
Approval process report

Roehampton University, Speech and Language Therapy 2024-25

Executive Summary

This is a report of the ongoing process to approve programmes at Roehampton University. This report captures the process we have undertaken to date to assess the institution and programme(s) against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme(s) are fit to practice.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found [our standards are met in this area.
- Reviewed the programme(s) against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Recommended all standards are met, and that the programme should be approved

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- We have conducted further exploration via quality activity. This was to ensure the link between the Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics (SCPE's) and the programme.
- The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.

Previous consideration	N/A
------------------------	-----

Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether the programme is approved.
----------	---

Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Subject to the Panel's decision, the programme will be approved and added to our list of approved programmes.
------------	--

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	3
About us	3
Our standards	3
Our regulatory approach	3
The approval process	3
How we make our decisions	4
The assessment panel for this review	4
Section 2: Institution-level assessment	4
The education provider context	4
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	5
Institution performance data	5
The route through stage 1	8
Admissions	8
Management and governance	10
Quality, monitoring, and evaluation	12
Learners	14
Outcomes from stage 1	17
Section 3: Programme-level assessment	17
Programmes considered through this assessment	17
Stage 2 assessment – provider submission	17
Data / intelligence considered	18
Quality themes identified for further exploration	18
Quality theme 1 – Ensuring that there is a clear link between the Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics (SCPEs) in both learning and assessment across the programme	18
Section 4: Findings	20
Conditions	20
Overall findings on how standards are met	20
Section 5: Referrals	24
Recommendations	25
Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes	25
Assessment panel recommendation	25
Appendix 1 – summary report	26
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution	28

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme detailed in this report meets our education standards. The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, the outcomes, and the recommendations made regarding the programme approval.

Our standards

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

Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

The approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:

- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)

- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

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

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

Gemma Howlett	Lead visitor, Paramedic - Educationalist
Elsbeth McCartney	Lead visitor, Speech and Language Therapist - Educationalist
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers nine HCPC-approved programmes across three professions. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC-approved programmes since 2006.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Arts therapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2006
	Physiotherapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2024
	Practitioner psychologist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2007

Institution performance data

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

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	202	232 (based on 25 learners)	02/05/2025	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was

		per year)		<p>assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is proposing through the new provision. The value number is higher than the benchmark.</p> <p>This refers to the additional number of learners when considering the programmes being considered for approval at the education provider. We do not need to explore this further</p>
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	7%	6%	2021-22	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 1%.</p> <p>We do not need to explore this data point through this assessment because the education provider is performing above the benchmark score and has improved on this score in recent years.</p>

Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	92%	90%	2021-22	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 3%</p> <p>The visitors considered this score as part of their assessment.</p>
Learner positivity score	79.0%	81.1%	2024	<p>This data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 6%.</p> <p>We do not need to explore this data point through this assessment because the education provider has a high score and far exceeding the benchmark</p>
HCPC performance review cycle length		2023-24		<p>The education provider has recently participated in our Performance Review process and was granted an ongoing</p>

				<p>monitoring period of 4 years. This is the second longest period that we award through this process. The education provider engaged well with us last year during the performance review process. They also engaged in the approval process alongside this process and completed a high level of work with us last year.</p> <p>The education provider is next due to go through performance review in 2028-29</p> <p>There were no ongoing referrals, recommendations or subsequent cases opened following the performance review.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Information for applicants –**
 - The education provider has outlined how the programme details will be contained on their institutional website following the format for existing approved programmes. This will include the programme entry requirements and application process.
 - Their institutional-level admissions policies and processes are well established and in place for their existing approved programmes. They

have explained how institutional policies are updated for specific professional programmes where necessary. This includes their existing admissions policies that have been updated to include Speech and Language Therapy alongside references to other professional programmes.

- They education provider has stated how staff are usually present at the education provider open days events. Applicants are also kept informed via applicant communications, invitations to interview, offer letters, enrolment instructions etc.
- This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.

- **Assessing English language, character, and health –**

- The education provider has discussed how entry and suitability requirements are published on their website for the proposed programmes in the same manner they follow for all their professional programmes.
- They have also explained how their Admissions Referral Board examines and makes decisions regarding applications where relevant criminal convictions have been declared or found via a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. Their established process has been expanded to include the proposed programme.
- The education provider has discussed how they have an existing Fitness to Study policy which applicable to applicants. This enables concerns about applicants fitness to study can be addressed before they start their programme. . This is generic and already refers to their Fitness to Practice policy for professional programmes and will include the proposed programme.
- The education provider's existing occupational health assessment processes and contracts will be expanded to include the proposed programme. Additionally, programme specifications will contain entry requirements and are subject to review by the approval panel.
- This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.

- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L) –**

- The education provider has stated that their existing policies and procedures have been updated to include the proposed programme This includes their Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Policy and information for learners who apply / transfer from another education provider. These policies and procedures are outlined on the education provider's website pages.
- The education provider has also stated how the RPL policy refers to the Public Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements. The programme specifications will also state specific RPL requirements. This will follow the existing process they have in place for approved programmes such as Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy programmes.

- This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - The education provider has stated that equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) is explicitly addressed within their admissions policy. They also have established Equality and Diversity policy, Disability policy, Dignity and Respect policy and occupational health processes. These apply to their existing approved programmes and will apply to the proposed programme.
 - The education provider has stated how they have an established process for programme recruitment. This is in place and currently used for their Occupational Therapy programme. This includes the recruitment of practice partners, service users and carers. Those working on the recruitment process must undertake EDI training before interviewing candidates. They will extend this practice to include the Speech and Language Therapy programme.
 - The education provider has also discussed how their approach to EDI is explicitly stated in the programme specification with reference to the institution-wide EDI policy. They have also discussed their strong strategic governance structure, with their EDI committee reporting to the University Executive Board.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register¹ –**
 - The education provider has referred to its existing Articles of Association, which confirm the provider's degree-awarding powers. They are an existing HCPC-approved provider that delivers a range of approved programmes.
 - The education provider has also confirmed they are registered with the Office for Students (OfS). Their Academic Regulations stipulate the undergraduate and postgraduate frameworks and any specific programme variations.
 - This aligns with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run / deliver to the expected threshold level of entry for their existing programmes.
- **Sustainability of provision –**

¹ This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

- The education provider has discussed how the proposed programme has been approved by both their Portfolio Development Committee (PDC) and their Curriculum Strategy Committee (CSC). This confirms that the institutional strategic support and investment is in place and ensures appropriate resources are available. Investment support is embedded in the School Business Plan.
- The education provider has also discussed how they have been successful in their £2m OfS bid. This was awarded to support the growth of Nursing, Physiotherapy, Occupational Therapy and other programmes. These includes specialised simulation and clinical assessment and treatment facilities which will be available to the proposed programme. They have also discussed the investment of additional funds for new equipment for the proposed programme.
- Their existing Nursing Service User and Carer group has also been extended to include Speech and Language Therapy. Service users and Carers are involved with curriculum design and development, programme approval, programme evaluation, learner recruitment, teaching, assessment and staff recruitment. Service users and Carers sit on programme Stakeholder Groups. The group is chaired by a pro-vice chancellor (Education) and led by programme-level lead academics.
- This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Effective programme delivery –**
 - The education providers' existing design and delivery framework guides the principles of validated programmes to ensure effective learner outcomes. Their Academic Regulations stipulate academic structure, assessment and management, monitored and evaluated by quality assurance procedures. They have discussed how processes are in place to ensure additional PSRB requirements are met.
 - The education provider has stated how programme and module specifications include updated templates and guidance to ensure contemporary and programmes-specific (inc. PSRB) requirements are clear.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Effective staff management and development –**
 - The education provider has discussed how their PDC's and CSC's approval processes and associated business case identify staff resources needed for proposed programmes.
 - They have stated that their staffing plans are in place to maintain the correct staff-to-learner ratios. These are set out in the business case for new programmes, which are reviewed by the PDC and CSC. These documents would include information about resource allocation, which covers staffing level in relation to learner numbers to ensure effective teaching and support.

- The education provider's learning and development programme is used across their current PSRB programmes. It includes sections on induction, mandatory and statutory training, appraisal, development for new academics, and ongoing continual professional development (CPD). The education provider's learning and teaching enhancement unit manages this.
- This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level –**
 - The education provider discussed how there are no plans to deliver the proposed programme through new or existing partnerships with another education provider. However, partnerships are in place on a programme level, and partnerships will be used in practice-based learning placement allocation,
 - The education provider has detailed how their partnerships office manages partnership development and approval. They maintain overall responsibility for partners, and there is a full set of updated processes on this section.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality –**
 - The education provider has discussed how their academic regulations stipulate the standards required for the programme and how these are the basis of their quality assurance (QA) procedures. Additionally, PSRB programmes usually have programme variants to ensure specific requirements are clearly identified. They have also explained how their academic office is responsible for administering QA procedures.
 - The education provider has discussed how a suite of processes and templates are required through programme development, approval, delivery and monitoring. They have also discussed how they are very experienced with meeting additional PSRB requirements. Standard Programme and Module Specification Templates and Guidance has been used for the proposed programme.
 - Programme monitoring occurs through the Student Education and Improvement Plan (SEIP). These are presented to the programme board, which scrutinises other quality measures such as External Examiner (EE) feedback. The education provider has also stated that appropriate EEs will be appointed for the proposed programme, and they are provided with training and support.

- This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments –**
 - The education provider has stated that a stakeholder group similar to those currently in place for their existing programmes will be established for the proposed programme. This group will meet at least three times a year and oversee practice-based learning placement quality.
 - The education provider has also joined LSEAPP for Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy. This group oversees placement issues at the local sector level. This will be extended for the proposed Speech and Language Therapy programme.
 - The education provider has stated that agreements will be used to establish partnerships for Speech and Language Therapy programmes where they don't already exist or where there is capacity for increasing placements. This specifies the quality level expected for practice placement providers. The Placement Team will manage the partnership established on an ongoing basis.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - The education provider has stated that learner involvement is central to their approved programmes. Current processes, including external examiners meeting with learners, will be expanded to include the proposed programme. Similarly, in line with their other approved programmes, learners on the proposed programme will also participate in the module evaluation surveys (MES) for each module they study. The results of these surveys are monitored and evaluated at their Student Experience and Outcomes Panel(s) (SEOPS). Learners will also be encouraged to complete the annual OfS National Student Survey (NSS). The results of the NSS are analysed through QA process described above and used to inform action plans for improving learner experience.
 - Outcomes and action plans are also analysed and developed through the SEIP, which is presented for discussion at the Programme Board. Programme representatives are identified and supported through the Student Union. Areas such as placements are often issues raised by learners on PSRB programmes.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
 - The education provider has referred to their established Service User and Carer group (SUC group) and strategy. This group will be expanded to support the proposed programme.

- Through this group, SUCs are involved in curriculum design and development, programme approval, programme evaluation, PSRB learner recruitment, teaching, assessment and staff recruitment. SUC's also sit on the programme stakeholder groups.
- This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support –**
 - The education provider has discussed how existing extensive learning support will be made available and tailored where necessary for learners on the proposed programme. This will include updating the library with additional texts and resources for Speech and Language Therapy and making the physical campus resources available for these learners.
 - The education provider has also discussed how their Academic Achievement Team (AAT) have experience of supporting learners on PSRB programmes and works closely with programme teams. The Programme Lead role is responsible for overseeing and coordinating learner support. Module Conveners also provide specific support at a modular level.
 - Support is also available for learners through the Wellbeing Team, Student Services and the Students' Union. These initiatives can provide support for learners' well-being, support with academic achievement and appeals. They also undertake work aimed at closing the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) attainment gap, learner leadership and peer mentoring.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - The education provider has discussed how enrolled learners are subject to their Student Contract. This identifies their general responsibilities and conduct expected of their learners and behaviours / conduct requirements specific to their programme, including PSRB requirements.
 - Ongoing suitability is managed through their Fitness to Study (FTS) and Fitness to Practice (FTP) policies. For PSRB programmes, FTP is most commonly followed when ongoing suitability is questioned. The Disciplinary Policy is also used when non-programme-related issues arise, such as disruptive behaviour in University accommodation.
 - Where health or fitness is a potential issue, PSRB learners are referred to Occupation Health for review. This may also feed into FTP

processes. The Wellbeing Team will also be involved in monitoring ongoing suitability and will liaise with PSRB programme teams when appropriate.

- This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E) –**
 - The education provider has discussed how their Inter-professional Learning (IPL) policy was created for their nursing provision and has been expanded for their existing HCPC-approved programmes. This will next be expanded to include the proposed programme. Additionally, the proposed programme's lecturers have experience of teaching across multiple programmes and Schools, demonstrating commitment to IPL approaches.
 - The education provider has also discussed how NHS England (NHSE) Standard Placement Agreement specifies the need for learner access to multi-professional resources. The education provider will, therefore, be abiding by this agreement. They have also stated that their internal educational audit process reviews access to IPL opportunities for learners.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - The education provider has discussed how they have strong strategic governance with their Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) committee reporting to their University Executive Board. A range of policies also feed into this area, and their access and participation plan highlight new vocational provision as increasing access to higher education. EDI is also explicitly addressed in the programme specification template concerning the institutional EDI policy.
 - They have discussed how there are a variety of EDI Network Groups and Champions which monitor and develop access and equality for learners and staff. QA processes monitor EDI data by awarding gaps through their Student Education Plan, SEOPS, programme boards, and SEC / SEG.
 - Their student engagement team leads innovations for supporting EDI, such as an inclusive practice working group, which includes students to analyse and develop curricula.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity –**
 - All proposed programmes will follow Academic Regulations regarding assessment structure and procedures with any additional relevant variations (e.g. / physiotherapy specifies two attempts at practice assessment).
 - The education provider has discussed how their Assessment and Feedback framework will be used to provide guidance on assessment style, volume and weighting. These categorical assessment criteria have been successfully applied to other approved PSRB programmes at the education provider. The Programme and Module Specifications detail assessment maps, weighting, criteria, and mapping to learning outcomes.
 - An external examiner will be appointed to scrutinise assessment processes and sit on the board of Speech and Language Therapy examiners. Enhanced external examiner roles have been adopted for other PSRB programmes.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Progression and achievement –**
 - The education provider stated the proposed programme will follow the existing Academic Regulations regarding progression and achievement with any required variations. These will be detailed in the Programme and Module Specifications. If required, the programme will have a bespoke examination board process to confer progression and achievement (as for nursing).
 - Progression and achievement will be monitored through the Student Education and Improvement Plan (SEIP), Programme Board, Student Evaluation Committee (SEC), and Student Experience and Outcomes Panel(s). This will include externally collected data such as OfS continuation, transfer data and 'Destination of Leavers from Higher Education' data (DLHE).
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.
- **Appeals –**
 - The education provider stated that the proposed programme will follow the existing academic regulations and appeals processes within the 'student complaints policy and procedure'.
 - Additionally, the student's union is responsible for supporting learners through this process. This process is already in place and in use for their existing provision and will apply to the proposed programmes.
 - This is in line with how we understand the education provider to operate and how they run their existing programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- The education provider has heavily invested in teaching resources for healthcare education, including the Mary Seacole Health Innovation Centre with specialist teaching spaces and equipment, and the Grove House Clinical Simulation Centre with flexible community rooms and a 6-bedded simulated ward.
- Speech and Language Therapy resources, including toys and games, assessments, and therapy materials, have been sourced to ensure authenticity in professional practice. A specific room for Speech and Language Therapy practice is also available.
- The education provider's library, opened in 2017, supports Speech and Language Therapy with extensive collections in print and online, including major academic databases. The library also has a School Experience Collection useful for preparing for practice placements in paediatric settings.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and Language Therapy	25 learners, 1 cohort per year	15/09/2025

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

Data / intelligence considered

We also considered data points / intelligence from others (eg prof bodies, sector bodies that provided support) as follows:

- In our role as regional officers, we receive intelligence and information from regional bodies and partners. This includes NHS England, who update us on practice-based learning placement shortages in London. This is something we were made aware of for this professional area. The visitors were made aware of this ahead of their review and considered it against the evidence presented in the education providers' stage 2 submission.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider met our standards.

We have reported on how the provider meets standards, including the areas below, through the [Findings section](#).

Quality theme 1 – ensuring that there is a clear link between the Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics (SCPEs) in both learning and assessment across the programme

Area for further exploration: The education provider stated that professionalism, preparation for practice, and person-centred holistic care are all central to the proposed programme. Furthermore, the Year 3 module 'Emerging Professional Practice for Speech and Language Therapists' has the learning outcomes embedded within the module's learning, teaching and assessment, which is aligned with the HCPC's Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics. The visitors have assessed all the information supplied as part of the stage two submission. This included reference to the mapping of the SCPEs to their programme and the programme's learning outcomes. However, we have not found a clear link to the SCPEs in both learning and assessment across the programme. We also did not find the SCPEs to be embedded into the learning outcomes. It is important that we ensure the SCPEs are fully integrated and embedded into the programme. We therefore need the education provider to supply information detailing the SCPE's embedding into the programme and the learning outcomes.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We chose to explore this further by inviting the education provider to submit further information. This took the form of a further documentary submission and a narrative submission.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider responded to the quality theme by submitting further documentation. These included a narrative response document in which the education provider explained how the SCPES are embedded in the programme, these also included evidence and specific examples.

The education provider has stated that the theme of professionalism is embedded throughout the programme and within its modules. They have stated that it is also embedded within the practice-based elements of the programme. The education provider has also discussed how they will set expectations for learners on the programme to engage in professional behaviour from the programme's start. This will involve time keeping, expectations around attendance, using appropriate language and adhering to confidentiality and information security principles amongst other themes.

The education provider has explained how the proposed programme's specification outlines its aims. They stated that several points in this specification refer to ensuring that the Standards of Conduct, performance, and ethics are considered and central to the programme's purpose.

This includes ensuring that learners have a secure understanding of the knowledge, skills, behaviours, and values required to meet the registration requirements for HCPC, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy (RCSLT), and the education providers' own criteria for the award. Additionally, the programme must be responsive to learners' needs and support them in achieving their potential as emerging professionals. Another specific area embeds service users and carers in the heart of the programme. The aim / goal of this is to bring authenticity and reliability and ensure that the programme reflects those individuals with whom the education provider works.

The education provider has also detailed how the programme's learning outcomes map to these standards. These include specific points in the learning outcomes stating that graduates of the programme will be able to demonstrate highly effective and advanced communication skills. They will be able to promote inclusion and access for service users and the wider professions of speech and language therapy. Another outcome is that graduates will develop effective and collaborative therapeutic relationships.

The education provider also submitted several policy documents in response to the visitor's questions. This includes their fitness to practice policy, their raising concerns policy, their student code of conduct and their overall academic regulations. The visitors considered these supporting documents, as well as the education provider's narrative response and mapping to the standards. After this, they considered the education provided to have demonstrated the Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics (SCPEs) to be both linked and embedded in the programme and the SETs related to this area to be met.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** – this standard is covered through institution-level assessment
- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
 - The education provider has set out their entry requirements for the proposed programme. This includes GCSE requirements of five GCSEs at grade C (Grade 4 or above), including mathematics, English language or literature and a science subject or equivalent. They have also explained how a UCAS tariff of BBC / 112 points or equivalent is required for entry to the programme.
 - The education provider has also detailed that for non-native English speakers, an International English Language Testing System test (IELTS) score level of 8.0 needs to be achieved and evidenced with no single element less than 7.5. This level needs to be in place prior to the learner being accepted for an interview for the programme.
 - The education provider has also detailed how as part of the admissions process onto the programme, all learners will be interviewed with a values-based interview prior to an offer being made. Interviews are planned in line with best practice and, where possible, have a member of the academic team and a service user / carer or practice partner on the panel.
 - The visitors considered all the information available and submitted through the submission. The visitors found the SETs related to this area to be met.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
 - The education provider has explained how they have established strong relationships with key practice education providers. Additionally,

they have actively involved them in curriculum development and admissions processes for the proposed programme. The education provider has discussed engagements with their local stakeholders such as attending regional manager meetings and including local health and education partners in interviews, which have fostered mutual respect and collaboration. These efforts have helped shape placement planning and documentation through shared understanding of learner and provider needs.

- The education provider has also discussed how their programme team has conducted site visits to assess practice-based learning placement suitability, resulting in 52 current offers across various learner levels. They state that regular contact between these placement providers and the programme team is planned, including support from link lecturers during the practice-based learning placements. National involvement through the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) Higher Education Institutions (HEI) Placement Leads meetings further supports networking and the sharing of best practices in practice-based learning and higher education.
- To enhance collaboration, the education provider has discussed how the programme will establish a partnership board with local practice partners and join the London and South-East Area Placement Partnership (LSEAPP). Training for practice educators will be offered alongside the Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy teams, promoting interprofessional learning. Additionally, guest speakers from clinical practice will be invited to further learner understanding of specialist areas and employability. They will also hold termly stakeholder meetings, chaired by the Head of Speech and Language Therapy, to ensure ongoing dialogue and development.
- The education provider has also stated that the Speech and Language Therapy Programme has strategically designed its curriculum to include paired practice-based learning placements, fostering peer support and reducing overall placement demand. Through active engagement with local practice partners, they state that their programme has identified additional placement capacity, including providers already working with other London HEIs who are open to collaborating with them. Being housed within their School of Education they have expanded access to diverse school-based settings such as nurseries, mainstream, and special schools, suitable for both observational and clinical placements. The team also participates in regional groups like Supporting Practice Educators in Southwest London, promoting shared learning and coordination with other HEIs to streamline placement scheduling. Furthermore, innovative longitudinal placements such as 'Time for Autism' and 'Time for Dementia' have been integrated into the curriculum. They state that this will enhance learners' understanding of long-term conditions through sustained engagement with service users and carers, with consultative support from Brighton and Sussex Medical School.

- The education provider has also outlined the staff they have available to run and support the programme. This includes two internal members of staff being HCPC-registered Speech and Language therapists. The programme will be supported by several support lecturers, including one who will lead the linguistics, phonology and sociolinguistics in relation to the deaf culture and sign language module. Another is a Speech and Language Therapist and also a Dyslexia Practitioner who will teach anatomy and physiology, clinical phonetics and acoustics.
- Through clarification, the education provider supplied more information, including practice-based learning placement numbers. They also supplied information on their planning to grow the programme going forward and ensure its ongoing sustainability.
- The visitors considered all the information available and submitted through the submission. The visitors found the SETs related to this area to be met.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - The education provider has stated that the proposed programme has been carefully designed to align with the HCPC's Standards of Education and Training (SETs) and the Standards of Proficiency (SOPS) for Speech and Language Therapists. Programme learning outcomes (PLOs) are mapped across all modules, ensuring that each module's learning outcomes and assessments contribute directly to meeting the required professional standards. The education provider has completed mapping documents to demonstrate how learners achieve the SOPS, with all modules being mandatory to support consistent and thorough professional preparation.
 - The education provider has explained how to ensure learners are fit for practice; all new entrants complete an Occupational Health (OH) questionnaire at the start of the programme. Where necessary, learners will attend OH clinic appointments to confirm vaccination compliance before beginning placements. The programme also includes an annual self-declaration process, detailed in the Practice-Based Learning Handbook, which outlines responsibilities and procedures for reasonable adjustments related to occupational health.
 - In addition to health screenings, they have explained how learners are required to sign the University of Roehampton Student Contract at the start of the programme and at the beginning of each academic year or following any interruption. This contract includes an annual self-declaration of good health and character, reinforcing the programme's commitment to professional standards and ethical practice throughout the learners' academic journey.
 - The education provider has also discussed how the underpinning principles of professionalism, preparation for practice and person-centred holistic care are central to their curriculum design. The education provider has detailed how there are expectations for learners conduct whilst on practice-based learning placements. These include uniform use, professional behaviours, and mandatory training

requirements. This, they reflect, supports the ongoing understanding for learners that there are professional standards of conduct, performance and ethics which need to be always adhered to at all time.

- They have also discussed how learners are encouraged and supported to raise concerns about safety and protect and promote the interests of service users and carers.
- The visitors considered the information available but did not find this to demonstrate a clear link between the Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics (SCPE's) in both learning and assessment across the programme. We therefore explored this further via quality theme [one](#).
- Following the exploration of this area via quality activity, the visitors found all SETs for this area to be met.
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider has detailed how practice-based learning is integral to the proposed programmes and integrated across all three years. They describe how there are regular opportunities for preparation for placement and debriefing, highlighting the reflective skills necessary for practice. The total number of placement days across the programme is 80 days or 600 hours. This is broken down as follows:
 - Year 1 = 25 days
 - Year 2 = 30 days
 - Year 3 = 25 days
 - The education provider has detailed how the proposed programme integrates eight external practice-based learning placements across health, education, and social care settings. This includes longitudinal models like Time for Autism and Time for Dementia. These placements are designed to complement education provider-led modules, enabling learners to apply and develop their knowledge and skills in real-world contexts that reflect contemporary practice. The education provider has also explained how placement preparation, review, and debrief sessions are embedded within dedicated modules to support learner learning and professional growth.
 - The education provider has also detailed how learners will spend time in the clinical simulation centres and will learn in simulated community areas, such as general practice rooms, home environments and a fully functioning simulated ward. This will support learners' confidence and develop skills such as equipment organisation, observing others and self-reflection skills needed within practice environments, having had an opportunity to prepare in situational environments.
 - The education provider has detailed how they work to ensure high-quality placement experiences through delivering support through meetings with practice educators, link lecturers, and learners. In addition to this, they organise regular opportunities for feedback and discussion. Programme learning outcomes are mapped to both the RCSLT Curriculum and HCPC Standards of Proficiency, to ensure

alignment with professional standards. They have detailed how learners also complete annual mandatory training, covering areas such as safeguarding, infection control, and equality and diversity. This is aimed at preparing them for safe and effective practice in diverse settings.

- The visitors considered all the information available and submitted through the submission. The visitors found the SETs related to this area to be met.

- **SET 6: Assessment –**

- The education provider has detailed how the proposed programme includes diverse and authentic assessments in both theory and practice. This is aimed to acknowledge different learning journeys and motivate students towards success.
- They state that the focus will be on ‘assessment for learning’ and ‘assessment as learning.’ They will also include a variety of assessments such as:
 - practical assessments.
 - case-study-based assessments.
 - oral presentations.
 - posters.
 - self-reflections.
 - peer assessment, and in-class tests.
- The education provider has also stated that academic regulations are in place to ensure that all theory modules are mandatory and all theory modules must be passed at 40%. A condoned fail grade is not permitted in any module. All assessments must be passed, and learners are required to pass all modules in each year to progress to the following year.
- They have explained how practice-based learning placements are non-credit bearing. However, they explained that learners must pass all placements for successful completion of the programme. Learners must meet the required 563 hours of practice-based learning to be eligible for professional registration with the HCPC and the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists.
- The visitors considered all the information available and submitted through the submission. The visitors found the SETs related to this area to be met.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Section 5: Referrals

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

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

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the programmes should be approved subject to the conditions being met.

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

- All standards are met, and therefore the programmes should be approved.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The programme is approved

Reason for this decision: The Panel accepted the visitor's recommendation that programme should receive approval.

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on approval. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation, and the nature, quality and facilities of the provision.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
Roehampton University	CAS-01733-Z2X2C8	Gemma Howlett Elspeth McCartney	<p>Through this assessment, we have noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have conducted further exploration via quality activity. This was to ensure the link between the Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics (SCPE's) and the programme. • The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved. 	<p>Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education provider has heavily invested in teaching resources for healthcare education, including the Mary Seacole Health Innovation Centre with specialist teaching spaces and equipment, and the Grove House Clinical Simulation Centre with flexible community rooms and a 6-bedded simulated ward. • Speech and Language Therapy resources, including toys and games, assessments, and therapy materials, have been sourced to ensure authenticity in professional

				<p>practice. A specific room for Speech and Language Therapy practice is also available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education provider's library, opened in 2017, supports Speech and Language Therapy with extensive collections in print and online, including major academic databases. The library also has a School Experience Collection useful for preparing for practice placements in paediatric settings.
Programmes				
Programme name			Mode of study	Nature of provision
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy			FT (Full time)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taught

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
MA Art Psychotherapy	FT (Full time)	Arts therapist	Art therapy		01/09/2009
MA Art Psychotherapy	PT (Part time)	Arts therapist	Art therapy		01/09/2009
MA Dramatherapy	PT (Part time)	Arts therapist	Drama therapy		01/09/2006
MA Dramatherapy	FT (Full time)	Arts therapist	Drama therapy		01/10/2012
MA Music Therapy	PT (Part time)	Arts therapist	Music therapy		01/09/2006
MA Music Therapy	FT (Full time)	Arts therapist	Music therapy		01/09/2006
MSc Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			15/01/2024
PsychD in Counselling Psychology	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Counselling psychologist		01/01/2007
PsychD in Counselling Psychology	PT (Part time)	Practitioner psychologist	Counselling psychologist		01/09/2017