

1.8 'Cyber Essentials' certification

The University of Manchester provider is security certified under the 'Cyber Essentials Scheme', most recently on 13.2.19. This certification will be maintained throughout the period of the contract award and will apply to all subcontractor institutions.

1.9 Delivery failure management

Potential delivery failure will be identified by the project director through monthly monitoring and PMB meetings. In almost all imaginable scenarios, delivery failure will be averted through proactive remedial action and support. The current and future intended project director (Prof Kevin Woods) has a proven track record in dealing proactively and successfully with potential delivery failure points within ITEP contracts.

Actual delivery failure relating to any contracted KPIs will be managed by the project director in full consultation with the PMB. For example, in the highly unlikely event that one of the consortium universities ceases an ITEP programme, currently registered students would be allowed to complete the programme and planned allocated places would be shared among the remaining consortium partners.

1.10 Management of trainee deferrals, interruptions and withdrawals

Successful applicants may not defer entry to the programme based on any factor known to them at time of application (including time of interview). Registered trainees may interrupt their studies for reasons and periods specified by their university regulations. In all cases, a clear plan for return to studies will be agreed between programme director and trainee.

Withdrawal from the programme may be required by the university, or sometimes negotiated between the trainee, the programme director and the DfE.

DfE will be notified of all interruptions, potential withdrawals and withdrawals.

1.11 Contract exit proposals.

The table below illustrates the contract exit plan as applied to any NOREMIDSW university based upon a notional cohort size of 10 trainees:

	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025	(Sept 2025)
Year 1	2020 cohort	2021 cohort	2022 cohort	–	–	–
Year 2	–	2020 cohort	2021 cohort	2022 cohort	–	–
Year 3	–	–	2020 cohort	2021 cohort	2022 cohort	–
Qualified EPs to Workforce	–	–	–	2020 cohort	2021 cohort	2022 cohort
Dedicated	Programme	Programme	Programme	Programme	Programme	–

Staffing	Director	Director	Director	Director	Director	
	Dedicated Administrator 1.0fte	Dedicated Administrator 1.0fte	Dedicated Administrator 1.0fte	Dedicated Administrator 0.67fte	Dedicated Administrator 0.33fte	–
	Academic and Professional Tutors (APTs) (>2.33 FTE)*	Academic and Professional Tutors (APTs) (>2.33 FTE)*	Academic and Professional Tutors (APTs) (>2.33 FTE)*	Academic and Professional Tutors (APTs) (≈ 1.6 FTE)*	Academic and Professional Tutors (APTs) (≈ 0.77 FTE)*	–

1.12 Successfully partnership working within NOREMIDSW and with other ITEP providers, organisations and EP employers

NOREMIDSW's twice yearly PMB meetings bring together representatives of each training university with representatives of each principal educational psychologist (PEP) network within each subregion of the consortium. PMB meetings allow ongoing monitoring and co-ordination of ITEP strategy and operations across the consortium.

From 2019, NOREMIDSW will extend the collaboration of the involved university programmes in three distinct ways:

- 1. Learner involvement in the training programme.** This involves an expectation that on all training programmes. This will include: trainee representation at and through all meetings of staff/student committee, programme Board of Studies and PMB; trainee involvement in design and delivery teaching sessions where appropriate, particularly those entailing inter-professional learning.
- 2. Research commissioning partnerships** with a range of service users, with a focus upon evidence-based interventions (see programme content, section 2 below).
- 3. Practice placement quality enhancement through service user and carer involvement** (see practice placements, section 3 below).

All NOREMIDSW consortium universities and their regional placement provider networks have built strong working relationships over many decades. UEA, the new NOREMIDSW partner, has quickly established supportive relationships within the Eastern region. In many cases, recent programme HCPC approval / BPS accreditation reports comment specifically upon the quality and effectiveness of these working relationships. For example, the BPS recently commended The University of Exeter's ITEP programme for *'The strong links with local psychological services in organising and participation in the South-West Educational Psychologists (SWEP) conference, shared learning symposia, road shows, and in-service training for placement providers, which benefits both trainees and the local community services in their learning, development, knowledge exchange and networking'*.

NOREMIDSW PMB will continue to welcome other and new providers both to the

ITEP academic community and, where appropriate, to NOREMIDSW specifically. As previously, NOREMIDSW will continue to work extensively with other ITEP providers on external examination coordination and collaborative research projects. NOREMIDSW programme directors attend regular meetings of all ITEP programme directors coordinated by the BPS.

1.13 Ensuring graduates' employment as HCPC registered EPs within an English local authority educational psychology service (EPS) for at least two calendar years immediately post graduation

Each successful applicant will be required to sign an agreement prior to admission which confirms their understanding of their obligations in this respect. The funder's employment requirement will be reiterated to trainee EP cohorts, and academic and practice placement supervisors, during each year of each ITEP programme. Through NOREMIDSW programmes, only English local authority EPS vacancies will be promoted to trainee EPs.

ITEP course content and delivery quality

Please describe and evidence how you will successfully design and deliver a level 8 Educational Psychologist postgraduate qualification, accredited by Health Care Professions accredited course. Please provide an outline of the course content and detail what the programme will involve for intakes in 2020, 2021, and 2022. What will you offer students of the Educational Psychologist programme?

Your evidence should include but not be limited to:

- quality assurance plan / proposals to ensure the delivery of the course and to demonstrate that the requirements of the contract will be delivered to the highest standards
- which geographical regions of England (according to the definitions found at attachment 4) you intend to operate within. You should explain where the training will take place, in which Local Authorities Placements will be offered to students, and how this addresses need in those areas. No particular region will be given more credence or prioritized over another by the DfE in the evaluation process, but it is crucial you demonstrate how you are addressing EP shortages and in which regions.
- how you will maintain up to date course curriculum to reflect changes in policy direction, the needs of employers of EP services and service users
- quality assurance, including and how you plan to acquire HCPC accreditation within the allotted timeframe of one year between contract agreement and contract commencement
- milestones and the steps required to achieve them
- trainee support
- the quality of the practice placements
- the range of experiences made available to students to support the training content
- supervision arrangements during both academic and L.A practice placements
- how you will work in partnership with other training providers, organisations and employers of EP services to improve the ITEP courses
- monitor and achieve satisfaction ratings that exceed 90% of trainees rating the programme good or above

Weighting: 25% of Technical Requirements

2. ITEP Programme Content and Delivery

2.1 Expertise and reputation for efficient and effective programme delivery

The eight training providers are all located in universities with local, regional and international reputations for excellence in teaching and research. All eight providers performed very strongly in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) exercise with all providers achieving over 70% of research being ranked as internationally excellent. For example, Sheffield and Manchester Universities' Schools of Education research environments have been ranked as being 100% world-leading and/ or internationally excellent. Such environments support the ITEP academic teams to develop world-leading and internationally excellent research to support the practice development of trainee educational psychologists (EPs). Similarly, The University of Manchester holds an international reputation for excellence through funded research into special educational needs and therapeutic interventions, also with strong links with the International School Psychology Association. The Birmingham ITEP tutor team are members of the largest educational psychology-related department within the UK, being internationally renowned for its research in disability, inclusion and special needs, professional learning and development. All members of the consortium bring distinctive and complementary strengths from the academic disciplines of both psychology and education. Each has a comprehensive infrastructure, with excellent student services, library and ICT support and a great depth of staff expertise in the work of the programme tutors evidenced in the range of research projects and publications. The collective consortium expertise ensures that ITEP takes place across a range of vibrant and successful academic communities, greatly enriching the quality of academic, professional and personal learning for trainee EPs.

Consortium members have an established record of collaborative working with each other to enhance the contribution applied educational psychology makes to the Government's education, special needs and mental health agendas. The consortium arrangement supports exchange of expertise amongst partner programmes, enhancing trainee learning experience quality across the consortium as a whole,

without seeking to homogenise ITEP programmes to a point where they lose individuality and capacity to innovate or to respond to local contextual drivers. Collaborative projects have been undertaken by consortium universities on problem-based learning, person-centred planning, supervision, therapeutic interventions and psychometric testing, alongside developments to strengthening service user involvement in all aspects of training.

2.2 Approved and accredited programmes with robust quality assurance

All NOREMIDSW programmes are HCPC approved so that, upon completion, trainee EPs are eligible to apply to become registered practitioner educational psychologists. All programmes are also BPS accredited, marking an enhanced level of quality assurance, and allowing trainee EPs eligibility to apply for admission to the BPS's Register of Chartered Psychologists upon completion of their programme. As such, all NOREMIDSW ITEP programmes are subject to BPS and HCPC regulatory processes, which include quality assurance checks in relation to the curriculum (including placement provision), staffing and resourcing of programmes, and the HCPC mandatory Standards of Education and Training (SETs) specified by the HCPC. All programmes have satisfied these standards and successfully maintained approval by the HCPC and accreditation by the BPS as providers of ITEP; all programmes are fully committed to maintaining both HCPC approval and BPS accreditation throughout the period of this ITEP award.

All NOREMIDSW ITEP programmes have within the last review period received BPS commendations on their training provision quality. For example, The University of Manchester programme was commended upon its impressive generation of new professional knowledge and dissemination relevant to ITEP, and upon its responsive and needs-led mental health strand. Similarly, The University of Nottingham was commended by the BPS for a culture, ethos and structure that empowers trainee learning and enables them to take control of their own development and professional identity.

All eight universities have in place a range of robust accountability mechanisms for quality assurance and enhancement, in full compliance with The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's comprehensive procedures and subject benchmarks within the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. The consortium ITEP programmes are governed by this regulatory framework, and related institutional protocols. Annual external examiner review of programme standards assures and attests to the high quality of the training provided. For example, The University of Birmingham programme external examiner 2017-18 report identified that student feedback highlighted very positive student experience and the highest regard for programme staff team expertise. Students valued the relationship between staff and students, founded on very high levels of care, skill and support from staff seen within a collaborative ethos. Similarly, external examiners noted that the Newcastle University programme is of a consistently high standard and that students there are

intellectually challenged and well supported in their progression. The University of East Anglia programme external examiner notes that all programme activities effectively develop trainee EPs' ability to make links between psychological theory and practice.

2.3 Maintaining a dynamic and responsive curriculum

Educational psychology practice is dynamic and evolving: it is shaped by developments in knowledge produced within the parent disciplines of psychology and education, and by the changing national and local policy contexts within which psychological services are delivered.

Consortium programme providers have developed a clear understanding of the opportunities and requirements of the 2014 Children and Families Act and the associated SEND Code of Practice. Through the National Association of Principal Educational Psychologists (NAPEP), NOREMIDSW ITEP programmes each have well-established links with regional networks of principal educational psychologists (PEPs). Programme directors attend regional PEP meetings and regularly consult with PEPs regarding workforce planning and policy developments affecting educational psychology practice and ITEP.

All consortium programmes have both formal and informal processes to support curriculum development and renewal, ensuring that trainees are fully equipped to manage the demands that will be placed upon them once qualified. These include periodic elicitation of structured feedback about service development needs from regional employers, from placement supervisors, from trainees themselves, and from the tutor team, who are themselves, practising EPs, and in many cases, members of national committees, third sector organisations. Each programme also has in place open channels of communication between trainees, employers and practice placement supervisors and the programme team.

Through their routine liaison with stakeholder groups, as required by BPS programme accreditation criteria, programme tutors are engaged in a continuous cycle of planning curriculum developments, including developments to placement experience, to ensure that ITEP provisions remain responsive to, and anticipate, the needs of employers and services. Programme teams are fully informed of the changes in the national and local policy context, EP service delivery and management. Recent curriculum adaptations across consortium provision has included:

- Extended preparation for the requirements of EP traded services, e.g. extended consultation and training skills
- Development of range and skillset of evidence-based interventions such as CBT, VIG and VERP
- Development of skills for supporting person-centred planning
- Development of service user engagement contributions to planning and delivery of teaching

For example, guided by appropriately trained and experienced tutors, the use of Video Interaction Guidance (VIG), an intervention endorsed by NICE, has been promoted on several NOREMIDSW programmes to promote student resilience, enhance communication with children with SLCN, enhance parent / teacher mutuality, and support foster carer involvement in children's education. In Manchester, in response to identified local services' need, a specialist EP tutor for CBT has been appointed to advance the development of CBT skills within the programme.

Developments to placement provision are integral to curriculum development such that changes to delivery within the university are complemented by changes to the programme of work negotiated for supervised practice placements. Recent developments have seen increased supervised practice in settings such as colleges of further education and youth offending institutions, and with vulnerable young people as they transfer from child and adolescent to adult services. Teaching experiences include practical and experiential sessions, structured pre- and follow-up reading, whole cohort events on current or specialist topics (e.g. gender; dynamic assessment), optional visiting speaker sessions delivered by specialist EPs and representatives of other disciplines, site visits, trainee-led sessions, problem-based learning and practice simulation activities. Notably, The University of Sheffield's ITEP programme's recent BPS accreditation report notes the breadth, range and integration of the inter-disciplinary learning on the programme as a particular strength, with an integrated curriculum that gives trainees the opportunity to study alongside peers from other disciplines and professions, including clinical psychology, speech and language therapy, medicine, social work and teaching.

2.4 Trainee support

Trainee support is a central provision to all of the NOREMIDSW ITEP programmes. For example, the Bristol Programme's BPS accreditation report notes that the programme team remain mindful of trainees' individual developmental needs and supports trainees effectively in managing these. Similarly, The University of Exeter programme ethos is highlighted to develop culture and values that nurture trainees to develop independently, allowing them to take control of their learning. HCPC SETs stipulate specific requirements for the provision and quality assurance of placement learning. Accordingly, consortium programmes maintain registers of placement supervisors and provide regular training in supervision, which placement supervisors are required to attend (see practice placement response section). Members of the consortium academic staff have conducted research to evidence the qualities of supervision in order to inform and enhance the experiences of both trainee EPs and placement supervisors in the UK and beyond. The outcomes of this research, including a developed model for accountable practice, have been published in internationally recognised academic journals to enable wider access and

impact.

For the academic and research components of their training each trainee is provided with a personal tutor and academic supervisor for the period their training, and a designated research supervisor during years 2 and 3 of their training. Regular supervision meetings are held between university supervisors and trainees, with records kept of discussions and outcomes. One specific advantage of the ITEP programme team is that each cohort of trainee EPs has access to a team of 6-12 academic and professional supervisors, extending the available breadth of expertise and support for each trainee in addition to their dedicated university and placement supervisors.

2.5 Working in partnership

The primary partner organisations consortium universities currently work with are:

- local authorities' educational psychology services and other approved settings in which trainee EPs undertake supervised professional practice;
- regional schools, nurseries and early years settings, colleges of further and higher education, academies and free schools, pupil referral units, and alternative and secure provisions;
- health and social care providers of services for children and young people.

Each of the NOREMIDSW programmes have also shown a keen willingness to develop and share resources and expertise, both within and outside of the consortium, for the mutual benefit of employers, trainees and the ITEP sector as a whole.

Recent HCPC requirements to strengthen service user involvement in all aspects of training and to develop inter-professional education have expanded the range of stakeholders and partners with whom programme tutors are developing shared working practices, which further contribute toward the quality and relevance of the student learning experience and the learning outcomes achieved. The Nottingham programme's BPS 2018 accreditation report commended the programme's culture of support and collaboration at all levels, described by stakeholders themselves as a 'transactional partnership', supporting trainees to develop partnerships across a range of settings. The University of Manchester has recently engaged an assistant programme director with special responsibility for service user engagement and social diversity who is leading on the inception of a programme service user reference group, a development which may then act as a resource/ reference point across NOREMIDSW.

2.6 Research commissioning and enhanced dissemination of ITEP research

The development of research commissioning and thesis linked to publication is a nationally unique achievement within ITEP. Combining consortium principles of partnership working and responsiveness to employer and stakeholder needs, The

University of Manchester has successfully trialled the innovation of explicit 'research commissioning' through ITEP. In this model, the research capacity of trainee EPs is linked to evidence needs within local educational psychology services, schools and organisations such as the North-West group of PEPs (NWAPEP). For example, in the past two years, trainee EPs have taken up commissions such as:

- NWAPEP-commissioned evaluation of the DfE-funded regional support response to the Manchester Arena bomb
- EPS commissioned evaluation of EP activity to promote community cohesion
- Local authority commission to evaluate school development response to ACE-aware training
- Manchester primary school commission to develop and evaluate rights-informed transition to secondary school
- International Play Association commission to evaluate play provisions for children in different UK jurisdictions
- Regional Early Years Interest Group commission to evaluate evidence for elicitation of the views of non-verbal young children and to develop a best practice protocol

Harnessing the capacity of ITEP research through trainees' doctoral thesis requirements enhances the relevance and utility of trainee research. Building on this, The University of Manchester has also trialled since 2016 a move to doctoral thesis by preparation of manuscripts for publication, by which the research from each trainee's doctoral thesis is translated directly to journal publication. This has improved dissemination rates from a national average of about 10% to over 80%, with each trainee EP producing two published journal papers from their thesis research. This huge step change in ITEP research dissemination has greatly enhanced out ITEP's contribution to the field of practice as represented by educational psychology services and the wider SEN community.

Following the successful trial at The University of Manchester, programmes across NOREMIDSW are now exploring the feasibility of extending research commissioning and publication from ITEP research throughout the consortium programmes. There is an ambition to co-ordinate ITEP research capacity to enhance the scale and scope of the contribution of ITEP to the evidence base for practice for educational psychology. As part of this, we are looking for larger organisational commissioners to co-produce longer term programmes of research in key areas of educational and public concern such as exam stress, community cohesion, equity in educational participation, and student self-harm. In shaping the research agenda and contribution from NOREMIDSW, we have had preliminary discussions with The Association of Educational Psychologists and NAPEP and would very much welcome discussions with the SEN team at DfE to consider how the Department's considerable

investment in ITEP funding might be utilised to provide research and publication aligned to Departmental priorities.

2.7 Monitoring student satisfaction

All programmes have in place processes through which formative feedback from and satisfaction levels of trainee EPs are sought. On each NOREMIDSW programme, there are regular, scheduled meetings between trainees and tutors, and written feedback is provided by students at both group and individual levels. This feedback is collated, evaluated and, where appropriate, acted upon with written feedback provided to the students on the programme team's feedback evaluation and contingent actions. Peer supervision meetings, as well as personal tutorials, offer further contexts through which trainee feedback is communicated, considered and acted upon. BPS comment on the Sheffield Programme that 'the level of engagement and co-production between the programme team, trainees and service users (parents/carers) in supporting the training of educational psychology is exemplary' further illustrate the integral place that trainee and service user perspectives and feedback have within the development and delivery of NOREMIDSW consortium programmes.

Practice placements

Please provide details on how you will plan and deliver high quality and sufficient regional distribution of practice placements throughout the course

Your response should include, but is not limited to:

- Any current placement provider relationships
- The provider shall proactively seek to address any trainee shortages by ensuring Local Authorities within the Provider's immediate region are supplied with a trainee.
- Evidence of an understanding of provider responsibilities for securing practice placements and showing that you have a strategy in place for ensuring that practice placements can be secured for all trainees
- To identify and put in place all necessary arrangements for each trainee to undertake placements that meet HCPC standards within Local Authorities.
- How you will assure the quality of practice placements according to Health Professions Council guidelines
- How you are willing to support the placement accreditation process
- the support you will make available to both trainees and practice placement providers
- Providing evidence for the steps you have taken to ensure that Local Authorities in greatest need have had trainees on placement

Other key points that should be considered in your response include:

- evidence of working in partnership with local authorities and plan for building strong relationships to secure practice placements
- how training provider(s) will ensure value of money and examples of previous similar activity
- quality assurance plans/proposals to ensuring a high-quality practice placements experiences for trainee

Weighting: 25% of Technical Requirements

3. Planning and delivering high quality practice placements throughout the three years in training and ensuring sufficient distribution across local authorities

3.1 Background information

The seven established educational psychology programme providers from the NORMIDSW consortium of universities have longstanding, close working relationships with the local authority educational psychology services within their respective geographical regions, which have formed a resilient foundation for the generation of an equitable allocation of high quality supervised practice placements for all trainees registered at regional and cross-regional consortium levels.

In March 2019, the University of East Anglia (UEA) joined the NORMIDSW consortium to constitute NOREMIDSW, with placement viability for its students supported through the strong commitment of all local authority educational psychology services within the Eastern Region. The addition of the UEA programme and Eastern Region local authorities into the consortium extends the strengths and benefits of the consortium approach detailed below.

3.2 Securing practice placements and responding to local need

Close working relationships with regional partners have ensured that NORMIDSW has a strong track record of securing high quality practice placements for all TEPs. Since its formation NORMIDSW has been able to ensure that all TEPs requiring placements in the region have been allocated appropriate placements. Having quickly established strong working relationships in the Eastern region UEA also has a clear commitment from regional partners to ensure the continued provision of high quality placements. In 2013-14, through its partnerships with key stakeholders, NORMIDSW developed a consortium wide process to enable early and proactive identification of sufficient Year 2/3 bursary placements and their transparent allocation. This firmly established process enables TEPs to be allocated a placement either within their training region or elsewhere within the consortium in the knowledge that it has been assessed as meeting the nationally agreed requirements for placement set out in the Practice Placement Partnership Framework. This framework was first developed in 2012 by the Initial Training of Educational Psychologist National Steering Group in England, and updated in collaboration with all key stakeholder groups at regular intervals since. The Practice Placement Partnership Framework (PPPF) aims to ensure 'equality of placement provision for all trainee EPs in England and to promote best practice'. The allocation process ensures:

- an agreed, simultaneous date for placement allocation within the consortium (and currently with the other consortium, SEEL);
- the establishment of, and rigorous adherence to a transparent, consortium-wide process that has clear written criteria for the allocation of placements and adopts common timescales and documentation, whilst allowing for regional flexibility;

- a commitment to prioritising students with additional needs or challenging personal circumstances, such as caring for dependents, student illness, or an illness within a student's close family/ significant others; and
- a key role for placement providers in placement allocation, ensuring attention to the differential needs and capacity of services within each region and enabling prioritisation for local authorities experiencing shortages of trainees.

The alignment of processes ensures that trainee preferences are considered simultaneously by regional placement panels. Decision-making in the allocation process follows a graduated process where matching of trainees to placement offers is first undertaken at *regional* level, prior to the *consortium-wide* resolution of any provisional decisions and/ or anomalies, followed by the final *inter-consortium* allocation of trainees to any unfilled placements. This allows for individual cases and service needs to be considered with care, which a more diffuse, 'blind' allocation process would mediate with less sensitivity. The inclusion of the UEA programme within the consortium consolidates and extends the capacity of the consortium to flexibly deploy the provision of trainee educational psychologists for employment across the regions of England according to need/ service shortages (see section 1 above – ITEP programme management).

Feedback from NORMIDSW trainees about the placements allocation process has been very positive and the process has been perceived to reduce anxiety for trainees. There has also been a high level of commitment from placement providers, which have, in some instances, increased the number of supervised practice placements offered in order to accommodate particular 'spikes' in regional need/demand. The capacity to reconcile anomalies by drawing upon consortium-wide options, rather than being bounded by regional constraints has proved invaluable in enabling resolution of a small number of geographical challenges.

The development, implementation and refinement of collaborative placement allocation systems has been a key consortium activity over recent years and has produced successful outcomes for placement providers, reconciling their regional affiliation to their local university with their appreciation of the benefits of exposure to the ideas and innovative methods and practices fostered by other consortium universities. For students, the well-managed accommodation of needs has contributed to the very high completion rates which have been maintained across the consortium.

Through regional local authority principal educational psychologist (PEP) meeting forums and the consortium management board meetings, the universities monitor and update placement allocation processes, which are reviewed and refined each year at both regional and consortium levels. Universities have also worked

collaboratively with regional partners to maintain and build placement capacity, for instance where understaffing compromises services' capacity to offer the sustained support required for placements. For example, The University of Newcastle worked with PEPs in the North-East, harnessing the role of Fieldwork Tutors who, alongside University-based work, oversee Year 1 placements in their employing EP service to support placements in neighbouring services which had previously been unable to provide Year 1 placements. This facilitated positive placement experience for trainees and, over time, increased both service momentum and trainee interest placements for Years 2 and 3, at the same time strengthening the working relationship between the services and between each service and university.

3.3 Meeting HCPC standards

All NOREMIDSW universities are approved by the HCPC and clearly demonstrate that they meet the following HCPC Standards of Education and Training (SETs):

- The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency. (SET 5.2);
- The education provider (i.e. the university) must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning (SET 5.3);
- Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users (SET 5.4);
- There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning (SET 5.5);
- Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register (SET 5.6); and
- Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme. (SET 5.7).

The above SETs are addressed through a comprehensive range of strategies. Well-supervised professional practice placements are integral to all programmes; for instance, the BPS stipulates that at least 300 days should be spent on placement over the course of three years. The universities within the consortium ensure that trainees work alongside, and receive a high standard of supervision from, experienced, HCPC-registered EPs, who have been selected for this role on account of their competence and commitment, and who are supported by university-led supervision, training and support. All trainee EPs will experience a minimum of three practice placements in the course of their three years' full time postgraduate training. Placements are chosen and structured to ensure careful graduation of demand, and progression and coherence of learning, ensuring progress toward the

standards of proficiency (SOPs) set for practitioner psychologists by the HCPC and the learning outcomes specified by the BPS.

In order to ensure the standards of the HCPC are met, universities ensure that placements are regularly monitored through a range of activities including initial 3-way meetings between the provider, student and University tutor at the start of placements; telephone contact with placement providers and placement visits. These activities ensure that the placement continues to be a safe environment for learning with appropriately qualified and experienced staff supporting the trainee EP. Each HEI also provides regular training for placement supervisors, these activities include opportunities for induction and feedback.

NOREMIDSW universities have a proven track record in addressing difficulties on practice placement, which has been realised through robust monitoring processes. When placement issues have arisen universities have addressed this proactively by providing additional support to supervisors and/or trainees, additional practice placement visits and ultimately withdrawing placements where this is in the best interest of the trainee and/or provider. Following withdrawal of placements universities have worked with regional providers to ensure a seamless transition to a new placement with additional support for the trainee. Continued proactive work with providers where placements have been withdrawn has also enabled measures to be put in place to address any placements capacity issues and joint monitoring of any future placements to ensure that these are successful.

3.4 Quality assurance and placement accreditation

Current HCPC approval of the programmes offered by all consortium providers affirms that the HCPC is fully satisfied with programme conformity to HCPC SETs, including SET 5, which specifically details requirements for the management and quality assurance of practice placements.

The consortium is committed to the full implementation of the PPPF, which was derived from liaison with the National Association of Principal Educational Psychologists (NAPEP), the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) and other stakeholders throughout its development and successive revisions, alongside development of processes to ensure its implementation. These include: negotiating a placement partnership agreement with the training provider and placement provider; set-up meetings at the start of each placement; regular placement agreement reviews through 'three-way meetings' between the placement supervisor, university tutor and trainee. Quality assurance of placements is ensured by use of clear criteria to inform selection of placement supervisors and by surveys of trainee EP and supervisor placement experience, findings of which are used to inform developments and improvements to placement management.

Quality assurance is mediated through collaborative partnership which endeavour to build on strengths and further enhance quality, rather than a more critical or 'inspectorial' orientation. For example, to cite a recent BPS programme accreditation report (University of Bristol: May 2017), "The programme team puts considerable effort into maintaining constructive relationships with placement providers. The support and training available to supervisors is excellent, and is highly valued by all". Similarly, local authority placement providers in the North-West have also been developing and piloting a peer-to-peer quality assurance process. Feedback on this process will be useful in informing future consortium strategies for enhancing quality assurance processes.

3.5 Support to trainee EPs and practice placement supervisors

The consortium programmes provide regular training for supervisors to ensure that they are familiar with the PPPF and programme requirements for supervising trainee educational psychologists. In addition to this programmes have collaborated (e.g. the universities of Manchester and Birmingham) to develop in-depth competency-based supervisor training which further enhances supervisor skills and, in the case of the Manchester training, provides further accreditation for supervisors.

Regular placement visits and liaison between university tutors and placement providers further contributes toward collaborative working between universities, trainees and supervisors. In addition to regular informal and formal contact, supervisors and trainees are made aware of processes for addressing concerns. Through both placement and university supervision, the consortium university programmes actively support trainees in managing placement demands and expectations. Trainees with additional needs are encouraged to work with the programme team from the outset to ensure that reasonable adjustments are made to all aspects of the programme to ensure their needs are met. Adaptations to placement have included adjustments to working patterns and access to specialist equipment and IT packages.

3.6 Allocation of places according to need (see also 'ITEP Programme Management' response sub-section 2.2)

The consortium has established relationships and procedures to support successful, flexible and efficient placement planning and delivery. These relationships and procedures operate at both regional and consortium levels. There are existing informal processes and criteria aimed at providing placements to educational psychology services (EPSs) in greatest need, which have been understood and developed within the regional local authority educational psychology service partnerships. In future, we will continue to allocate places to universities and practice placements to local authority EPSs in accordance with need, insofar as regional practice placement capacity allows (see Table 1 above)

However, there is no simple currently available and agreed metric which reliably indicates need/ potential shortage within EPSs. Neither child population, nor EP:0-19 yrs CYP ratio, nor EP:0-25 yrs CYP ratio, nor EP vacancies, nor statutory assessment levels, nor traded work potential, alone are reliable indications of EP shortage and service need. In addition, a current 'ideal' EP:CYP ratio is not available. Therefore we will undertake development work in partnership with local authority regional NAPEP groups across all of the NOREMIDSW regions to identify a best fit formula by which to calculate an agreed 'index of need' to be applied to each local authority EPS. A 'task and finish' group, comprising representatives of each consortium university and each NAPEP regional association, will complete this work between July-Nov 2019 and regional allocation calculations from local index of need data will be made by Feb 2020. NOREMIDSW universities have already considered possible formulae by which an index of need may be calculated, and a process by which this would then be applied to allocation, so the task and finish group will be able to engage quickly with the task.

3.7 Ensuring value for money and examples of previous similar activity

Since the NORMIDSW consortium began operations in 2013, it has successfully trained over 200 educational psychologists for England (over 200 more are currently registered to complete training by 2021). All the constituent programmes in the consortium have been evaluated very positively by both the BPS and HCPC. The consortium programmes have experience and expertise in securing a very high completion rate, to ensure that public funding for training is well spent.

The consortium has a track record in delivering high-quality, value for money professional training. The consortium remains committed to continuing this in the future.

Recruitment to ITEP

Please provide details and evidence as to how you will manage the application and recruitment process, recruiting to your allocated numbers and retaining high quality candidates from a diverse range of experiences.

Responses should include, but not be limited to:

- How you will design and implement a fair and equitable application process that shall determine the suitability of any applicants applying for the course having due regard to each applicant's individual merits.
- Evidence of your specialist knowledge in assessing whether an applicant could successfully complete the course to HCPC standards
- Make available an online application portal for trainees available 24/7 except in reasonable downtime agreed with DfE. (If an applicant is unable to apply online, the Provider shall make available a paper-based application form or if required a braille paper application form)
- provide a detailed plan on how you will have the capacity to support the full application process and support trainees
- design and implement a fair and equitable application process that treats suitably qualified candidates solely on the basis of merit and includes an online portal
- How you will recruit the allocated numbers while retaining high quality candidates from a diverse range of experiences
- Ensure all successful candidates meet the entrance criteria and understand fully all of the conditions of funding
- how you will have the capacity to support the full application process and support trainees during the process / post selection

Other key points that should be considered in your response include:

- providing a detailed recruitment plan highlighting training providers internal structures and processes which will support the application process and how these will support value for money
- details of your diversity policy and monitoring including plans for ensuring that recruitment to the course will attempt to address any imbalances
- details of the processes in place to ensure that Disclosure and Barring Services checks are in planned and organised by the training providers prior to the start of the course
- details about the process and support available for trainees with particular reference to deferrals and withdrawals

Weighting: 15% of Technical Requirements

4. Recruitment to ITEP

4.1 Introduction

The consortium universities can provide evidence of effective management of all aspects of the application and recruitment process and of having adapted easily to system changes to the coordination of the application process and allocation of funding to successful candidates. Recruitment across all programmes includes University tutors and relevant stakeholders; experienced HCPC-registered senior and principal educational psychologists (PEPs) (representing placement providers), and representatives from other core service user groups (such as parents or head teachers) within each recruitment team and in the ongoing development of the process. Effectiveness of this process is clearly demonstrated through the consortium's performance to date within the ITEP application process run by the Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP) and the proportion of trainee educational psychologists (EPs) who successfully complete their training and register with the HCPC (95.65% for 2012-2014 cohorts).

The consortium universities are committed toward continuing to support a rigorous and fair application process, and to working with the AEP to ensure that applications can be made, considered and outcomes reported in a timely manner, fully in line with the schedule published each year by the AEP.

4.2 Ensuring a fair and equitable application process which has due regard to each applicant's individual merit

All universities operate and monitor recruitment and selection processes which adhere to the rigorous equality and diversity policies of each institution and are fully compliant with current legislation. All consortium staff and stakeholders contributing to the process, have access to and undertake, as appropriate, relevant recruitment, equality and diversity and selection training.

In order to address any imbalances in recruitment, each programme takes the following steps:

- collaboration with regional educational psychology services (EPSs) to offer promotional activities that support community access to information about the EP role and initial training, for example Birmingham University, in collaboration with Birmingham City EPS offers Open Events and school/community events to encourage young people from the city to consider a career in educational psychology;
- reviewing trends in the profile of applicants and successful applicants in partnership with service user representatives, and utilising analyses to refine existing arrangements and inform future outreach work;
- actively encouraging applications from those living in regions and localities with an under representation of EPs, e.g. the North-East, Yorkshire and Humber,

Cumbria. In the East region 91% (2018-19) and 90% (2019-2020) are from the region.

- ensuring pre and post admission that trainees are routinely, and as needs arise, directed toward, and able to access: information and support for minority groups, students experiencing hardship or health difficulties; disability assessments and reasonable adjustments.

All programmes hold accreditation from the British Psychological Society, having demonstrated that each conforms fully to *Programme Standard 3: Selection and entry*, which aligns with *Section 2 of the HCPC's Standards of Education and Training*, outlining the standards that programmes need to meet in relation to their selection and admission procedures.

Overall, accreditation affords evidence that equality and diversity policies and their implementation and monitoring in recruitment, selection and the delivery of programmes is judged to conform to the exacting standards of the Society and the HCPC regulatory frameworks.

4.3 Evidence of specialist knowledge in assessing whether an applicant could successfully complete the course to HCPC standards

During short-listing written applications are checked by members of the recruitment team for evidence that all core eligibility criteria relating to pre-requisite foundation skills underpinning the achievement of HCPC standards are met. Decisions about selection outcomes are informed by multi-method assessment, through which candidates' performance is assessed against a set of explicit criteria. All offers of places (and ranking on the waiting list) are made on the basis of assessed performance against these criteria.

4.4 Make available an online application for applicants available 24/7 during the agreed recruitment period each year

The consortium work closely with the AEP to ensure that an effective online portal (plus paper based and braille applications) is available for all applicants. The Association's officers' and General Secretary's attendance at ITEP programme directors' meetings, and an annual Educational Psychology Funded Training (EPFT) liaison group meeting enable discussion of the selection process. The online portal process is reviewed through these meetings and any issues relating to access and accessibility are resolved. Once the portal is open individual universities work closely with the AEP and applicants to resolve any queries in a timely manner.

4.5 Capacity to support the full application process and support trainees during the process post selection

The scale, duration and necessary rigour of the application process has high time costs and requires efficient management to ensure availability of external stakeholders and allocation of staff time and expertise to the selection process. Careful timetabling ensures deployment of staff to ongoing teaching and trainee EP support alongside selection (see management of deferrals and withdrawals, sub-section 1.10 above).

The following are in place to support the application process.

Staffing

Each consortium university has:

- *(a) programme director(s)* to coordinate the application process, liaise with AEP, recruitment team and administrative support staff;
- *a dedicated programme administrator* to operate the Central Application System, receive and respond to initial enquiries from prospective applicants, and update the System to ensure that all records and decisions are accurately maintained;
- *academic and professional tutors* to support capacity to evaluate applications, interview candidates, and record and communicate outcomes;
- *strong partnerships with regional providers of educational psychology services.* Working relationships are well-established across the regions covered by consortium universities, to ensure that principal and senior HCPC-registered EPs contribute fully to the selection process; and
- *strong partnerships with service user representatives, parents, young people and school staff* who advise on the process and/or participate directly in selection panels at individual universities.

Internal structures and processes

Within each University, the tutor team and programme administrator ensure:

- provision of accessible information for prospective applicants on-line, freely-available prospectuses incorporating links to other relevant sources of information and organisations;
- processes through which inquiries from candidates are addressed expeditiously;
- robust compliance with NCTL / AEP time frames for processing applications, including:
 - liaison with stakeholders, to check the detail of selection criteria and arrangements, and to organise moderation and selection panels membership for short-listing, interviews, and final decisions re: allocation of places and ranking of waiting-list candidates;
 - communication with candidates throughout all stages of the selection process;
 - provision of timely feedback to candidates not shortlisted, and to those not offered funded places following interview; and
 - clear pre-admissions processes and events for successful applicants.

These well-established processes embedded within existing programme arrangements ensure a high quality recruitment process and value for money.

4.6 Recruitment of the allocated numbers while retaining high quality candidates from a diverse range of experiences

For each university across the consortium, the number of applications from eligible candidates has continued to grow and far exceeds the number of places.

Following our promotional activities, shortlisting and interview processes all consortium universities have easily filled places with highly competent students, characterised by a rich diversity of past life, academic and professional experience: a mix which, in itself, affords a rich resource to support academic and professional learning of all members of each trainee cohort.

4.7 Ensuring all successful candidates meet entrance criteria and fully understand the conditions of funding

All universities adhere to published criteria comprising the nationally agreed essential characteristics set out in the Applicants' Handbook, along with institution-specific criteria negotiated with regional stakeholders, against which they consider applications, and evaluate performance during selection activities.

All participating Universities have fair and rigorous 'in house' procedures which are followed within the short-listing and interview procedures.

One core function of the short-listing process is to check the written application for evidence that all core eligibility criteria are met: no applicant would be offered an interview, were essential criteria not satisfied within the shortlisting process.

Those candidates invited to attend for interview are required to provide photographic evidence of their identity, along with copies of relevant certification.

Documents are scrutinised by selection panel members to ensure core eligibility criteria (specified in the ITEP Applicants' Handbook) are met, if a candidate's application is to be considered further.

In interview invitation letters, candidates are invited to apprise the University of any additional needs that may compromise participation, were reasonable adjustments not made. Any such disclosure is then followed up and reasonable adjustments made as required. Candidates are assured that any disclosure of additional needs would not compromise their application.

Information events and interview days provide interviewees with opportunities to review programme facilities, ethos and provisions, to meet tutors and trainees, and ask questions that may inform their decision-making. Key information about ITEP requirements is made available to all applicants in written information/ events and links to the applicant Handbook. All shortlisted candidates are briefed orally and/or in writing about key information in the ITEP online Applicants' Handbook.

Offers of places to candidates are framed as conditional offers, requiring processing of a health declaration and the **child and adult DBS check** as core conditions for confirmation of an unconditional offer. DBS checks are undertaken by each university prior to admission.

Reporting and contract management

Please provide details on how you will monitor performance and manage the collection of data / information requested by DfE.

Responses should include but not be limited to:

- The actions you plan to take to address any potential causes of concern which may be raised by trainees / employers / regulators in the course of delivering the programme
- Your commitment to provide monthly reports to DfE updating on recruitment, deferrals, placements and any other areas of concern raised by candidates
- Bidders shall submit a security plan that explains how they will ensure that DfE's data and the personal data of individuals will be protected
- How you may incorporate feedback and lessons learnt following each application process
- Any other data collection requirements outlined in the specification
- Examples of process / systems in place to provide accurate reports and information
- Demonstrating how your organisation will propose to monitor and manage data systems including compliance with data security requirements
- How you will support the implementation of any review of training agreed recommendations

Weighting: 10% of Technical Requirements

5. Reporting and Contract Management

This section focuses upon reporting to the DfE and contract management. It comprises six sections linked to the ITT criteria.

5.1 Potential causes for concern

All providers of professional training within NOREMIDSW engaged with the contract delivery will adhere to the requirements of three key documents with regard to addressing potential causes of concern::

- The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) Standards of Education and Training (Standards – 3.5; 3.7; 3.8; 3.12; 3.13; 3.15; 3.16; 3.17; 4.2; 5.4; 6.6 apply)
- The British Psychological Society (BPS) Programme Standards (Standards – 1.4.7; 1.4.8; 1.4.9; 2.1.4 2(k); 2.1.4 10(i); 2.4.1; 7.4; 8.2.1; 8.2.2; 8.2.3 apply). These standards are based upon those framed by the Quality Code on setting and maintaining academic standards (www.qaa.ac.uk) and finally the
- Practice Placement Partnership Framework (PPPF) (Sections Managing Difficulties pp8-9 and Roles and Responsibilities p16 apply).

Additionally all providers of professional training will adhere to internal quality control processes, including those described in 8.2.

The compliance of NOREMIDSW with these key documents set by external regulators is reviewed annually by the HCPC and six yearly by the BPS. The internal monitoring of education provider processes is reviewed annually. NOREMIDSW programmes also undertake regular review with regional PEP groups which facilitates discussion of any general concerns relating to trainee placements; processes for addressing trainee concerns are described in sub-section 3 below.

5.2 Provision of data to the Department for Education (DfE)

- *Trainee educational psychologist progression and cohort management: monthly returns*

Under the terms of the previous contract awards, the NORMIDSW ITEP consortium and the University of East Anglia have maintained excellent track records in reporting and contract management in a period since 2012 to the present time. On behalf of the new NOREMIDSW consortium, The University of Manchester will, at the end of each month, use a standard pro forma and collate data about each trainee within the consortium programmes from all consortium members as follows:

- any absences of more than one month's duration (giving trainee number, Year group, reason for absence, and university)*;
- any withdrawals from the programme, either by the trainee or by the education provider*;
- information about any trainee whose studies are currently deferred, and anticipated date of return;
- the location of each trainee's placement (i.e. placement provider) during the preceding term;
- expected date of completion for each trainee currently enrolled; and
- date of graduation and addition of trainee name to the HCPC pass list.

* The consortium will provide detailed information using the DfE's standard pro

formas in relation to each individual trainee who is absent for a period of more than one month, or who is withdrawn, or withdraws, from their programme of study.

On behalf of the consortium, The University of Manchester will also provide annual reports on progress against key performance indicators specified within the requirements of the contract.

- *Trainee educational psychologists' destinations*

At the end of the third year of training of each student cohort, The University of Manchester will provide the DfE with details of the known employment destination after completion of each trainee EP from each NOREMIDSW university.

- *Responses to trainee educational psychologist feedback*

All members of the consortium will support the DfE in conducting its satisfaction survey of final year trainees. On behalf of the consortium, The University of Manchester will provide the DfE with the results of the survey carried out by members of the consortium.

In responding to TEP feedback representatives of the consortium will also attend relevant management meetings that may be convened by the DfE and, as appropriate, support the work of any ITEP National Steering Group.

5.3 Examples of processes and systems to provide accurate reports and information:

As noted in Section 4 above, all consortium universities have in place well-developed systems for monitoring trainee recruitment, identifying under-represented groups, and using these data to plan a response.

Regular progress monitoring includes:

- punctuality, attendance and progress within both the university and practice placement contexts;
- maintaining records which are used to inform periodic reviews in dialogue with trainees in the context of regular personal, academic and research supervision meetings with university tutors, and
- regular placement-based review and planning meetings between the university tutor, trainee and placement supervisor.

A range of other mechanisms exists which ensure reliable information exchange in relation to trainee performance, trainees' own satisfaction with the trainee experience and addressing trainee concerns. These include:

- regular meetings between each trainee cohort and representatives of the tutor team, with minutes taken and circulated to tutors, trainees and the university programme administrator;
- collation of trainee participation and engagement data in the form of attendance records and written trainee feedback on aspects of the learning experience;
- records of university and placement supervision sessions;
- records of the regular 'three-way meetings' between each trainee and her/his university tutor and placement supervisor, in which progress and development targets are routinely set, reviewed and refined, alongside noting any identified concerns and the agreed action plan to address these and monitor progress; and
- outcome data (in relation to the assessed components of consortium ITEP programmes).

5.4 Data security

In compliance with the Data Protection Act (2018) and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (2018) , and all appropriate security standards, all members of the consortium are able to ensure that all data will be secure and segregated from any data not related to this project.

Each consortium university has secure IT network storage. Each member of staff has a unique account that allows her/him access to university computing facilities. Data will be stored in each tutor's own secure location on each university's network storage; access to this location will be restricted to those staff participating in the ITEP work contracted by the DfE .

In line with current practices within all eight consortium universities, any portable IT equipment (USB devices, laptops and iPad) will be fully encrypted in compliance with Cyber Essentials certification standards.

Only anonymised data will be shared between institutions, and all emails containing sensitive personal data will have those data encrypted to the required DfE standards. Reporting data containing personal information which is passed between subcontractor universities and the contract holding university, and between the contract holding university and the DfE, will be encrypted.

All paper documentation will be kept secure and, when not in use, stored in locked cabinets and, when no longer required, disposed of using confidential waste disposal procedures.

Data on trainees, including information on health or disciplinary matters, will be destroyed after 10 years, but a skeletal record, which will include a full transcript of academic achievements, will be retained for reference purposes.

All education providers adhere to the standards set by the contract holder and a review of the standards is carried out each month. The standards will meet those set out in Attachment 3 Departmental Security Standards as set out in the invitation to tender documentation

Across the consortium and The University of East Anglia, data systems are reviewed each month and there have been no breaches of security on the current contract; this will be maintained within the new NOREMIDSW consortium. The education providers are mindful, and active in the implementation, of the latest cybersecurity precautions as detailed in the Board Toolkit published by the National Cyber Security Centre (<https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/section/information-for/public-sector>)

5.5 Reviewing the application process

Each NOREMIDSW institution will provide interviewed candidates with the opportunity to feedback anonymously regarding their experience of the application process and to raise any concerns. Also, panel members involved in the interviewing process are, and will continue to be, asked for feedback. This feedback will be discussed by the programme team and brought to a programme management board meeting and the EPFT liaison group meeting with the AEP and DfE should any issues be relevant to all providers.

5.6 Supporting the implementation of any review of training agreed recommendations

The NOREMIDSW institutions will support the implementation of agreed recommendations following any programme or sector review, provided that the recommendations fall within the remit of the current contract. The mode of implementation would be through discussion at the programme management board, with careful checking that the recommendations did not compromise the programme providers' compliance with the HCPC and BPS standards before making necessary changes to the existing provision.

Contract Costs - weighted 30% of overall bid score

Please provide details of your costs and how you will provide value for money

The Response section below is allocated to allow you to provide a written response in relation to your costs and articulate any necessary clarifications. In addition, **you must complete the Cost Matrix**, providing a full breakdown and detailing of your costs.

Key points of consideration

- You must use the cost matrix to identify all programme costs.
- You must identify if VAT will be chargeable and at what rate
- Any bid with a management charge of over 15% will be excluded from the evaluation process.
- Pricing will be evaluated on the total cost per participant for a three-year course. There is a finite amount of funding available for this contract.
- You must provide a total cost per participant for all three cohorts (2020,2021,2022).
- You must provide a full breakdown of what these costs are made up of including tuition, supervision and staff / management costs. If you have included infrastructure / I.T. / Administration aspects within your costs then you must provide a clear breakdown showing of these costs.
- If you have not been clear with costs, DfE reserves the right to clarify any costing assumptions within their submission.

Response

The costing has been based on a cohort of 123 students per year.

To keep within budget and give value for money no central charges have been included for students or premises. The credit amount under students is the HEFCE PGR supervision income that is credited to the University each year, so this has reduced the costs on the bid.

The staff central charges include contributions to central university costs for HR, finance, library, IT, compliance and risk and the President's Office. This figure is based on the University of Manchester teaching rate from the 16/17 TRAC return. No inflation has been included on this figure.

Staff costs are as per the staff student ratio on the costing template and the assumptions tab. Pay inflation of 2% has been included.

Other costs relate to general non-pay running costs of the programme and have been

itemised on the costing template. No inflation has been included.

All costs have been divided equally between each cohort (so 33% each cohort).

Total cost per participant for all three cohorts (2020,2021,2022) including a bursary in year 1 is:

