

The Association of Child Psychotherapists

CAN Borough, 7-14 Great Dover Street, London SE1 4YR

+44 (0) 020 7922 7751

admin@childpsychotherapy.org.uk

www.childpsychotherapy.org.uk



Report

of the Association of Child Psychotherapy (ACP) 2022 re-accreditation visit to

the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust

This report is in three parts:

Part One: Background to the accreditation visit p.1

1.	Dates and Panel Members	p.1
2.	Training council link member	p.1
3.	Independence of the panel	p.1
4.	About the Tavistock Training (<i>with information from the Tavistock Report</i>)	p.2
5.	Timing of the visit	p.2
6.	The key lines of enquiry were:	p.3
7.	Documents, meetings and observation of teaching and placements	p.4
8.	Actions since previous re-accreditation report - an update on the Training School's progress with the previous action plan	p.5

Part Two: Report on the training delivered in 2022 in relation to the ACP quality assurance framework p.6

1.	Training School Management and organization	p.6
2.	Staffing and effective use of resources	p.10
3.	Curriculum	p.11
4.	Use of learning outcomes	p.12
5.	Trainee selection, progress and achievement	p.13
6.	Trainee support	p.14
7.	Trainee placement learning and teaching	p.15
8.	Assessment	p.17
9.	Qualification	p.17
10.	Quality enhancement and maintenance	p.18
11.	Values, equity and diversity	p.19
12.	Personal Analysis for trainees	p.20

Part Three: Conclusion, commendations, conditions and recommendations p.22

Authors:

Dr Jonathan Bowden-Howl
Dr Andrew Dawson - *Panel Convenor*
Sarah Gilmour
Gweneth Kirkwood
Charlotte Pitt

Part One: Background to the accreditation visit

1. Dates and Panel Members

Date of visit

23rd and 25th May 2022 with additional placement visits during the three weeks beginning 16th May 2022.

Names and roles of panel members

- Dr Jonathan Bowden-Howl, Child Psychotherapist, Recent Graduate of the Tavistock Programme
- Dr Andrew Dawson, Professional Lead for Child Psychotherapy, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde.
Panel Convenor
- Sarah Gilmour, Lay Non-Executive Director, ACP
- Gweneth Kirkwood, Psychoanalytic Parent Infant Psychotherapist and Highly Specialist Child and Adolescent Psychoanalytic Psychotherapist
- Charlotte Pitt, Child Psychotherapist and representative of the ACP Training Council

2. Training council link member

- Isobel Pick, Chair of the ACP Training Council.

3. Independence of the panel

The ACP accredits five training schools. The Tavistock training is one of the largest child psychotherapy training school in the UK. The appointment of the convenor and panel members involved a rigorous process to ensure that the panel and process was as independent as possible.

The panel time and independence was supported by their NHS employers who provided dedicated time for the accreditation visit. In line with the ACP quality assurance document, the expectation of the supporting health trusts was that the panel members would be independent and accredit a training that produces high quality graduates able to work in contemporary CAMHS services and meet the clinical needs of children and young people using NHS services. When recruiting the panel the following factors were considered: No panel member is involved in the delivery of the Tavistock training or employed by the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust. Any connection with the Tavistock or the Tavistock training was declared to the panel convenor and the Training Council Link member, Isobel Pick. One member of each accreditation panel is a recent graduate and in this case we recruited a recent graduate who is not employed by the Tavistock and Portman Trust. One member of the panel is a Lay member of the ACP Board and, in this case, has a legal background.

The panel time for the accreditation was supported by: Specialist Children's Services NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde; City and Hackney Specialist CAMHS; Birmingham Women and Children's Trust, Forward Thinking Birmingham; The Dragonfly Tier 4 CAMHS Unit & Norfolk and Waveney LAAC CAMHS Team, both within Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust.

4. About the Tavistock Training *(with information from the Tavistock Report)*

The course team, jointly led by Sarina Campbell and Phillip McGill delivers the Clinical Training in Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy and Professional Doctorate M80. The M80 course sits within the Directorate of Education and Training (DET). The DET then sits within the wider Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust that also provides clinical services. The academic aspect of the training is delivered in partnership with the University of Essex. The clinical placements for trainees are delivered via a wide range of partnerships with clinical services across England and the UK.

M80 sits within the Psychoanalytic Clinical and Forensic Portfolio, within the DET. At the point of writing, it has 79 current trainees across the four years of the programme, with many more who are post-qualification and registered to complete their Doctoral studies with the course academic partner the University of Essex, and with the University of East London, the previous partner.

Health Education England (HEE) funds the M80 training in a per-trainee allowance for training costs, topped up by an additional annual amount. Many of the core course team and the wider teaching team are also clinicians working within Tavistock and Portman or other NHS trusts.

5. Timing of the visit

We appreciate that this review is taking place in the context of unprecedented levels of professional and personal stress relating to the pandemic and this includes the whole Trust as well as students and course staff.

The re-accreditation panel therefore put trainee and staff well-being at the centre of the re-accreditation and we have endeavoured to take all of the stresses into account in preparing the report.

The accreditation visit was delayed twice at the request of the Training School. This was for multiple reasons including difficulties related to the pandemic and the many demands that the training school was managing, relating to using distance learning and work. In addition, the whole Trust was undertaking a strategic review that put many demands on the staff and students. The training school was also responding to developments from Health Education England who were commissioning future trainings that required a great deal of planning and negotiation. The final dates for the accreditation visit were therefore agreed for late May 2022, after the strategic review and completion of the HEE tendering process but before the results of either were announced.

The course leads provided an initial self-evaluation document in December 2021 and then provided supplementary information in March 2022. When the panel requested additional information, it was provided promptly.

Initially the accreditation was planned for dates when the trainees would be attending the school for in-person teaching. This was changed at a late stage as the timetable was not implemented as planned and the accreditation remained on-line. The panel meetings with the course team and students were therefore mostly online too. In this context, the panel made every effort to have an extra focus on placement visits. The panel were able to learn from a note from the previous accreditation visit that it was important to visit placements across the country as well as in London. This was to provide different perspectives on the trainee experience. Two members of the panel were also able to arrange an in-person tour of the Tavistock building and library.

As the visit to the training moved on-line, the panel made additional efforts to provide opportunities for trainees and staff contributing to the course to participate, and a series of on-line sessions were organised.

Letters inviting participation and providing a confidential email address for feedback were provided to the training school who sent the letters to the following groups: trainees, the course team, intensive case supervisors, service supervisors (placement providers) and teaching staff. Some of these meetings were in the two weeks prior to the accreditation visit. During the visit days, there were additional opportunities for trainees, student representatives and teaching staff to meet with the panel.

The change to an on-line accreditation visit did provide the panel with a sense of the scale and complexity of moving a large and complicated course to a digital model. The panel depended heavily on Bira Kawooya, course administrator, for her organisation and help. We would like to thank her.

As a result of the postponements, there was a full six years between accreditations. The panel convenor took advice from the ACP Training Council who considered this appropriate in the circumstances due to the pandemic, the Trust strategic review, the HEE tender and the fact that the new course leads, Phillip and Sarina, were in post from April 2021. The panel convenor met with the course leads on the 17th December 2021, then again on the 25th March 2022 and on the 29th April 2022 to agree the meetings with key stakeholders and placement providers.

The panel had a series of on-line meetings to discuss the Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and information received in relation to the ACP Quality Assurance Framework document. These sessions were on Monday evenings from the 31st January 2022. In total, there were eight meetings in advance of the accreditation visit: 31/01, 07/02, 14/02, 28/02, 28/03, 25/04, 09/05, 16/05.

From these initial meetings the panel identified key lines of enquiry that we shared with the training school and stakeholders along with the letters inviting them to participate in the accreditation.

6. The key lines of enquiry were:

- i. **Training School Management and Organisation.** The panel noted the multiple demands on the organisation identified in the self-evaluation document and considered this an exceptionally challenging environment, which may impact on the delivery of the training. We noted that the previous accreditation report mentioned that the Trust and DET was going through significant organisational change and six years on this seemed to be even more profound. We therefore asked to discuss the management of the training and also the organisational risk assessment and plans to ensure the continuity of the training. We requested a meeting with the portfolio manager and a representative of senior management or CEO.
- ii. **Staff and Trainee Well-being.** The panel noted the multiple stresses on staff and trainees relating to the pandemic, organisational reviews, current affairs and curriculum changes. We therefore wanted to gather evidence of how staff and trainee well-being was addressed. This included looking at the resources in place and also the staff and student experience of these resources. We wanted to discuss the complaints procedure, the content of trainee surveys and how the organisation responds to the surveys.
- iii. **Diversity, Equal Opportunities and Inclusion.** We noted the new leadership approach in relation to diversity, which builds on previous work in this area. We wanted to gather more evidence of how this works in practice and to hear more about inclusion and equal opportunities. This includes recruitment, trainee experience and plans for the future. In addition to the documentation provided, we requested a dedicated meeting with the course leads to discuss this topic.
- iv. **Trainee Progression and Qualification.** The panel wanted to look in detail at student progress, how competencies were evidenced, how intensive case supervisors, placement supervisors and tutors contribute to the qualification process, and the student experience of this. The panel requested that case examples were provided and to be guided through the process.
- v. **Opportunity Cost of Curriculum Development.** The panel noted the pressures on the curriculum in relation to developing research, diversity, infant mental health and other specialist areas. We wanted to explore what had been reduced to make this possible and to get feedback from multiple sources about any impact the changes may have made.

7. Documents, meetings and observation of teaching and placements

Emails

A confidential email address was provided for participants who wanted to raise confidential issues or for those who were unable to attend the scheduled meetings. We received three items of note. One relating to the curriculum, one addressing concerns about communication, and one that raised a perplexing experience for one trainee. The latter of these was offered a follow-up individual meeting, which took place on the 23rd May 2022.

List of Documents:

- Annual Report to the Training Council of the ACP (2019-20)
- Confidential M80 Self Evaluation Document (December 2021)
- Data Protection Policy
- Equality, Diversity, Inclusion Policy
- Information Governance Policy
- M80 and NSCAP Equalities Action Plan Following University of Essex Periodic Review (2020)
- M80 Course Handbook (2021-22)
- M80 Feedback Form (2021-22)
- M80 Year 1 Timetable (2021-22)
- M80 year 2+ Timetable (2021-22)
- Procedure for Safe Management of Participants and Volunteers
- Safeguarding Children Policy
- Safeguarding of Adults at Risk Policy and Procedures
- Student Complaints Procedure
- Supplementary information to update SED - 28th March 2022
- Tavistock and Portman Student Protection Plan
- The Placement Handbook (2020-21) - *which remained unchanged for 2021-22*
- UEL Appeals Procedure Flowchart
- University of Essex Exam Board Appeals Procedure

Supplementary documents provided on request:

- Annual Report to the Training Council of the ACP (2020-21)
- Course Committee Minutes (March 2021)
- Course Committee Minutes (June 2021)
- Course Committee Minutes (December 2021)
- M80 Annual Review of Courses report for (2021-22)
- M80 Annual Student Survey (2021)
- M80 Guide to Timetable Requests (2021-22)
- Tutor memo re: clinical qualification process (2021 -22)

List of Meetings

Tuesday, 10th May - 5pm-6pm

Tuesday, 17th May - 3pm-4pm

Wednesday, 18th May - 2pm-2:45pm

Thursday, 19th May - 2pm-3pm

Thursday, 19th May - 3pm-4pm

Monday, 23rd May - 12pm-1pm

Monday, 23rd May - 1:30pm- 3:30pm

Monday, 23rd May - 4pm-5pm

on-line meeting with **trainees**

online meeting with **service supervisors**

online meeting with **Antje Netzer-Stein, Analytic Liaison**

online meeting with **Portfolio Manager, Anne Hurley and Associate Dean, Elisa Reyes-Simpson**

online meeting with **intensive case supervisors**

online meeting with **course leads and senior team with examples of student progression**

online meeting with **the course team**

confidential online meeting with **trainee**

Wednesday, 25th May

Panel members attended the following seminars and meetings during the teaching day

11:30am seminars:

- Parenting Workshop. *Anya Suschitzky*
- Trauma Workshop. *Louise Allnutt*
- Diversity Workshop 3 - *Mel Serlin and Phillip McGill*
- Narcissistic structures workshop. *Gianna Williams & Roberta Mondadori*

1pm-2pm - some panel members met with the student reps and trainees.

1pm-2pm - some panel members met the teaching staff.

2pm seminars:

- Year three theory with *Alberto Hahn*
- Year one theory with *Kate Robertson*
- The research seminar with *Brinley Yare*
- The final year seminar with *Phillip McGill & Sarina Campbell*

3pm-4pm - The panel met with course leads to clarify specific issues and discuss diversity and inclusion.

5pm-6pm - The panel met the course leads and senior team, for initial feedback and clarification of issues.

List of Site/ Placement visits

These are the places we visited, and we would like to acknowledge the time that the CAMHS teams gave us and thank those who took part. In the report, information gathered during visits is referred to without reference to the source.

Friday, 13th May & Tuesday 17th May

one panel member visited Marlborough CAMHS online. A CAMHS team servicing a rural area.

Thursday, 19th May

one panel member visited Bedford CAMHS, in person.

Friday, 20th May

two panel members met online with Kensington & Chelsea CAMHS.

Thursday, 26th May

two panel members visited the Tavistock Clinic and Library, including meeting with one of the library staff, in person.

Friday, 27th May

the panel member cancelled an on-line visit to Belfast CAMHS but received detailed feedback by email.

Monday, 30th May

two panel members visited Hammersmith & Fulham CAMHS, in person

8. Actions since previous re-accreditation report - an update on the Training School's progress with the previous action plan

There were no conditions from the previous accreditation visit.

The following recommendations were made in the 2016 report and reported on in the SED:

- i. That the Tavistock reports on the impact of organisational change on the smooth running and management of the M80 programme, in particular how changes to administrative support are working in its next annual report (2016) to the ACP.

→ Action: This was included in the 2016 annual report to the Training Council. Complete.

- ii. That the Tavistock amends section 2 point 11 and 12 of the new 'Placement Handbook' to improve clarity and reduce any ambiguity relating to trainee progression.
→ *Action: The handbook was amended for the start of the 2016-17 Academic year. Complete.*
- iii. That the Tavistock adopts a more formal approach to developing its future M80 teachers and tutors and puts a succession plan in place by April 2017.
→ *Action: The Tavistock created a strategic plan for this in Spring 2017. Complete.*
- iv. The panel recognises the actual and future potential of using Advanced Technology Learning systems in supporting the learning, personal and professional development of trainees, teaching staff and service supervisors and the Trust continues to explore with ATL staff to realise what MOODLE has to offer.
→ *Action: The work of Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) is an on-going project in which the M80 programme is fully engaged, with regular updates. Changes were made for the 2016-2017 intake, which addressed the concerns described in the accreditation report. TEL continues to develop at the Tavistock, with upgrades and changes made year on year, which the programme continues to engage with. Complete.*
- v. That the staff team continue to review the process of matching trainees and placements so that trainee concerns are addressed.
→ *Action: This was in place for the recruitment of trainees since 2016.*
- vi. That the M80 management team requests resources from the Trust to provide additional expertise to support them in developing and implementing a comprehensive equality and diversity strategy and action plan.
→ *Action: Consultation with the Tavistock Equalities Committee. Development of a course strategy in conjunction with Trust-wide action in this area. Implementation of the strategy. This was achieved by the appointment of a diversity lead for the programme to develop and implement the strategy. Complete October 2018.*

Part Two: Report on the training delivered in 2022 in relation to the ACP quality assurance framework.

I. Training School Management and organization

Criteria

- 8.1.1. The Training School should have in place a clear, transparent organisational structure which ensures efficient management of the training and delivery of the curriculum. It should have a sufficient degree of permanence in its establishment and organisation to enable entrants to commence a training course, which is normally of minimum four years' duration, with confidence.
- 8.1.2. The Training School should monitor the circumstances of their own sustainability and viability and have plans in place, detailing the measures and initiatives being undertaken in the immediate and the longer term, to address any concern and to protect its future.
- 8.1.3. The organisational management should include systems and processes to ensure good communication between the Training School, service supervisor, training case supervisor and analyst as well as clearly delineated roles and responsibilities.
- 8.1.4. The Training School should have clear, transparent policies and procedures to indicate how it meets the requirements of all relevant legal frameworks, including Data Protection, Information Governance and Equal Opportunity.

- 8.1.5. Information about any issues arising from the Training School in relation to compliance with any of the relevant legal frameworks should be reported in the Annual report and in the Re-accreditation SED.
- 8.1.6. Where training schools are embedded in a host organisation, information should be included to indicate how the host organisation meets the requirements of legal frameworks which are relevant to the Training School and its functions.

Information was gathered from:

- A meeting with the portfolio manager and associate dean
- Feedback from teaching staff
- Meetings with placement providers and service supervisors
- Meetings with the course leads and course team
- Meetings with trainees
- Student surveys
- The SED and updated SED

Findings

The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust is a complex organisation that delivers a range of highly specialist mental health services as well as professional trainings through its Directorate of Education and Training (DET).

Key Issues From the SED

- The Directorate of Education and Training delivers a broad portfolio of University validated and Trust validated training with courses ranging from short 'awareness' programmes through to Masters and Professional Doctorates in specialist clinical and other fields. This provides a rich learning environment for the student community.
- Clinician tutors work alongside professional services to deliver teaching and training, led by the Dean of Postgraduate Studies; Operations Director; Associate Dean for Learning & Teaching; Deputy Director of Education and Training / Associate Dean, Academic Governance & Quality Assurance; and Director of Education and Training and Dean of Postgraduate Studies.
- The teaching is research and evidence-informed and through conducting their own research, the doctoral students contribute to the evidence base that informs future practice. The course is developed and delivered by clinician tutors, which aims to ensure the education trainees receive is relevant and up to date.
- The M80 training normally takes place in an NHS clinic across seminar rooms, a lecture theatre and consulting rooms, but also includes online elements. The course delivery has been mostly on-line since 2020 in line with government guidelines and clinical advice from the wider Trust.
- Since December 2020, the Trust has been recognised as a Higher Education Provider by the Office for Students (OfS). This evidences several important aspects of the academic offer, including the quality of course design; that qualifications hold their value over time in line with recognised standards and that the Trust has the management and governance arrangements necessary to provide and deliver the courses advertised. The Trust and its students also now benefit from a Student Protection Plan that is required to set out the risks to courses, how it will protect student and trainee interests and the future of the courses.

Key Issues from Student Feedback

Trainees were able to report a high level of appreciation of the organisation while also raising issues that they thought could be improved. In the context of mostly positive feedback, the panel heard from several sources that there were some communication issues that had caused concern. For example, during the strategic review, letters were sent to trainees employed by the Trust that suggested their jobs were at risk when this was not the case. Later decisions about returning to in-person teaching were not accurate, causing students some distress and financial costs.

Key Issues from the Course Team

- The staff team were clear that they felt supported by their portfolio manager and they did understand the need for the strategic review. At the same time, the review process had been stressful and prolonged, and this involved a lot of work from the staff team to ensure that the unique aspects and demands of the training were fully understood in the context of the strategic review. The staff team feared that trainees were aware of these dynamics with the Trust and noted how active the trainee group were in articulating their own voice as part of the review.
- During the pandemic, the training was able to move quickly to on-line delivery. This was possible because of previous investment in IT equipment prior to the pandemic and by the Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) service that helped to improve the quality of the on-line learning experience.

Key Issues from Meeting with Portfolio Manager and Associate Dean

- The panel appreciated the frank discussion about the current circumstances and the extreme pressure the whole Trust has been under since the pandemic and in the context of financial constraints.
- It is clear that the M80 training is longstanding and benefits from the historical stability and resources available in the DET and wider Trust. There is a trust-wide pride in the course and a clear commitment to sustaining and developing the training. The Portfolio Manager and Associate Dean were able to convey the extensive groundwork put in place to protect the course and secure its future in relation to the Trust Strategic Review. Student dissatisfaction with the process of the strategic review was discussed and the panel were informed that in response to student feedback, specific consultation sessions were held between the CEO and student groups and that this had been beneficial for both. While the panel were given assurances that the course had been protected in the strategic review, this was not published at the time of the accreditation.
- The Portfolio Manager and Associate Dean were well aware of the range of issues that impacted on their staff group and trainees. In relation to the return to in-person teaching, they made a clear commitment to this next term, noting that a return to buildings committee with a budget had been created. They were able to explain the additional difficulties of delivering the training within a clinical building, which meant some decisions were more complicated and not only driven by an academic agenda.
- A full discussion of the sustainability of the training included the nature of funding from HEE, with the Student Protection Plan, which guarantees that current students will be able to complete their full course. In relation to on-going funding, which is in the context of the wider trust finance, there are opportunities to continue and develop the course via a new round of tendering for the training commissioned by HEE and in line with the long-term plan for the NHS.
- Furthermore, the relationship with the M80 partner, the University of Essex was discussed in detail and examples given of good partnership working.

Panel Consideration

- The child psychotherapy training is at doctorate level and the University of Essex provides the academic governance. A previous academic relationship with the University of East London is ending and does not affect this accreditation phase.
- The panel were provided with good evidence that there is a strong and working relationship between key staff at the University of Essex and the DET. They were able to describe close collaboration and timely support when the DET needed to respond to HEE in relation to commissioning new training opportunities.
- The scale and complexity of the Trust, and the relationships between the Trust, the DET and the course team, can make it difficult for this structure to be clear and efficient especially at the time of a strategic review and with the many changes associated with the pandemic. Overall, there was a feeling that despite the long-term security of the training within the Trust, and the clear commitment into the future, the staff team and trainees did not benefit from the feeling of security that this should bring.

- The panel considered that the concept of efficiency should relate to the student experience as well as the issues of time and cost. The panel thought that the security of the training and trainees, which was evidenced, was not understood in full by the Trust HR department itself. Also, the unique aspects and demands of the psychoanalytic training seemed difficult to articulate to the Trust.
- One of the panel's key lines of enquiry was in relation to the multiple demands on the organisation identified in the SED. It was evident that many of the stresses listed in the SED were still active. Although the outcome of the strategic review was not yet published, we heard during our visit that the CEO and Dean had both resigned to pursue other opportunities or to retire. This had an obvious impact on the staff team and resonated with feedback from trainees and others that there was an organisational anxiety about the future and that communication often stirred anxiety rather than alleviating it. Of course, this all takes place against the background of the pandemic. The panel were left with some concern that, separate from the financial sustainability of the training there were real issues relating to communication about organisational change. The commitment of the course team was evident, as was their appreciation of the portfolio manager's work on their behalf. The panel hope that the Trust will be able to recruit to their most senior roles and provide more stability for the organisation.
- In relation to the safety and sustainability of the training, the Associate Dean was able to describe the security provided by the registration with the Office for Students and that, with the funding from HEE, each current trainee has a guarantee that they will be supported to complete their course. The panel thought that this was a high level of security for current trainees.
- As the panel do not have sight of the outcomes of the strategic review for the Trust or of the HEE commissioning process, we are unable to comment on the financial stability and sustainability of the Trust or Training in the longer term.
- The panel noted the many positives and the extensive resources that were made available to trainees and staff. Being part of the wider Trust also allows for many trainee placements to be offered within the clinical teams operating. These include CAMHS services and highly specialist mental health services.
- The panel recognises that the strategic review itself is evidence that the Trust is monitoring its own sustainability and viability and is planning for the longer term.
- The panel had confidence that many of the issues around communication had been explored by the DET, course staff, trainees, and the CEO. While there are many benefits of being part of a large organisation it is important that there are effective lines of communication with the Trust, DET and Course Team. It was clear that the course team and portfolio manager were continuing to educate others about the unique aspects and demands of a psychoanalytic training and give the trainees the benefit of the security that is delivered by the Training School.

Conclusion

The panel consider that these criteria have been met.

Some communication issues were identified that are addressed in [section 6 - Trainee Support](#), [section 7 - Trainee Placement Learning and Teaching](#), and [section 11 - Values Equity and Diversity](#).

Commendations

The panel heard positive reports from many sources that the TEL and Library teams have been an outstanding support to the course throughout the pandemic, supporting a fast change to practice in a crisis situation and helping to improve the quality of the learning experience for teachers and trainees.

Even in the context of the internal Trust Strategic Review and the tendering for HEE, we noted the registration with the Office for Students and that HEE funding is guaranteed for each cohort. Also, being part of the wider Trust offers many additional resources and opportunities for learning and development. We considered this to be strong evidence of the robustness of the training, even during exceptionally turbulent times.

Recommendations

- Update the ACP with the outcome of the Trust strategic review.
- Update the ACP with the outcome of the HEE tender.

2. Staffing and effective use of resources

Criteria

- 8.2.1. All teaching staff and supervisors should be appropriately qualified. There should also be evidence of continued professional development for tutors in their teaching role specifically. The training school should ensure that all staff are used effectively in the delivery of the training.

Information was gathered from:

- Meeting with trainees
- Meetings with service supervisors
- Meetings with teaching staff
- The Course Handbook
- The meeting with intensive case supervisors on the 19th May
- The meeting with the course team on the 23rd May
- The Placement Handbook
- The SED

Findings

The Tavistock has access to teaching staff and tutors who have many years of experience in clinical work, teaching and often in writing and publications relating to child psychotherapy. At the same time, the panel found evidence of effective succession planning with new course leads and other course staff at different levels.

There was clear evidence of CPD for staff and tutors. We heard in detail that there has been a focus on CPD in relation to difference and diversity and that this has involved monthly meetings. In addition to the resources provided from within the course, there are other opportunities relating to the wider portfolio within the DET and within the Trust as a whole.

The panel heard of the supportive work provided by the TEL department which was mentioned in [section 1 - Training School Management and Organisation](#). We have also heard from tutors and intensive case supervisors that in the early days of the pandemic the trainees managed to support staff who were not digitally native. We heard that the trainees appreciated the clinical expertise available, and the teachers appreciated the kindness and tolerance of the trainees, and also the support between tutors. The panel considered this collaborative approach to be an example of effective use of resources.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

Commendations

- For maintaining the breadth and depth of the expertise available to contribute to the course.
- To the trainee group for supporting tutors and staff in using online technology in the early days of the pandemic.

Recommendations

None. Please refer to the recommendation in [section 7 - Trainee placement learning and teaching](#).

3. Curriculum

Criteria

- 8.3.1. All Training Schools are to offer the curriculum set out in sections 5.0 and 6.0 of the ACP Quality Assurance Framework. Training Schools should ensure that their courses reflect the needs of current NHS practice and that there are processes in place for monitoring the quality of teaching, and should ensure that processes are in place to allow service supervisors to be involved in curriculum development.

Information was gathered from:

- Attendance at teaching seminars
- Email communication with the panel convenor
- Meeting with intensive case supervisors
- Meetings with placement providers
- Meetings with service supervisors
- Meetings with the Course Team and Teaching Staff
- The Course Handbook
- The SED

Findings

The Course Handbook outlines an ambitious curriculum that meets the core competencies for qualification. The SED did draw attention to the multiple demands on the curriculum and the panel therefore included the opportunity cost of decisions into our key lines of enquiry.

There were many tensions within the extended network of stakeholders in this regard and the key issues were as follows:

- In addition to the content of the curriculum, we heard that the theory seminars, which by tradition and practice have been 75 minutes duration, have been reduced to 60 minutes. This reduction was a decision of the DET executive in response to several factors. There were a range of views of this, mostly negative.
- The theme of difference and diversity had been advanced in the curriculum as an essential aspect of the training. There was a broad agreement that this was appropriate and welcome.
- There is an increasing emphasis on leadership and professional readiness for work in the NHS. Again, this is welcome as it is in line with the NHS long-term plan, and we had evidence that in practice the teaching is of a high quality and trainees felt that it was useful and necessary.
- We did get a picture from trainees, placement providers and intensive case supervisors that the current practice in NHS CAMHS is extremely demanding. Child Psychotherapists need to be able to operate as senior members of a CAMHS team. The clinical complexity of cases requires leadership from child psychotherapy. We also heard that trainees and graduates need to be able to manage cases where extreme trauma and neglect require a specialist response.
- The Tavistock does try to give trainees choices in relation to specialist workshops and this was appreciated by trainees.
- There were some stakeholders who thought that the weighting toward trauma-specialist practice was not sufficient, with the emphasis on other aspects of the training. The panel gave this some considerable thought and noted that trauma appeared as an implicit theme across many of the specialist workshops, and we wondered if this could be thought about in the module descriptions.
- The delivery of the doctorate as part of the training has had many impacts on the course and the trainee experience. We noted that trainees now have additional study leave in order to complete the research aspects of the training and this has meant some reduction in the number of clinical hours available across the year. However, the panel considered that this was a necessary development in order for the trainees to manage the many demands on them.

- The panel did think that the training had made many advances in integrating the research and clinical aspects of the training, which brought multiple benefits to the trainees and the profession as a whole. We noted the careful integration of psychoanalytic reasoning and research into the curriculum and the quality and creativity shown by the research leads from the Tavistock and from the University of Essex.
- Trainees took opportunities to note that they appreciated the quality of this teaching. This was also noted by panel members who attended seminars.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

Commendations

- This is a mature curriculum, and the students are offered high quality training opportunities and access to specialist workshops of a high standard.
- The leadership and creativity of the research leads has continued to integrate the learning opportunities from psychoanalytic reasoning into clinical work.

Recommendations

- A stakeholder group is created, including trainee representatives and placement providers from across the range of placements to ensure developments to the curriculum continue to reflect the demands of contemporary CAMHS services.
- The course team reviews each module to highlight, where appropriate, how trauma is integrated into the teaching to ensure that trauma specialised practice is adequately reflected in the curriculum.

4. Use of learning outcomes

Criteria

- 8.4.1. Details of the learning outcomes for all aspects of the training should be put in place and provided to the trainees.

Information was gathered from:

- Attendance at teaching seminars
- Meeting with course leads and tutors to discuss student progression
- The Course Handbook
- The Placement Handbook

Findings

- The documents reviewed showed the maturity of the training as the learning outcomes were detailed and appropriate, and clearly linked to the core competencies for training.
- The placement handbook, likewise, was clear and the competencies were clearly rated.
- There were some comments from the trainees that the Student Log was at times difficult to update, though many other trainees reported that this was not an issue.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

5. Trainee selection, progress and achievement

Criteria

- 8.5.1. Training schools should have in place robust, transparent processes for trainee selection as well as processes in place to ensure trainee progress and achievement towards competencies required for qualification. This should include:
 - a robust induction process
 - systems for monitoring of academic and clinical skills of trainees, developing towards the qualifying competencies;
 - a process for identifying early poor performance and/or special learning needs and subsequent support;
 - processes for monitoring placement experiences to ensure they are sufficient for trainees needs;
 - career guidance.

Information was gathered from:

- Course Handbook
- Meetings with trainees
- Placement Visits
- SED
- Service Supervisor Meeting
- Tutor and Course Lead Student Progression Meeting 23rd May

Findings

- While the documentation and delivery of a full induction process was evidenced and confirmed by trainees, the panel did note that this may have been more demanding during COVID-19 or if the induction was done virtually. Students who had an on-line induction were less confident that there had indeed been an induction. Also, there was a lack of clarity about who was responsible for some essential aspects of training, namely mandatory training for work in the NHS. We did not think there were any trainees who had not completed this but there was some confusion. The panel thought that this was complicated by the scale of the training and that some trainees are both students and employees of the Tavistock and Portman Trust, while others are students but employed by other trusts. We thought that this area of communication could be made more explicit in the placement handbook. We also thought that this drew attention to the need for an in-person induction process if this was at all possible, even if much of the training was required to be on-line.
- Course leads and tutors were able to guide the panel through the process toward qualification. We were shown examples of how decisions are made, the contributions from service supervisors, intensive case supervisors, tutors and the trainee. It is clear that there is good communication about student needs and progress that is focused on the mid-term and the annual review. These were the key meetings and reports and were shown to work well.
- We were guided through examples of what happens if a trainee is unable to fully meet the criteria in one area and how a portfolio approach can be taken in relation to intensive case work. The feedback from trainees was that these meetings worked well, and they did have sufficient information as they progressed and that tutors and service supervisors were sympathetic and helpful in making sure that they had access to the full range of training opportunities required.
- A member of the panel was able to attend the Final Year Seminar during the training day and was able to observe the highly relevant career guidance on offer.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

Commendations

None.

Recommendations

- If possible, the induction process should be provided in person.
- See [Section 6](#) - for recommendation that the induction process clarifies who is responsible for Occupational Health and Mandatory Training.

6. Trainee support

Criteria

- 8.6.1. Training Schools are to provide appropriate information, advice and support to trainees during the training period.
- 8.6.2. Systems and processes should include:
 - Induction process for the Training School and the training post;
 - A robust tutorial system;
 - A formalised and transparent process for the review of trainee progress which involves both the training post and Training School;
 - Trainee feedback process for placement and Training School;
 - A complaints procedure;
 - An appeals mechanism;
 - Exit interviews.

Information was gathered from:

- Course Committee Minutes
- Course Handbook
- Meeting with Placement Service Supervisors
- Meeting with Portfolio Manager and Associate Dean
- Meeting with Tutors
- Meetings with Trainees
- Placement Handbook
- Student Survey
- The SED

Findings

- As mentioned in [section 5](#), there were issues related to the induction process for students who had only been on-line. This made it more difficult for trainees to have a full sense of starting the course and raised issues about belonging. As also mentioned in [section 5](#), more explicit guidance should be given in relation to mandatory training.
- Trainees went out of their way to give the panel confidence in the quality of the pastoral care and support offered by course leads, tutors and intensive case supervisors. We heard many times that trainees felt that their concerns would be listened to and they would get a good response. There was a caveat to this, that often there would be a long delay in emailing a tutor and receiving a response. While the panel note and appreciate the experience and number of tutors, we also noted that many of them had multiple roles or had extremely limited time for their role as a tutor. We also heard that trainees often raised complex issues that required the tutor to discuss with others or to find out the answer for themselves before helping the trainee. On balance, the panel thought that some guidelines around what a trainee should be able to expect and from whom would be helpful for everyone.
- From multiple sources, the panel heard that the annual 3-way meeting was well evidenced, transparent, and fully involved the trainee, training school and placement provider. These annual reviews form the core of student support and progression.

- The panel noted that the training does not conduct exit interviews. We would recommend that these are re-activated. This is particularly important to give additional confidence that the student support processes are working and to give more evidence that the complaints procedure is working as well as it seems.
- The panel made some additional enquiries into student well-being in relation to the pandemic. We heard that the NHS providers, including the Tavistock, had access to additional psychological supports for all staff during the pandemic. However, none of the course team or trainees reported using these resources. Instead, staff and trainees did highlight the support they received from tutors, from the portfolio manager and from peer support.
- There did appear to be some disparity between the experience of trainees working in placements at or closely connected with the Tavistock and those in more remote placements. In some cases, the latter group of trainees appeared to feel less well supported and more isolated. This feeling was clearly exacerbated by the pandemic.
- The panel also received feedback from trainees who encountered adverse circumstances where they required support from their employing NHS trust. The process of receiving support was complicated and delayed in the case of trainees who were employed by the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, but their placement was within another NHS trust on an honorary basis. The feedback highlighted confusion for trainees, service supervisors and human resources departments regarding which organisation was responsible for providing occupational health support.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

Recommendations:

- Open a conversation with trainees to consider how to enhance the experience of trainees based in placements not in London or less closely connected with the Tavistock (*see additional commentary in section 11*).
- The panel recommend the Tavistock seek to clarify the organisational responsibilities where a trainee's employer and host placement are not one and the same. This information can then be clearly identified and conveyed during the induction process. These should specifically refer to the provision of mandatory training and the process for seeking occupational health support.
- The training provides some guidelines to tutors and trainees in relation to the timeframe for responding to emails or raising issues in order that trainees can be kept informed of matters that affect them in a clear and timely fashion.

7. Trainee placement learning and teaching

Criteria

- 8.7.1. Training Schools should ensure that training posts are able to provide a training placement that will meet the Standards for Providers of Clinical Training Posts set out in Appendix 3.
- 8.7.2. The Training School shall ensure that:
 - There is an annual 3-way review of each trainee's progress, involving the trainee, the trainee's tutor from the Training School and the service supervisor.
 - There are systems and processes in place to ensure good communication between the Training School and the service supervisor.

Information was gathered from:

- Meeting with Service Supervisors
- Meeting with the Course Team
- Meetings with Trainees
- Placement visits
- The Course Handbook
- The Placement Handbook

Findings

- The annual 3-way meeting is clearly a key event in the teaching year. We have evidence that this meeting works well and that it provides all necessary feedback for all parties to progress to the next year or to qualification.
- The Course Handbook and Placement Handbook are both detailed and substantial documents. The panel did find that there were some issues related to communication which could be improved. The issue of clarity relating to responsibility for mandatory training was noted in [section 5 - Trainee selection, progress and achievement](#).
- We also noted that some trainees reported difficulty in getting a prompt reply from tutors at times, and also that some trainees are in placements where there is limited time with their service supervisor. We noted how important it is to have a sufficient number of placements for trainees and that this could become more difficult as the training numbers expand. The panel noted the scale of the task for the placement liaison manager and the limited number of hours for this post.
- Trainees reported that they experienced different levels of communication and felt there was a cultural difference between trainees offered a placement in the Tavistock and Portman Trust, those with placements in London, and those with placements that were further afield.
- The panel did hear that many service supervisors, while noting the limitations in relation to time, would welcome a closer link to the training, especially those that were at a greater distance. Of note, the panel received feedback from some service supervisors around the lack of diversity and difference CPD for them in their task as service supervisors, which was felt to represent a disparity in advancing a more holistic diverse training experience. In addition to this, the panel were informed of an absence of available service supervisor specific CPD generally, not just relating to diversity and difference. This was connected to being outside of London or feeling more distant from the Tavistock.
- The panel also heard that there were issues, separate from trainee progress meetings, in relation to communication between service supervisor and tutor and the employing NHS trusts. Many of these issues were complex and have been described elsewhere in [sections 1 and 6](#), relating to mandatory training and access to occupational health. The panel also noted the intention to increase the number of trainees and placements and therefore recommend that the role of placement manager is robustly protected and developed. As well as the content of the communication we hope that it will be possible to have a more collaborative approach to service supervisors, to have a clearer induction process that clarifies the roles for each party, clarifies issues related to how to direct complaints, access occupational health and so on. We also hope that this could include placement providers in the development of the curriculum to ensure that the training fully prepares people to work in a contemporary CAMHS team as a child psychotherapist.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF

Recommendations

See [section 6](#) recommendation in relation to mandatory training 'The panel recommend the Tavistock seek to clarify the organisational responsibilities where a trainee's employer and host placement are not one and the same. This information can then be clearly identified and conveyed during the induction process. These should specifically refer to the provision of mandatory training and the process for seeking occupational health support.'

- We recommend that mandatory training is clearly included in the student log.

8. Assessment

Criteria

- 8.8.1. Training Schools should ensure that trainees are in consultation throughout their training with progress advisors or tutors, with regular progress reports and a training record held for each student.
- 8.8.2 Documents about assessment processes should be transparent and available to trainees and service supervisors. There should be mechanisms in place for regularly assessing and feeding back to trainees on their development as clinicians.

Information was gathered from:

- Course Handbook
- Course Lead and Tutor Progress Meeting
- Placement Handbook
- Placement Visits
- Service Supervisor Meeting
- Trainee Feedback

Findings

The panel were given examples of trainee progression that evidenced effective systems for identifying competencies and additional training needs. We found that this involved the trainee, placement, tutor and incorporated reports from intensive cases supervisors. There is evidence that some creativity and compassion is used to ensure that trainees get appropriate intensive cases and that all appropriate work is considered from a competency basis.

The panel were provided with the Course Handbook that sets out the detail of how assessments are carried out and the standards required, these are based on the competencies for practice and academic learning. These give clear guidance to trainees and those working with them.

As described above (*see section 7*), the assessment process is collaborative and transparent. The student log and competencies are reviewed annually, and a clear plan is put in place for each trainee for the coming year. Any issues or barriers to progress are clearly articulated alongside a plan for the trainee. The student log and annual review meetings form the core of the process.

The Spring mid-year review has also provided a helpful opportunity to address difficulties early and to put in place arrangements to support trainees' progression.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

9. Qualification

Criteria

- 8.9.1 Training Schools must have systems and processes in place to ensure that trainees seeking qualification must have satisfied all of the requirements of the training, as noted in s.5 and s.6 above and have submitted satisfactory written work including as a minimum:
 - A clinical paper demonstrating a capacity to integrate theory and practice.
 - Evidence of capacity for report writing as set out in section 5.4.1. of the QAF.
- 8.9.2. It is the responsibility of the training school to ensure that the trainee has completed all aspects of the training curriculum recognised by the ACP in order to determine a trainees' readiness for qualification. The Training School will gather information from the trainee's supervisors (including the service supervisor) and will ask the trainee's analyst/therapist if they have any comment to make at this point. The Training School report on their qualifying trainees to the Register (Director of the Professional Standards Committee).

- 8.9.3. In very exceptional circumstances a Training School may recommend the qualification of a trainee where the curriculum requirements of s.5 have not been met in a significant way, but indicating how an equivalent level of achievement, matching with the competence framework requirements of s.6, are thought to have been reached.
- 8.9.4. Training Schools are required to include in their Annual Report to Training Council information about the number of trainees qualifying under sections 8.9.2. and 8.9.3. For any trainees qualifying under section 8.9.3. this information should be provided in a confidential appendix to the main report, including a brief summary of the circumstances and how the equivalent level of achievement has been reached.

Information was gathered from:

- Course Handbook
- Course Lead and Tutor Progress Meetings
- Intensive Case Supervisor Meeting
- Placement Supervisor meeting
- SED
- Student Meetings

Findings

The students' progress and readiness to qualify was clearly evidenced with examples as discussed in *sections 7 and 8 above*. The academic requirements in relation to report writing and the clinical paper are clearly outlined and the rigor of the educational assessment process was evidenced through the standards employed by the DET and the University of Essex.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

10. Quality enhancement and maintenance

Criteria

- 8.10.1. Training schools should have robust processes for monitoring and maintaining quality standards and be able to demonstrate these processes at work in response to accreditation visits and external audit such as academic validation or reviews by funding bodies.
- 8.10.2. Training Schools should have full and appropriate complaints processes in place and detail of how to use these should be easily available to anyone who may require it. Training Schools should keep a complete record of every use made of their complaints processes and they should report on these in their Annual Report and in their Re-Accreditation SED. Any confidential information provided in order to satisfy this criteria will be stored in confidential appendices and will not be published.

Information was gathered from:

- Annual Review of Courses
- Annual Student Survey
- Course Committee Minutes (with reference to feedback from students)
- Course Handbook
- Feedback from Trainees
- SED

Findings

- The maturity and quality of the training has been established by multiple accreditation visits both from the ACP and the Academic accreditation from the University of Essex and previously from the University of East London. The training also has a long-standing relationship with HEE and comply with their quality assurance processes. The training benefits from being part of the wider DET and the academic supports and events that are cross-disciplinary. The panel noted the Trust is registered as a Higher Education Provider by the Office for Students.

- There were delays to the accreditation process because of the pandemic and the strategic review. The panel recognise that these factors will have impacted the organisational ability to monitor the quality enhancement at this time. In the circumstances the panel thought that the training school had done well in this regard.
- The panel did note the multiple accreditation processes that the training is involved in. While each process has a specific function and reporting structure, the panel did wonder if there were ways of partnering with one of the other processes, possibly the academic partner, to reduce the time burden on the course team and trainees. This is something that the ACP training committee could consider.
- The panel noted that the complaints procedure was described but during the accreditation visit the panel was not aware that it had been used by the trainees. We discussed this at different meetings. The general view was that if an issue was raised with a tutor, then the trainees had confidence that they would be listened to and that they would be satisfied with the response. The panel did explore the possibility that there was a culture where complaints were not acceptable or may in some way hinder student progress. However, trainees and staff at all levels seemed to consider the absence of complaints as evidence of a successful use of the process to support trainees. The panel thought that re-introducing an exit interview would provide more confidence that the complaints procedure was working well.
- Subsequent to the visit, during a process of fact-checking, we were made aware that two complaints had been made and dealt with appropriately with one being upheld and the other not. Both complaints were in relation to process issues rather than the course content or delivery.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

Commendations:

The training manages to consistently engage with multiple accreditation processes and the Trust is registered as a Higher Education Provider by the Office for Students.

Recommendations:

- The course leads open a discussion with the ACP training committee to explore options of streamlining multiple accreditation demands.
- Reintroduce exit interviews after qualification.

II. Values, equity and diversity

Criteria

- 8.1.1.1. The Training School should:
 - Have in place appropriate policies to ensure it does not discriminate within the meaning and scope of the Equalities Act 2010.
 - Be able to demonstrate an active commitment to widening access to the training.
 - Ensure that the training programme reflects an understanding of cultural diversity in relation to working practice as a psychoanalytic child psychotherapist.

Information was gathered from:

- Annual Report to the ACP Training Council (2020-21)
- Co-Course Leads and Tutor Progress Meeting
- Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy
- Intensive Case Supervisors Meeting
- Meeting with Trainees
- Observation of Difference, Identity and Diversity Seminar
- Placement Visits

- Self-Evaluation Document
- Service Supervisors Meeting
- Trainee Feedback

Findings

- The policies made available to the panel alongside the content of the SED demonstrated a commitment to providing an inclusive and safe training experience. There was evidence in the documents alongside verbal feedback in the aforementioned meetings which confirmed the successful recruitment of a larger proportion of trainees from diverse backgrounds compared to previous years. The panel were made aware of the challenges involved with recruiting larger cohorts in line with the increased funding available from HEE, which included the limited number of training placements available alongside time and resource constraints for the placement manager in their ability to assist in the creation of new placements whilst nurturing existing placements. The task of providing equitable widening access to the training is complicated by disparities in the funding arrangements for pre-clinical courses and support for analytic fees, which is dependent on geographical location of placements. Overall, the panel were satisfied with the continued efforts by the course team to make the training more equitable to a greater number of prospective trainees in the context of the ongoing challenges.
- The panel was able to observe the changes made to the course content to become more inclusive of diversity and difference in several forms. These changes were laid out in the SED and various meetings with trainees, service supervisors and teaching staff confirmed these had been implemented in the overall teaching and trainee experience. The feedback from trainees around this change was largely positive, and the teaching of this topic was contemporary, engaging and of high quality. Some efforts to utilise contemporary literature within the teaching content of other seminars was evident.
- During the course of the re-accreditation process, the panel became aware of a particular use of language that appeared to have a connection to both satisfaction and inclusion with regard to training experience. Meetings with trainees, course teaching staff and service supervisors highlighted consistent use of descriptors such as 'in London', 'out of London', 'in the Tavi' or 'outside of the Tavi'. The contextual use of this language suggested a correlation between individuals describing themselves as 'out' and feelings of disconnection and isolation from the training. Although this information was not provided in the form of a complaint, the panel felt this could be suggestive of some important unspoken elements to the training experience that the Tavistock could consider gathering information about in the first instance. The relevant recommendation is included in [section 6 - Trainee Support Recommendation](#) 'to open a conversation with trainees to consider how to enhance the experience of trainees based in placements not in London or less closely connected with the Tavistock'.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

Commendations:

- The panel commend the efforts of the course leads to implement successful changes to the curriculum which provide more contemporary and diverse aspects to trainee learning experience.

12. Personal Analysis for trainees

Criteria

- 8.12.1. Training schools should ensure that all trainees are in their own psychoanalysis for a minimum of four times a week. This is an essential and central requirement of the training. The requirements prior to commencing the training are laid out in section 4.2.6. In circumstances where there is an evidenced scarcity of analysts accredited by the Association of Child Psychotherapists then at the discretion of the Training School and in consultation with the analyst, this may be reduced to three times a week. All exceptions and reasons for exception are to be noted in an anonymised form in the Training School's annual report.

- 8.12.2. The analysis shall be congruent with the training and with a person whose qualifications have been approved by the Trainees' Analysts Sub-Committee as laid down in the Memorandum on Qualifications for Trainees Analysts.
- 8.12.3. In exceptional cases where the analysis is terminated before the end of training, this must be reported in anonymised form to the Training Council in the Annual Report. Any change of analyst or interruption of analysis must similarly be notified.
- 8.12.4. Training schools will contact the analyst/therapist before a student starts intensive casework and again before qualification. Analysts/therapists are requested to confirm these points of transition that they know of no reason why the trainee should not proceed.
- 8.12.5. Each Training School must notify to the Chair of the Trainee Analysts group annually the names of the analysts of current trainees.

Information was gathered from:

- Annual Report to Training Council of ACP (2020-21)
- Tutor memo re: clinical qualification process (2021 -22)
- Meeting with course leads and senior team with regard to student progression.
- The SED
- Placement Visits
- Online meeting with Analytic Liaison Tutor – 18.05.22

Findings

- Both the SED and Analytic Liaison Tutor (ALT) outlined the process by which a prospective trainee is introduced to the ALT with a view to starting personal analysis either one year before the commencement of their clinical training or, since a clarification of the ACP pre-clinical requirements for personal analysis, by the beginning of their clinical training at the latest. The ALT holds the list of analysts approved by the ACP to support trainees and introduces prospective trainees to one or more analysts with a vacancy. It is then up to the trainees and analysts to negotiate the terms of their arrangement, including fees, direct.
- The ALT can also assist an analyst or therapist who wishes to join the ACP list to apply for approval by the relevant ACP committee.
- One trainee reported to panel members that they were not supported to find an approved analyst and had to make their own arrangements. This was a historic issue and had been resolved by the time of the accreditation therefore we did not discuss the individual case with the ALT. Additionally, save for this occasion, the Training School's process for introducing trainees and analysts appears to work well and it has been able to ensure that all trainees are in personal analysis despite the increases in the trainee cohorts required by HEE since Autumn 2020.
- The ALT did acknowledge a number of difficulties which included a scarcity of approved analysts outside North West London, sometimes a significant disparity in the fees charged by analysts and a lack of diversity amongst analysts. These issues may limit the choice of analysts afforded to trainees who, in some cases, have to travel significant distances to see their analysts. The fact that only a proportion of analysts' fees are paid by HEE places further financial pressure on trainees. In order to mitigate some of these difficulties, the ALT reported that she is actively trying to recruit analysts from other areas with the support of the ACP, while the ACP is currently reviewing the criteria for becoming a training analyst.
- The SED also acknowledges that there was some disruption to analytic arrangements because of the COVID-19 pandemic lockdowns and the Panel learnt that during 2021 the analysis of a trainee on the course broke down. In addition, the analyst of another trainee was ill for several months which exacerbated the trainee's sense of isolation, albeit unintentionally. Overall, however, the analysis of the trainees during a very difficult period was maintained and both analysts and trainees showed great flexibility by working online where possible.

- The SED and senior team confirmed to the panel the process by which analysts are consulted both before trainees commence intensive casework and before they qualify. It was also noted that adjustments are being made to allow those trainees who did not start their analysis prior to the training, to commence intensive casework in their second year.

Conclusion

The training meets the standards set out in the QAF.

Part Three: Conclusion, Commendations, Conditions and Recommendations

- The COVID-19 pandemic meant that this accreditation took place in the context of unprecedented levels professional and personal stress and this includes the whole organisation as well as students and course staff. There were additional demands on the training relating to a Trust-wide strategic review and a tendering process with Health Education England. The panel therefore put trainee and staff well-being at the centre of the accreditation process and we have taken all of the stresses into account in preparing the report.
- The accreditation needed to be mostly on-line, with only a site visit to the building and library and some placements being in person. This did provide the panel with an experience that gave an insight into the teaching and learning environment over the past two years. While, for many, there was a yearning for more in-person teaching it is clear that on-line teaching meant that the training could continue throughout the pandemic. This was supported by the Technology Enhanced Learning Team, Library Staff, and the goodwill and sense of community created by the trainees and course staff.
- The Training School benefits from the extensive resources available in the wider Department of Education within the Tavistock and Portman NHS Trust. The training can evidence the security of the training for the trainee cohorts in post and have active plans to continue to deliver the child psychotherapy training in partnership with HEE. Being part of such a large organisation with multiple partners requires the course leads and portfolio manager to make on-going efforts to educate and communicate with their partners in the trust in relation to the unique qualities and demands of a psychoanalytic training. The panel identified some aspects of communication that would benefit from attention. These mostly relate to trainees who do not have a placement in the Tavistock and involve clarity for each trainee about who is responsible for their occupational health and mandatory training. The panel thought all of the necessary requirements were in place but the communication about these issues could be more trainee-centred and individualised.
- The Training is the oldest and biggest Child Psychotherapy Training in the UK. The panel found that the maturity of the course was evident in the curriculum, the number and experience of the teaching staff and intensive case supervisors, and documentation that was used to support the trainees. The panel also noted clear evidence of succession planning in relation to the course team, teaching staff and intensive case supervision.
- In recent years, a professional doctorate has been introduced as an integral part of the training. The Doctoral qualification is delivered in partnership with the University of Essex. The training has also started to adapt to the needs identified in the NHS long term plan. Both of these have made demands on the curriculum, course staff and trainees alike. Over time it is clear that the Doctoral tasks in the training have become more integrated into the training and the training school has increased confidence in asserting psychoanalytic reasoning as a central pillar to the clinical training.
- The panel took a special interest in the course team's focus on equal opportunities and inclusion work. There has been a major investment in the teaching staff and intensive case supervisors CPD and monthly groups focusing on diversity have been established. The clinical workshop on diversity has been made compulsory for the trainees. The panel thought that this was appropriate and of a high quality. Some of the

placement visits conducted by the panel, and meetings with the wider trainee cohort identified a possible theme of geographical exclusion which would be worth considering further. This was related to a feeling that trainees based in the Tavistock and Portman Trust had a different and more favourable experience than those who were in different placements, particularly those at a distance from London.

- The panel noted that the training hopes to increase the number of clinical placements over the next few years. The relationship with placement providers works well in regards to trainee progression but it was clear that more meaningful and fruitful relationships with placements might be possible if more time was devoted to liaison. We encourage placement providers to play an increased role in developing the curriculum in relation to the demands of contemporary practice in NHS CAMHS. We noted that some placement providers would welcome enhanced support with equality and diversity training in relation to supervision.
- The panel thought that the curriculum was rich and mature and appreciated the quality of the teaching staff. One criticism of the curriculum was that trauma-specialist practice was not emphasised enough through a compulsory module. The panel noted that many of the specialist workshops and clinical seminars did have a trauma focus even if the module title did not specify this.
- Overall, in the current context, the Tavistock Training School has managed to maintain a high-quality course and can clearly evidence that they are complying with the ACP quality assurance standards. Trainee progression is clearly evidenced and a strong course team with new course leaders has maintained the delivery of the training throughout the pandemic.
- The panel concluded that there were no conditions in relation to the accreditation. There were many commendations listed below and some recommendations to improve the training experience.

Commendations:

- i. The panel heard positive reports from many sources that the TEL and Library teams have been an outstanding support to the course throughout the pandemic, supporting a fast change to practice in a crisis situation and helping to improve the quality of the learning experience for teachers and trainees.
- ii. Even in the context of the internal Trust Strategic Review and the tendering for HEE, we noted the registration with the Office for Students and that HEE funding is guaranteed for each cohort. Also, being part of the wider Trust offers many additional resources and opportunities for learning and development. We considered this to be strong evidence of the robustness of the training, even during exceptionally turbulent times.
- iii. The panel commend the efforts of the course leads to implement successful changes to the curriculum which provide more contemporary and diverse aspects to trainee learning experience.
- iv. For maintaining the breadth and depth of the expertise available to contribute to the course.
- v. This is a mature curriculum and students are offered high quality training opportunities and access to specialist workshops of a high standard.
- vi. The leadership and creativity of the research leads has continued to integrate the learning opportunities from psychoanalytic reasoning into clinical work.
- vii. The training manages to consistently engage with multiple accreditation processes and the Trust is registered as a Higher Education Provider by the Office for Students.
- viii. To the trainee group for supporting tutors and staff in using online technology in the early days of the pandemic.

Recommendations:

- i. Update the ACP with the outcome of the Trust strategic review ([section 1](#)).
- ii. Update the ACP with the outcome of the HEE tender ([section 1](#)).

- iii. A stakeholder group is created, including trainee representatives and placement providers from across the range of placements to ensure developments to the curriculum continue to reflect the demands of contemporary CAMHS services ([section 3](#)).
- iv. The course team review each module to highlight, where appropriate, how trauma is integrated into the teaching to ensure that trauma specialised practice is adequately reflected in the curriculum ([section 3](#)).
- v. If possible, the induction process should be provided in person ([section 5](#)).
- vi. Open a conversation with trainees to consider how to enhance the experience of trainees based in placements not in London or less closely connected with the Tavistock ([section 6](#)).
- vii. The panel recommend the Tavistock seek to clarify the organisational responsibilities where a trainee's employer and host placement are not one and the same. This information can then be clearly identified and conveyed during the induction process. These should specifically refer to the provision of mandatory training and the process for seeking occupational health support ([section 6](#)).
- viii. The training provides some guidelines to tutors and trainees in relation to the timeframe for responding to emails or raising issues in order that trainees can be kept informed of matters that affect them in a clear and timely fashion ([section 6](#)).
- ix. We recommend that mandatory training is clearly included in the student log ([section 7](#)).
- x. The course leads open a discussion with the ACP training committee to explore options of streamlining multiple accreditation demands ([section 10](#)).
- xi. Reintroduce exit interviews after qualification ([section 10](#)).