Healthcare Professionals
Quality and Contract Performance Management Results

June 2017

Developing people
for health and
healthcare

www.hee.nhs.uk

THE NHS
CONSTITUTION
the NHS belongs to us all

Contents

Foreword

The 2015-16 Quality and Contract Performance Management (QCPM) cycle marks another successful year of the process. In this year's report a noticeable four-year positive trend of results is evident and demonstrates how education providers commissioned to deliver education and training continue to improve and support the development of the healthcare workforce. Over the years the process has driven excellence and education providers have continually enhanced the education and training they deliver. The QCPM process was implemented in 2007, and was designed to assess, monitor and facilitate improvement in the quality of education and training for healthcare professionals (Nursing, Midwifery and Allied Health Professionals) – both student and post qualification.

We are now moving into a new era of education training and with the culmination of the process we would like to celebrate the success of QCPM process and what it has delivered in the past nine years. The success can be attributed to the partnership working with education providers, placement providers, learners and service users. These relationships have been key and will continue to contribute to a setting that is conducive to improvements in the learning environment. I would like to thank all of the education providers who engaged so positively with the QCPM process.

Like last year the work of the education providers are showcased in Part 2 of this document. It contains information on innovative projects and best practice across the region. I hope that you will find these results as encouraging as I do.

Professor Elizabeth Hughes
Director and Dean of Education and Quality, London and the South East
Health Education England

Introduction

The London and the South East (LaSE) Quality and Contract Performance Management (QCPM) process established in 2007-08 has continued to have an important impact in the quality of non-medical education and training programmes commissioned by Health Education England (HEE). The QCPM portal and process is administered by the Quality and Regulation Team while assessment of submitted data is led by the commissioning teams in each local office. The process is aligned with and forms an integral part of the contract, commissioning and quality monitoring cycle managed by the Non-Medical Contract and Commissioning local teams.

In August 2015 the formation of one quality and regulation team across LaSE integrated 4 more education providers from Kent, Surrey and Sussex (KSS) into the process. This widened the scope of the process and ensured consistent delivery in contract and performance management across the region. The region includes the Health Education North Central and East London (HENCEL) local office, Health Education South London (HESL) local office and the Health Education North West London (HENWL) local office. The baseline results for KSS are not included in this round of publishing as it is an agreed part of the process that the baseline data is not formally published. This is to allow education providers sufficient time to adjust data collection processes to meet the requirements of the QCPM process.

This process has now successfully run for 9 years with 31 education providers and numerous placement providers working together to continually ensure value for money and fitness for purpose of programmes that develop the future healthcare workforce.

This process culminates in the published QCPM results by education provider demonstrating progress towards HEE's organisational goals that allow for a fair and transparent comparison of education provision. This report provides a snapshot of performance over the 2015/2016 cycle. Although overall attainment can be deduced by programme, this report is not a league table.

The Results

The QCPM process retrospectively measures education providers against a predefined set of contact performance indicators (CPIs). The CPIs are a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators allowing for a fair and transparent comparison of education provision across the region. They have been developed using the lifecycle of a student from recruitment through to qualification.

The principle

The qualitative CPI themes include

- Recruitment – with value based recruitment (VBR)
- Academic – expanding into content and delivery of inter professional learning and safeguarding
- Practice placements – covering placement audits and schedules thereof
- Professionalism – of students asserted by service providers and service users
- Commitment and Transparency – appraising student feedback and external examiner reviews
- Innovation – please see the published paper showcasing creative projects implemented by education providers.

Quantitative CPIs relate predominantly to student outcomes namely recruitment variance, attrition, progression/pass rate and completion variance.

Overall performance ratings are an aggregate of qualitative and quantitative CPI RAGs. RAGs are awarded by comparing performance indicator values with tolerances set for each CPI. The RAG result is multiplied by a CPI weighting to give a performance rating. Some CPIs denote a higher level of risk than others. This variation in the level of risk associated with CPIs is captured through giving each CPI a weighting. Finally, the performance rating scores for all the CPIs for a course are aggregated to give an overall score.

All education providers who attain a red or amber RAG against a CPI are required to develop an action plan to remediate the area of concern. Action plans are progressively monitored through the contract monitoring process.

What the results tell us

The results provide a high level summary of education providers' performance against agreed specific CPIs and are based on the information that education providers submit in their data returns. This data is analysed by the HEE local commissioning teams and an annual report produced giving overall red, amber (high and low) or green (RAG) rating based on performance: with the thresholds and descriptors for each of the RAG ratings described as follows:

• **Red** (<50%) – Serious concerns on aspects of performance. Immediate action taken to rectify the problem

• **Low Amber** (50% to <70%) – Several areas of concern. Improvements need to be made

• **High Amber** (70% to <90%) – A few areas for concern. Improvements need to be made

• **Green** (90% to 100%) - No significant areas for concern. Monitor locally.

The results are an indication of value for money and partnership working to ensure that qualified individuals have the skills, knowledge and personal attributes required by the NHS.

A red rating does not necessarily mean that the overall standard of education provided is poor, or that the HEE local commissioning team should not continue to have a contract with the education provider. There are many reasons why a programme or an education provider might be red rated – some of which may be outside of the direct control or influence of that individual education provider. If an education provider is rated red for a number of CPIs or for a whole field or profession then the education provider could be put into turnaround until the issues are remedied and the HEE local commissioning team is assured of both the quality of education and training, and patient safety within that branch of profession

The Result Tables by Profession

Midwifery 2015/16 Results					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
City University London	95.6%	Green	-1.5%	↓	97.1%	Green	94.4%	Green	99.1%	Green
Kings College London	99.8%	Green	-0.2%	↓	100.0%	Green	95.0%	Green	96.5%	Green
Kingston and St Georges University	88.5%	High Amber	-7.9%	↓	96.4%	Green	83.2%	High Amber	85.9%	High Amber
London South Bank University	86.0%	High Amber	-2.8%	↓	88.8%	High Amber	76.3%	High Amber	92.9%	Green
Middlesex University	92.3%	Green	8.7%	↑	83.6%	High Amber	77.0%	High Amber	82.4%	High Amber
University of Greenwich	92.1%	Green	-3.3%	↓	95.4%	Green	100.0%	Green	81.7%	High Amber
University of Hertfordshire	92.7%	Green	-4.2%	↓	96.9%	Green	85.5%	High Amber	94.6%	Green
University of West London	91.9%	Green	-0.7%	↓	92.6%	Green	95.2%	Green	97.2%	Green

Adult Nursing 2015/16 Results				Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Buckinghamshire New University	92.9%	Green	-0.4%	↓	93.3%	Green	97.4%	Green	93.8%	Green
City University London	92.8%	Green	5.1%	↑	87.7%	High Amber	90.0%	Green	84.6%	High Amber
Kings College London	93.8%	Green	-1.9%	↓	95.7%	Green	93.1%	Green	91.7%	Green
Kingston and St Georges University	96.2%	Green	7.1%	↑	89.1%	High Amber	86.2%	High Amber	91.0%	Green
London South Bank University	93.6%	Green	12.1%	↑	81.5%	High Amber	96.2%	Green	87.4%	High Amber
Middlesex University	88.2%	High Amber	-2.4%	↓	90.6%	Green	85.0%	High Amber	79.9%	High Amber
University of Greenwich	85.7%	High Amber	-6.5%	↓	92.2%	Green	98.5%	Green	95.1%	Green
University of Hertfordshire	83.6%	High Amber	-7.3%	↓	90.9%	Green	78.4%	High Amber	85.6%	High Amber

Child Nursing 2015/16 Results				Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Buckinghamshire New University	96.5%	Green	0.2%	↑	96.3%	Green	84.2%	High Amber	91.5%	Green
City University London	97.6%	Green	6.0%	↑	91.6%	Green	91.4%	Green	89.4%	High Amber
Kings College London	100.0%	Green	6.4%	↑	93.6%	Green	100.0%	Green	97.5%	Green
Kingston and St Georges University	90.8%	Green	0.2%	↑	90.6%	Green	94.0%	Green	98.9%	Green
London South Bank University	87.5%	High Amber	-0.7%	↓	88.2%	High Amber	73.6%	High Amber	70.1%	High Amber
Middlesex University	92.2%	Green	-4.9%	↓	97.1%	Green	79.6%	High Amber	87.8%	High Amber
University of Greenwich	94.3%	Green	-0.6%	↓	94.9%	Green	97.2%	Green	96.3%	Green
University of Hertfordshire	97.7%	Green	0.6%	↑	97.1%	Green	94.7%	Green	96.3%	Green
University of West London	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	98.7%	Green	87.8%	High Amber

Learning Disabilities Nursing 2015/16 Results				Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Kingston and St Georges University	100.0%	Green	8.7%	↑	91.3%	Green	76.3%	High Amber	100.0%	Green
London South Bank University	96.9%	Green	4.8%	↑	92.1%	Green	100.0%	Green	85.4%	High Amber
University of Greenwich	96.1%	Green	-3.9%	↓	100.0%	Green	90.8%	Green	86.6%	High Amber
University of Hertfordshire	93.0%	Green	13.3%	↑	79.7%	High Amber	77.6%	High Amber	84.1%	High Amber
University of West London	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green

Mental Health Nursing 2015/16 Results					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Buckinghamshire New University	93.2%	Green	-3.8%	↓	97.0%	Green	94.5%	Green	93.7%	Green
City University London	97.4%	Green	6.7%	↑	90.7%	Green	97.2%	Green	88.5%	High Amber
Kings College London	95.2%	Green	-4.8%	↓	100.0%	Green	93.5%	Green	93.0%	Green
Kingston and St Georges University	99.4%	Green	7.5%	↑	91.9%	Green	88.3%	High Amber	84.0%	High Amber
London South Bank University	90.2%	Green	-0.7%	↓	90.9%	Green	97.9%	Green	88.7%	High Amber
Middlesex University	97.5%	Green	-2.5%	↓	100.0%	Green	88.2%	High Amber	92.2%	Green
University of Greenwich	97.3%	Green	-2.3%	↓	99.6%	Green	100.0%	Green	93.3%	Green
University of Hertfordshire	95.3%	Green	-4.7%	↓	100.0%	Green	75.7%	High Amber	90.2%	Green
University of West London	100.0%	Green	3.4%	↑	96.6%	Green	95.4%	Green	84.3%	High Amber

Allied Health Professionals 2015/16 Results					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Human Nutrition and Dietetics										
Kings College London	97.6%	Green	-2.4%	↓	100.0%	Green	98.2%	Green	98.2%	Green
London Metropolitan University	89.9%	High Amber	-1.9%	↓	91.8%	Green	80.0%	High Amber	78.1%	High Amber
Mental Health Practitioner										
Middlesex University	100.0%	Green	2.5%	↑	97.5%	Green	100.00%	Green	N/A	N/A
Occupational Therapy										
Brunel University	93.5%	Green	3.3%	↑	90.2%	Green	83.4%	High Amber	72.8%	High Amber
London South Bank University	95.8%	Green	8.3%	↑	87.5%	High Amber	95.3%	Green	92.0%	Green
Oxford Brookes University	100.0%	Green	3.1%	↑	96.9%	Green	100.0%	Green	96.3%	Green
Operating Department Practitioner										
Anglia Ruskin University	100.0%	Green	11.2%	↑	88.8%	High Amber	100.0%	Green	93.4%	Green
London South Bank University	72.7%	High Amber	-12.4%	↓	85.1%	High Amber	80.8%	High Amber	98.0%	Green
University of West London	96.9%	Green	-1.5%	↓	98.4%	Green	100.0%	Green	96.1%	Green

Allied Health Professionals 2015/16 Results					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Physiotherapy										
Brunel University	99.8%	Green	-0.2%	↓	100.0%	Green	98.9%	Green	98.1%	Green
Kings College London	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Kingston and St Georges University	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Podiatry										
University of East London	91.4%	Green	9.5%	↑	81.9%	High Amber	82.9%	High Amber	59.1%	Low Amber
Radiography - Diagnostic										
City University London	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	88.8%	High Amber	87.8%	High Amber
Kingston and St Georges University	89.1%	High Amber	-5.8%	↓	94.9%	Green	100.0%	Green	87.2%	High Amber
London South Bank University	100.0%	Green	5.3%	↑	94.7%	Green	99.3%	Green	93.7%	Green
University of Hertfordshire	97.7%	Green	-2.3%	↓	100.0%	Green	90.8%	Green	87.8%	High Amber

Allied Health Professionals 2015/16 Results					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Radiography - Therapeutic										
City University London	96.7%	Green	-2.8%	↓	99.5%	Green	91.7%	Green	80.8%	High Amber
Kingston and St Georges University	89.1%	High Amber	-0.8%	↓	89.9%	High Amber	100.0%	Green	82.9%	High Amber
London South Bank University	98.9%	Green	1.5%	↑	97.4%	Green	90.0%	Green	84.0%	High Amber
Speech and Language Therapy										
City University London	99.3%	Green	0.6%	↑	98.7%	Green	86.2%	High Amber	84.5%	High Amber
University College London	100.0%	Green	0.9%	↑	99.1%	Green	94.2%	Green	91.9%	Green

Child Psychotherapy & Clinical Psychology 2015/16 Results				Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Child Psychotherapy										
British Association of Psychotherapists (BAP)	100.0%	Green	3.7%	↑	96.3%	Green	83.3%	High Amber	100.0%	Green
Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust	90.7%	Green	-9.3%	↓	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Clinical Psychology										
Kings College London (IoP)	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Royal Holloway	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
University College London	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
University of East London	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green

Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) 2015/16 Results					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
IAPT - High Intensity								
Kings College London (IoP)	100.0%	Green	8.0%	↑	92.0%	Green	N/A	N/A
Royal Holloway	97.5%	Green	5.5%	↑	92.0%	Green	N/A	N/A
IAPT - Low Intensity								
University College London	100.0%	Green	9.0%	↑	91.0%	Green	N/A	N/A

Workforce Development and Cytology 2015/16 Results					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14		Historic Data 12/13	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Workforce Development										
Buckinghamshire New University	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	90.6%	Green
City University London	100.0%	Green	4.7%	↑	95.3%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Kings College London	91.7%	Green	-8.3%	↓	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Kingston and St Georges University	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	97.7%	Green
London South Bank University	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Middlesex University	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	96.9%	Green
Royal Marsden School of Cancer	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust	90.0%	Green	0.9%	↑	89.1%	High Amber	94.5%	Green	61.7%	Low Amber
University of Greenwich	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
University of Hertfordshire	97.5%	Green	-2.5%	↓	100.0%	Green	97.7%	Green	89.8%	High Amber

University of West London	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Cytology										
Northwick Park Hospital	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green

Physician Associates 2015/16 Results					**Historic Data 14/15**		**Historic Data 13/14**	
Education Provider	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**	**Comparison to the 2014/15 performance**	**Performance Change**	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**
St Georges, University of London	97.4%	Green	-2.6%	↓	100.0%	Green	N/A	N/A

Specialist Community Public Health Nursing 2015/16 Results Health Visiting					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14	
Education Provider	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Comparison to the 2014/15 performance	Performance Change	Performance Rating	RAG Rating	Performance Rating	RAG Rating
Brunel University	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
Buckinghamshire New University	100.0%	Green			N/A	N/A	100.0%	Green
City University London	100.0%	Green	9.1%	↑	90.9%	Green	85.3%	High Amber
Kings College London	94.1%	Green	-3.3%	↓	97.4%	Green	99.4%	Green
London South Bank University	77.9%	High Amber	-20.0%	↓	97.9%	Green	84.7%	High Amber
University of Greenwich	89.1%	High Amber	-10.3%	↓	99.4%	Green	70.3%	High Amber
University of Hertfordshire	91.2%	Green	-8.8%	↓	100.0%	Green	85.2%	High Amber

Specialist Community Public Health Nursing 2015/16 Results School Nursing				Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14	
Education Provider	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**	**Comparison to then 2014/15 performance**	**Performance Change**	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**
Brunel University	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
City University London	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	92.6%	Green
Kings College London	100.0%	Green			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
London South Bank University	94.0%	Green	2.2%	↑	91.8%	Green	85.2%	High Amber
University of Greenwich	97.9%	Green	-2.1%	↓	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
University of Hertfordshire	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	N/A	N/A

Community Nursing - District Nursing 2015/16 Results					Historic Data 14/15		Historic Data 13/14	
Education Provider	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**	**Comparison to the 2014/15 performance**	**Performance Change**	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**	**Performance Rating**	**RAG Rating**
Buckinghamshire New University	100.0%	Green			N/A	N/A	100.0%	Green
City University London	94.2%	Green	4.7%	↑	89.5%	High Amber	92.6%	Green
London South Bank University	75.5%	High Amber	-8.4%	↓	83.9%	High Amber	85.2%	High Amber
University of Greenwich	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↑	100.0%	Green	100.0%	Green
University of Hertfordshire	100.0%	Green	0.0%	↔	100.0%	Green	85.2%	High Amber

Conclusion

The results of the QCPM system should be reviewed in context alongside other reports from professional bodies to provide a stronger overall 'fitness for purpose' representation.

Further information on the QCPM framework can be obtained by writing to lase.qcpm@hee.nhs.uk.