the sustainability of the programme.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The provider informed us the challenges with communication had been caused by the staff restructuring at UEL, the impact of the pandemic and the consequent high turnover of internal staff. The visitors explored the updated action plan submitted by the provider detailing the outcome of intended actions to address the issues identified. They have appointed a Link Tutor and a Collaborative Partner Accounts Manager to manage these issues. They are confident the actions they have taken to address the issues identified will help ensure the continued sustainability of the programme. In the meantime, it has not adversely impacted their ability to deliver the programme or recruit learners.

The provider is aware there has been an impact on processes such the transfer of learners from the PG Certificate to the MA Programme. There are dual registration processes which may result in delays with learner UEL registration they believe, but the new appointed roles intend to address these impacts. The visitors were satisfied the issues identified will not affect the sustainability of the programme, and the provider has put appropriate measures in place to mitigate and manage risks from their partnership with UEL. This further detail ensured the visitors the provider is appropriately addressing their concerns.

### Quality theme 2 – Developing an apprenticeship programme

**Area for further exploration:** The provider identifies diversifying their portfolio to include apprenticeships is key aim for the future. They are exploring the possibility of taking part in the procurement exercise currently being run by Health Education

England (HEE), in partnership with UEL and a local London NHS Foundation Trust. It was unclear on the progress the provider has made with this process, and how they will evaluate the operating environment of the programme to assure sustainability and ongoing improvement. The visitors explored the provider's involvement in the procurement exercise, and the actions being taken to prepare for this. It is important for the provider to have considered how this will affect sustainability of both current and future programmes.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The provider outlined they have not progressed the apprenticeship pathway, because there has been no clear proposal from UEL on how this can be implemented. This communication issue with UEL was discussed in [quality theme 1](#). The visitors were satisfied the provider's current provision is sustainable, and before they are no longer pursuing the apprenticeship pathway this won't influence this. The updated information ensured the visitors the provider is appropriately addressing their queries.

### Quality theme 3 – Clarity of interprofessional learning opportunities to learners

**Area for further exploration:** The visitors agreed the input from other professionals on the programme is sufficient to ensure learners are receiving adequate interprofessional learning opportunities. It was unclear how the provider is making learners aware of these opportunities and highlighting the significance of interprofessional learning within practice placements for learners. The visitors explored how and where the significance of interprofessional learning is signposted to learners, and assessed, within the programme to ensure learners are aware of this as an important and compulsory part of their learning.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The provider has amended their documentation (including their Student Handbook, the Placement Record Audit of Resources and Facilities, and the Placement Manager's Monitoring Report) to specifically use the term 'interprofessional learning' to make this clearer for learners and placement providers. Throughout the programme, teaching staff highlight the importance and value of working in a multi-disciplinary team to learners, so they can learn from other professionals and understand their role within the wider allied health professions (AHP) and medical team. The visitors were satisfied more clarity was provided in documentation, outlining expectations and opportunities to learn across professions (with both other trainees and practitioners). Changes made in the Student Handbook clearly signpost learners to the opportunities and expectations of multi-disciplinary learning, including alongside clients. This further detail provided assurance to the visitors the provider is appropriately addressing their concerns.

### Quality theme 4 – Implementing equality and diversity policies at programme level

**Area for further exploration:** The Provider outlines they do not have a formal mechanism for monitoring compliance with its Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) policy, but have institutional policies in place. It was unclear how the impact of institutional EDI policies and processes are monitored at programme level, so the visitors explored how the impact of institutional EDI policies and processes are demonstrated at programme level in more detail. The ability to monitor the impact of



these policies allows the provider to reflect upon their suitability and how they are able to continually improve performance regarding EDI.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The provider identified they are in the process of developing their institutional policies, and therefore cannot demonstrate the impact of these policies at this stage. They will be able to reflect upon the impact of the new policies in their next performance review. The visitors were satisfied the provider is taking action to develop the policies and have intentions of monitoring their impact, once developed. This further detail ensured the visitors the provider is appropriately addressing their concerns.

#### Quality theme 5 – Responding to UK Quality Code developments

**Area for further exploration:** The expectations set by the UK quality code (QAA) are important to be considered by education providers for any developments which might influence their programmes, however the provider has not reflected on these. It was unclear what actions the provider takes to ensure they are monitoring and addressing any developments within the UK quality code. The visitors explored what processes are in place to ensure the provider can implement relevant changes to their programme in an appropriate and timely manner to changes in the UK quality code. The Quality Code is a key reference point for UK higher education, protecting the public and learner interest, therefore ensuring quality education from providers.

**Outcomes of exploration:** Due to the programme being validated by the University of East London (UEL), they undergo Quality Assurance (QA) processes in compliance with UEL regulations and the UK Quality code. Changes in the code which trigger changes in QA processes would be communicated to the provider by UEL. They also have expertise provided by the Academic Registrar who is a Higher Education professional, and who regularly undertakes process reviews to ensure they follow existing and new developments. The visitors were satisfied communication channels and the role responsible for reviewing new developments was clear, showing the provider can respond to UK quality code changes appropriately.

#### Quality theme 6 – Processes in place to ensure development of programme curriculum

**Area for further exploration:** The provider's portfolio suggests they have a range of means in place to assure the currency and development of the curriculum. It was unclear whether or how the current HCPC approved programme has been modified during the review period. The visitors explored how the programme curriculum has been developed in this time, and what steps are being taken to prepare for any subsequent revalidation with the UEL. Whilst the provider has stated they have several processes in place to develop the curriculum, it is important for them to identify the changes they have made to the programme during the review period and reflect on the successes and challenges.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The programme undergoes two reviews. It is revalidated by the UEL followed by a full collaborative review which examines all aspects of the course from academic content and development to identifying and resolving any

issues. Also, the Organisational Member Review with UK Council for Psychotherapy (UKCP), which ensures the provider is meeting professional body requirements in terms of training, both academic and clinical standards.

The provider has submitted an example of a change made to the programme. . This relates to the introduction of a social injustice module to embed equality, diversity and inclusion into the curriculum which has had positive feedback from learners. The visitors were satisfied the programme undergoes a range of formal reviews, which will provide scope for appraisal of the current curriculum and overall programme delivery. They agreed the additional module in programmes is a very positive development. This further detail ensured the visitors the provider is appropriately addressing their concerns.

#### Quality theme 7 – Policies regarding service user and carer involvement

**Area for further exploration:** Through the provider's portfolio reflections they clearly show they engages Service Users and Carer (SU&C) to both inform and deliver aspects of the training and have responded to issues of potential risk via additional teaching sessions. It was unclear if the provider has a formal policy to underpin the sustainability and development of service users and carers involved in the programme. The visitors explored further the policies and procedures which underpin the involvement of SU&C in the programme, to ensure sustained involvement. It is important that service user involvement is integral to the programmes, and there are policies to support and clearly outline their involvement.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The provider identified they do not have a formal policy to underpin the sustainability and development of service users and carers involved in the programme. However, in response to this feedback they are planning to recommend a policy is developed to their Academic Board. The visitors were satisfied with the provider's plan to recommend the development of a policy to the Academic Board. This further detail ensured the visitors the provider is appropriately addressing their concerns. They recommended the creation of the policy should be followed up during the next reviewed.

#### Quality theme 8 – Processes to gain and address feedback from practice placement educators

**Area for further exploration:** The provider explained there is an informal, ongoing approach to communicating with practice educators, and they gain feedback by maintaining regular contact as the placement evolves. It is unclear how the informal feedback is addressed, by whom, and how it is reported back to both learners and practice placement educators. The visitors explored processes in place for reviewing, evaluating, and actioning the feedback and recommendations from practice educators and learners. It is important feedback can be collated in a formal and structured way so the provider can address it, reflect on it and continually strive to improve performance.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The placement coordinator initially reviews all feedback from practice educators and clinical supervisors. Issues highlighted are shared with the team, included in termly formative feedback to learners and considered at the

final staff meeting of the academic year, when procedures, documents and templates are reviewed. In response to visitor's feedback, the provider is going to introduce an annual Practice Educator Annual Placement Review for practice placement educators to complete, to obtain formal feedback from all placements.

The visitors are satisfied both the informal and formal methods of collecting feedback are suitable. The proposed annual placement review will support evidence of future best practice and enhancements in practice education, alongside existing practice, and enable the provider to keep a formal record of this feedback and actions resulting from it. This further detail ensured the visitors the provider is appropriately addressing their concerns.

## Section 4: Summary of findings

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

### Overall findings on performance

#### Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

#### Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
  - The provider has policies which are set at institutional, university and professional body levels. These include Business Plans, Recruitment figures, University monitoring and review exercises, PSRB Monitoring report and reviews and Staff Recruitment Policy. These are regularly monitored and updated by senior management to ensure financial viability of all programmes.
  - Learner recruitment has been consistent with high retention rates. There is a staff recruitment policy to ensure appropriately qualified and experienced staff are recruited to manage and deliver the programme.
  - To ensure the continued recruitment of sustainable numbers of learners, the provider has developed recruitment strategies which they will continue to monitor and develop.
  - We explored how the provider works with their partner University of East London (UEL) in [quality theme 1](#) with whom they are taking actions to improving their communication and engagement/ collaboration.
  - The visitors were satisfied the provider has procedures and policies in place to ensure the sustainability of their programmes through considerations of learner and staff recruitment, and collaboration with their partner University.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
  - The provider has policies set at institutional level with variations to accommodate the different requirements between programmes. The

provider has partnerships with placement providers, with signed agreements. There are dedicated placement co-ordinators whose roles are to manage, develop and monitor all placements.

- Despite the challenges identified in the collaborative relationship between the provider and UEL, the provider has instigated actions to rectify the situation, as detailed in the Collaborative Action Monitoring Report. These concerns were explored in [quality theme 1](#).
- There is regular monitoring of these partnerships to ensure effective communication, data sharing and relationships with link tutors.

The visitors were satisfied there are suitable policies and procedures in place to enable successful partnerships with other organisations, and the provider is addressing the challenges with UEL discussed previously.

- **Academic and placement quality –**

- Policies and processes to monitor academic quality are set at institutional and university level. External examiner systems are in place to ensure academic quality for each programme. Regular monitoring takes place in the form of annual monitoring reports to UEL, professional accrediting bodies, and external examiner.
- The provider made appropriate adaptations to academic teaching during the pandemic to ensure the quality was maintained. They developed more effective approaches to learning, online delivery and resources, and scheduled extra sessions for learners. Learner's feedback regarding these actions have been positive.
- Procedures to ensure placement quality are set at institutional level but with variations for the different programmes. Practice co-ordinators manage and co-ordinate placements. The provider adapted communication with placement providers and learners to help them adjust for the pandemic circumstances and sought feedback from learners on the experience to support future developments.
- The visitors are satisfied the provider has presented adequate evidence of both programme adaptation throughout the pandemic restrictions, and in response to learner needs and feedback. They have acknowledged the impact which enforced periods of remote placement engagement had on the quality of learning experience within the working/ clinical environment. The reporting, monitoring and review processes they have in place, have ensured timely responses of the programme with initiatives to support this aspect of the student learning experience.

- **Interprofessional education –**

- Interprofessional education occurs within placements settings during the programme. The provider is not able to offer interprofessional learning opportunities because they do not deliver any other professional programmes.
- While on placements, learners work in varied settings, with a from a range other from other professions. Certain modules are taught by other professionals including social workers, researchers, psychiatrists, and allied health profession (AHP) colleagues from a national health service (NHS) Trust partner. They continue to build relationships with more trusts to increase the opportunities for learners.

- We explored how learners are made aware of the importance and relevance of interprofessional learning during their programme in [quality theme 3](#). This should enable learners to gain experience of working in multidisciplinary teams, understand different and various roles and working with trainees on other AHP programmes. The learners will have opportunities to hear from both allied health professionals and experts by experience.
  - The visitors were satisfied there are appropriate opportunities for interprofessional education for learners and the expectations of learners are clear. They agreed the changes and developments being made by the provider show suitable reflection.
- **Service users and carers –**
    - Service users are involved in many layers of the programme, including teaching learners, reviewing programme documents, and sharing feedback with staff. Service users speak to learners about their lived experience and of receiving different types of therapeutic support.
    - The pandemic has had an impact on service user involvement, resulting in reduced engagement. However, the provider has acknowledged this and has contingency plans in place for this and additionally if a service user cannot attend a session due to personal reasons.
    - The provider has support and resources in place to help service users to manage the practicalities of contributing to the programme. They have agreed to recommend the Academic Board develops a policy to outline the sustainability and developing of service users in the programme, as discussed in [quality theme 7](#). The visitors agreed this is good practice to see the provider responding positively to their recommendations.
    - The service users were satisfied the provider has considered service user involvement in the programme and support they can provide to them suitably. They agree service users are engaged with the programme and are satisfied the provider is willing to address their concerns by introducing new policies.
- **Equality and diversity –**
    - The provider has a policy set at institutional level which sets out the principles and processes for learners, staff and trainers in terms of equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI).
    - The provider monitors compliance with this policy informally through feedback from staff, learners and placement providers. They have appointed an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Adviser who sits on the Academic Board and on the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) Bursary Panel and advises on any issues. They are developing institutional EDI policies, as discussed in [quality theme 4](#).
    - They have also introduced a social injustice module across all programmes and BAME studentships.
    - The visitors were satisfied the provider has demonstrated they are taking current actions to enhance EDI policies and have already put several mechanisms in place to develop their approach to EDI.

- **Horizon scanning –**
  - The Provider identified diversifying their portfolio to include apprenticeships is key aim for the future. An Arts Therapies apprenticeship standard and assessment plan was developed and approved for delivery in 2018 but was never implemented. In 2022, Health Education England (HEE) agreed to work with stakeholders and employers to develop understanding of apprenticeships and to run a procurement process for this pathway.
  - We explored the providers intentions to initiate this apprenticeship pathway in [quality theme 2](#). The provider responded to outline they are no longer pursuing this pathway and therefore there were no considerations to be made. They are waiting for a clear proposal from UEL on how this can be implemented.
  - The visitors were satisfied the programme is being run sustainably, and there are no significant changes upcoming which will impact upon this. They are satisfied the provider has reflected on their potential for apprenticeships but are reliant on UEL's progress before they can pursue this.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** The provider has agreed to recommend the Academic Board develops a policy to outline the sustainability and development of service users in the programme. This was discussed in [quality theme 7](#). The development of this policy should be reflected on in the providers next performance review

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:**

- The visitors stated the provider has robust mechanisms in place to monitor academic and placement quality. There is positive triangulation between the commentary provided and the evidence provided in the documentation to evidence this
- The programme team have shown their responsiveness during the pandemic to uphold a positive student experience, whilst also implementing several innovations in learning and teaching practice as acknowledged by learners.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
  - The provider responded to the pandemic through new guidelines to support learners, assessments delivered virtually and development of hybrid learning models. Whilst the disruption caused by the pandemic clearly saw new challenges to the quality of learner engagement, the provider has developed appropriate initiatives and working practices to minimise disruption.
  - They adapted their extenuation policy to take account of the pandemic. They put additional resources and support in place for learners, so there was space to reflect on links between teaching and practice and

to ensure staff would be aware of any challenges faced and able to help learners to respond to these proactively.

- There was some negative feedback with relation to the limitations of remote learning and communication, but the provider has endeavoured to address these issues throughout this period.
  - The visitors were satisfied the provider has responded appropriately to the challenges posed by the pandemic, suitably supporting learners and addressing issues as they arise.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
    - Prior to the pandemic, the provider was developing technology to accommodate learner needs and feedback regarding the accessibility and resources on the programme.
    - Evidence was provided of programme adaption through technology throughout the pandemic restrictions. The provider reviewed feedback on an ongoing basis to determine any influence on plans for delivery moving forward. Management of learning, teaching and assessment during the pandemic, provided a catalyst for developments in the use of online technology to enhance the learner experience.
    - Learner feedback and evaluation reflects a positive experience with staff and learners adopting a partnership approach.
    - The visitors were satisfied the provider has adapted their use of technology appropriately to learner feedback and the challenges posed by the pandemic.
  - **Apprenticeships –**
    - This is covered in the providers approach to horizon scanning, therefore in this section the visitors have reviewed the providers intentions for the future. Please see [institution self-reflection](#) section.
    - The provider is no longer pursuing the apprentice pathway and therefore there were no considerations to be made.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** The visitors identified the programme team have responded positively to enabling student learning throughout the pandemic. A report provided identified a range of proactive and responsive actions within university-based and practice education settings.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
  - As the HCPC-approved programme is a UEL validated programme, the provider operates all local Quality Assurance processes in compliance with UEL regulations and the UK Quality code. All changes made in

response to updates to the code are communicated via UEL, which we explored in [quality theme 5](#).

- The provider has in-house expertise provided by the Academic Registrar who is a Higher Education professional, and regularly undertakes process reviews to ensure they follow existing and new developments.
- The visitors were satisfied the provider has appropriate communication channels and roles responsible for reviewing new developments in the UK quality code.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
  - The provider engages with professional bodies;
    - the British Association of Art Therapists (BAAT),
    - the United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy (UKCP), and
    - the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy (BACP).
  - This provider has an understanding of the requirements of the professional bodies who are integral to maintenance and development of the programme. The roles of the professional bodies are outlined clearly, and there are 5 yearly reviews.
  - An external moderator is appointed to the programme to monitor ongoing developments from this review.
  - The visitors were satisfied the provider is maintaining appropriate relationships with relevant professional bodies and has the process in place to ensure regular monitoring and reviews.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Curriculum development –**
  - When the provider reviews the curriculum each year, they follow relevant standards or education, policies, guidelines, and advice from appropriate professional bodies and regulators.
  - They use a range of processes to assure the currency and development of the curriculum. These include recent publications, research findings, best practice guidelines, and feedback from a range of stakeholders. These include staff, learners, practice educators and service users. The concerns the visitors had regarding programme modifications was addressed in [quality theme 6](#). The provider had outlined areas of change to the curriculum and the process for reviews by UEL. They highlighted the addition of the social injustice module in all programmes.
  - The visitors were satisfied the programme undergoes a range of formal reviews, which provide scope for appraisal of the current curriculum and overall programme delivery.



- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
  - The provider maintains positive relationships with their two professional bodies (the British Association of Art Therapists and the UK Council for Psychotherapy), whom they state they align their policies and guidance. to. During the pandemic they used guidance from these bodies to develop their own practice guidelines which learners, placement staff and clinical supervisors found very supportive.
  - The visitors agreed the provider has beneficial relationships with the professional bodies they work with, and effectively work with them to inform the development of their programme.
  
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
  - The provider has a placement coordinator who has developed methods of identifying new placement opportunities and builds strong working relationships with existing providers. They also plan to appoint a placement administrator to help increase the capacity of the current role to source and approve new placements.
  - The provider has outlined placement capacity in their region has not posed an issue, and they have the staff roles in place to manage current and future placements. A range of developments are detailed to support the ongoing capacity of placements required for the number of learners.
  - The visitors are satisfied the provider has ensured appropriate placement capacity for learners and has put the staff in place to continue to provide placements whilst developing existing relationships.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** The visitors noted the positive development of the introduction of the social injustice module into the curriculum of all programmes. Both visitors agreed this was a very positive addition as a way of embedding equality, diversity and inclusion into the curriculum.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learners –**
  - The provider outlined the reoccurring issues which were identified by learners through feedback during the review period. In response to the issues, the provider summarised the actions they have taken to address them. For example, timely responses to the adaption to online teaching and introduction of virtual software for teaching in response to learners identifying challenges with training remotely.
  - Through their response to the pandemic, including a range of initiatives and responses to learner feedback, the provider has shown learners and their experience are a priority.

- The visitors were satisfied the provider has a range of methods in place to ensure learners inform the development and enhancement of the programme, and the provider is proactive in addressing feedback.
- **Practice placement educators –**
  - The provider regularly collects feedback from practice placement educators through regular contact, but do not have a formal feedback mechanism in place. In response to feedback from the visitors (discussed in [quality theme 8](#)) the provider plans to send an annual Practice Educator Annual Placement Review Form to obtain more formal feedback.
  - The placement coordinator initially reviews all feedback from practice educators/ clinical supervisors and maintains on-going communication with them about the placement. Feedback is shared with the programme team and considered in end of year staff meeting when procedures, documents and policies are being reviewed.
  - The visitors were satisfied the provider has appropriately reflected on their mechanisms to gain feedback from practice placement educators. They are satisfied moving forward there will be both informal and formal feedback captured from placement educators, which will help to obtain positive practice and potential underlying issues at placements.
- **External examiners –**
  - The provider has appropriate systems in place to obtain external examiner (EE) feedback and recommendations. The latest report continues to review the programme as performing to expectations in most areas, with several areas of positive practice highlighted.
  - The EE did not identify any areas which required action or issues. The provider appears to have a good, productive relationship with the EE.
  - The visitors were satisfied the provider continues to work with the EE in a productive capacity, with suitable processes in place to received feedback and recommendations.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Data and reflections

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Aggregation of Percentage of learners not continuing:**
  - The provider has supplied internal data, showing they maintain a continuation rate of around 97%. This percentage dropped during the pandemic, which the provider identified was down to the impacts of restrictions. They have introduced tracking in order to monitor patterns and trends and identify early intervention. There is no data supplied for the aggregation of percentage of those who complete programmes in

employment/further study, Teaching Excellence Framework or National Student Survey.

- **Programme level data:** Learner numbers have stayed constant over recent years. The provider has recruited further staff to ensure stability of teaching and developed resources to enable teaching to adapt to last minute staffing cancellations. They have brought the deadline for admissions onto the programme forward to enable time to review systems, recruit and train staff and plan for the programme.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

## Section 5: Issues identified for further review

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

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

## Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

### **Assessment panel recommendation**

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

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

**Reason for this recommendation:** Overall, the portfolio was completed well and showed good reflections from the provider. It clearly showed their progress and performance during the review period. Due to the lack of comparable data points available for this provider, we recommend the maximum review period of two years.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

<b>Name</b>	<b>Mode of study</b>	<b>Profession</b>	<b>Modality</b>	<b>Annotation</b>	<b>First intake date</b>
MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy	PT (Part time)	Arts therapist	Art therapy		01/10/2013