Performance review process report

University of Strathclyde, Review Period 2018-2023

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of the University of Strathclyde. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

We have:
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission against quality themes and found that we did not need to undertake further exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed

- The education provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2028-29 academic year, because:
    - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users and practice educators.
    - The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
    - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
    - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
    - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes.

Previous consideration	N / A as this case did not arise from a previous process.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be.
Next steps	Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2028-29 academic year.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

Our standards

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

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:
- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

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

The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:
- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see,

rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

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

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:
- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

How we make our decisions

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

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

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this education provider:

Hazel Anderson	Lead visitor, Prosthetics/Orthotics
Lucy Myers	Lead visitor, Speech and Language Therapy
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the

assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, as the education provider only has two HCPC-approved programmes, we considered we had sufficient expertise in the two Lead visitors, because they were from the relevant professions.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers three HCPC-approved programmes across three professions. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1998.

This is the first interaction with the education provider since the introduction of the quality assurance model for Education.

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	Prosthetist / Orthotist	☒Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	1998
	Speech and language therapist	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2002

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[1].

Data Point	**Benchmark**	**Value**	**Date**	**Commentary**
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	56	63	7 March 2024	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or

---

[1] An explanation of the data we use, and how we use this data, is available here

				through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of leaners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission. The education provider is recruiting learners above the benchmark, meaning we should explore the potential impact on resources to support learners.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	1%	2020-21	This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects. The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	93%	94%	2020-21	This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 3%.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	77.1%	78.8%	2023	This data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the

				provider is performing above sector norms.

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the thematic areas reviewed section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their portfolio.

Although we asked for clarification in two areas, we did not consider quality activity necessary due to the thoroughness and relevance of the education provider's portfolio.

Section 4: Findings

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

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Resourcing, including financial stability** –
  - The key area of reflection here concerns the education provider's recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and their adaptation to ongoing economic challenges. The education provider linked to their most recent strategic financial plan, and to an institution-level mission statement, to contextualise this reflection.
  - At a more detailed level, the education provider reflected on each programme separately. For the BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics programme (P&O), the key challenge faced during the review period was a change in the funding arrangements. Money was now coming from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) rather than directly from the Scottish government. This has meant more uncertainty about funding,

because under SFC procedures, funding is more closely linked to learner numbers, with the result that if recruitment declines, this may mean reduced funding. In response, the education provider has extended its recruitment efforts to the P&O programme. The programme staff has also been expanded during this time, as a way of ensuring that the programme remains as attractive to learners as possible.

- o For the speech and language therapy programme, the education provider noted that they had received around £1 million in research funding during the review period, which they considered would help sustain their position as a centre of excellence. They also noted that they had a strong financial position and were well-supported institutionally.
- o In light of the above the visitors considered performance was good, because the education provider had reflected well on particular challenges and formed strategies to deal with them.

- **Partnerships with other organisations** –
    - o The education provider has a high-level strategic governance of partnerships. For example, they note that "academic partnerships are scrutinised by the University's Collaborative Provision Agreements (CPA) Sub-Group", which reports into the Senate.
    - o At the programme level, there was more detailed and specific reflection challenges. For example, the portfolio noted that Scotland has a shortage of prosthetics placements, and that education provider staff are constantly having to use their partnerships to expand capacity. Steps being taken to develop partnerships include formal agreements, exploring international placements, and expanding into non-traditional NHS placements.
    - o For the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology (SLT) programme, the reflection focused on the education provider's development of a strategic partnership with the local NHS Board. The education provider stated that this partnership is being used to deliver better and more widespread operational collaboration between the education provider and individual placement settings.
    - o The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had a clear focus on developing their partnerships to ensure that they continued to be fit for purpose.

- **Academic quality** –
    - o The education provider's reflection was focused on how they had identified areas where enhancements and developments were required / appropriate. There is an institution-level Education Strategy Committee (ESC) which provides strategic direction and sets quality requirements that programmes must follow. All programmes undergo a full internal five yearly review.
    - o The reflection highlighted issues that the programmes had addressed during the review period. These issues had been identified through a variety of quality assurance mechanisms, including internal reviews, annual programme reviews, and external reviews by the Quality Assurance Agency. The issues included:
        - development of new technologies, especially those which helped with inclusion; and

- ensuring that learners gave feedback on particular learning and teaching activities, so that the education provider could develop their pedagogical approach.
  - o Regarding specific programme quality initiatives, the education provider noted that the BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics programme was accredited in 2020 by the International Society for Prosthetics and Orthotics (ISPO) accreditation audit for the BSc. They were awarded "distinguished" status and IPSO will not seek to re-accredit for five years (the maximum). Theirs is the only IPSO-accredited programme in the UK. Areas where the education provider has worked on improvements in response to this process were clinical skill assessment regarding production and manufacturing procedures (craft skills & experiences), and enhanced training for practice educators.
  - o In regard to SLT, the education provider noted that during the review period, they underwent Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) accreditation (2021) and Quinquennial Review (2022/23). This was in addition to receiving annual external examiner reports and learner survey data. One issue they highlighted in the reflection is that there has been some instability in the staff team, but this has now been resolved by new recruitment. Additionally there is now a dedicated member of staff whose role is to advocate for additional resources and support from the institution, which they say will support their quality assurance.
  - o The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider has clear mechanisms for reviewing quality and delivering necessary improvements.
- **Placement quality** –
  - o The education provider reflected on how they have made training for practice educators more accessible, by moving it online, to ensure that as many practice educators as possible are able to take part. This contributes to quality by ensuring that all practice educators are able to support learning to the greatest degree. In 2023 they undertook a review of this training, asking practice educators for feedback
  - o They also reflected on how they have used their processes for assessing overall placement quality. These processes have been strengthened to include more frequent spot checks on practice educators, and to require more training for practice educators. Additionally they have strengthened the support available to practice educators. This was because they reflected that some practice educators weren't delivering best quality and most appropriate supervision because they themselves were not being supported well. The education provider plans to undertake ongoing monitoring of these new initiatives.
  - o Additionally the education provider note that they are involved in the NHS Education Scotland (NES) Quality Standards for Practice Learning (QSPBL) scheme. During the review period, they reflected on how effectively they were communicating these standards to practice partners and have been working to increase familiarity with them through more frequent communication.

- o The education provider also reflected on how well they were gathering learner feedback about placement quality, and considered that they needed to gain more effective learner feedback. They did this by implementing a new virtual learning environment (VLE).
  - o The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had shown clear commitment to reflecting on their delivery of practice-based education, and making relevant improvements.
- **Interprofessional education** –
  - o The education provider's reflection was focused on how they gathered feedback about interprofessional education (IPE) from learners, and the changes made as a result. For example, learners reported that some of the IPE sessions focused on professional co-operation were not clearly focused enough on how each profession should contribute. Other feedback included that the sessions were not always timetabled at the most appropriate times, and the education provider noted they had taken steps to address this, by appointing a staff member to review the integration of IPE with the rest of the curriculum.
  - o The visitors considered performance was good, because they had seen evidence of reflection on IPE, and action taken as a result of that reflection.
- **Service users and carers** –
  - o The education provider reflection focused on how they ensured that service users felt valued, and how they gathered feedback from service users. Their feedback has been generally good, and the changes they have been made in response have been relatively minor – for example, they reviewed the way that they matched up learners to appropriate service users. They also sought to ensure that they were not overusing the core of the service user group.
  - o Another innovation during the review period was the education provider's decision to create an oral history of a particular set of service users on the BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics programme. The education provider noted that these people had suffered ill effects from polio in childhood but were now all elderly, and they wanted to ensure that their firsthand accounts of their unique clinical experiences were available to learners even after their deaths.
  - o The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider was reflecting appropriately on how to improve and develop service user involvement.
- **Equality and diversity** –
  - o The education provider reflected on how they had formed their Athena Swan action plan, which will run from 2023 to 2027. They had identified under-represented groups on their programmes and come out with specific plans to help attract more applicants from those groups. Specifically they noted that men and ethnic minorities were under-represented. They have some progress in addressing the imbalance during the review period but the work is ongoing as of 2024.
  - o The education provider also reviewed their reasonable adjustments policy, and amended it to ensure it was clear that all module co-ordinators were required to take responsibility for adjustments in their modules.

- o The education provider noted that they were having ongoing discussions about how to minimise financial barriers to participation in their programmes.
  - o The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider was willing to reflect in detail on how well they were expanding access to their programmes, and take actions as required.
- **Horizon scanning** –
  - o The education provider's strategic horizon scanning is directed by the "Strathclyde 2030" plan, which sets out a vision for all programmes and faculties. Within this, two key issues are highlighted for reflection: the availability of placement capacity, and the meeting of learner recruitment targets. Regarding recruitment, the BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics programme has launched a series of recruitment and outreach events, both in Scotland and in England. They gave numerous examples of venues and events which they visited during the review period.
  - o Regarding placement capacity, they noted that they have expanded staff duties to ensure that there are sustainable and productive links between the programmes and the placement providers.
  - o Specifically in speech and language therapy, the education provider highlighted changes in the professional landscape, notably the diversification of provision in England, making English programmes more attractive to learners. Also, the education provider noted limitations on the amount of financial support they can give to learners. At the time of submission of their portfolio, the education provider were investigating new ways that they can expand such support, or target it more carefully.
  - o The visitors considered that performance was good, as the education provider had clearly undertaken appropriate horizon scanning and was taking action to address issues highlighted.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
  - o The education provider outlined how they had approached integration of the revised SOPs. For the HCPC-approved programmes, this was done via a series of staff meetings where all members of the teaching teams identified parts of the curriculum that may need to be updated. In terms of implementation of changes, some of the steps taken included updating of assessment design, amendments to learner guidance, and redrafting learning outcomes.
  - o Specific examples of how they considered the place of particular revised SOPs were given in in the portfolio. For instance, they concluded that the Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) SOPs were already covered by both programmes, and so no changes were

needed. Regarding registrants' mental health, they strengthened the learning outcomes in their professional practice modules.

- o The visitors considered performance to be good because the education provider had given a clear explanation of how they reflected on the new SOPs and integrated them into the programme.

- **Learning and developments from the COVID-19 pandemic** –
  - o Several issues were highlighted as learning points from the COVID-19 pandemic. The education provider noted that they had retained much of the blended learning approach adopted at the time, because this offered more flexibility for learners, practice educators and service users.
  - o They also reflected on what action needed to be taken to address gaps in learning that affected learners because of the pandemic. They noted, for example, that practice educators had reported clear problems with theoretical and clinical knowledge because of disruption to their learning. This had been addressed through scheduling remedial sessions for those learners and also for making staff available for informal "catch up" sessions.
  - o For the BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics learners, the education provider invested in new mannequins, as a mitigation of the loss of access to service users and clinical placements. Following the pandemic, these mannequins have been retained as they proved to be excellent for learners' clinical skills.
  - o The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider has clearly reflected on which innovations from the pandemic era should be persisted with.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** –
  - o The education provider reflected on the technological changes made in their provision during the review period. There were several examples of this, resulting from the education provider identifying gaps or weaknesses in current arrangements. One initiative was the Strathclyde Online Learning (SOL) Committee, which gives strategic direction to the work done on technological adaptation by individual programmes. Additionally the education provider has expanded its IT support provision significantly, to deliver its new Blended and Online Learning Design (BOLD) project.
  - o Part of the BOLD project was to ensure that all learners were able to feed back online for their modules. BOLD have also been the lead body at the education provider for shaping their response to AI. The intended outcome of this is a set of policies and approaches concerning assessment integrity, learning and teaching, and guidance for staff and learners.
  - o Other digital innovations highlighted in the reflection include developments to the virtual learning environment (VLE), such as apps offering quizzes to learners, and integration with Snapchat, to encourage learner engagement with the learning experience. It also reinforces teamworking which is an essential skill for multidisciplinary working within the health service.

- o The visitors considered performance in this area was good because they saw many different examples of the education provider reflection on its use of technology, and a willingness to act on that reflection.
  - **Apprenticeships in England** – Not applicable as this is a Scottish institution

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education** –
  - o The education provider noted in their reflection that their institution-level Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) sets strategic direction concerning overall quality compliance. The QAC compiles an annual Quality Code Map, which guides individual programmes in complying with the relevant standards.
  - o They are aware of the consultation on the updated Quality Code; when appropriate this will be considered by the QAC and integrated into their provision. The last QAC update to the Quality Code Map was in early 2023.
  - o The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider was clearly aware of the relevant requirements and had reflected on how they would react to the Quality Code update.
- **Office for Students (OfS)** – Not applicable as this is a Scottish institution.
- **Performance of newly commissioned Allied Health Professional (AHP) provision in Wales** – Not applicable as this is a Scottish institution
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies** –
  - o The education provider noted for their prosthetic / orthotists provision, the British Association of Prosthetics and Orthotists (BAPO) currently does not have a regulatory function. However, they do publish curriculum guidance, to which staff at the education provider have contributed, and which will be used to update the P&O programme.
  - o The P&O programme has been accredited by the International Society for Prosthetics and Orthotics (ISPO), and is the only UK programme to be so accredited.
  - o The education provider reflected during the review period on how to incorporate updated guidance from the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT). The RCSLT re-accredited the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology programme in 2021. Staff members from the education provider are involved with the RCSLT and have been involved with various RCSLT workstreams, including updates to curriculum guidance in 2018 and the refresh to bolster Eating, Drinking and Swallowing competencies in 2021.
  - o The visitors considered performance was good because the education provider had clearly engaged well with relevant regulators and professional bodies.
- **Office for Students (OfS) –** Not applicable as this is a Scottish institution.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Curriculum development** –
  - The education provider reflected on some of the areas where they had been working on curriculum updates during the review period. Some of these curriculum changes were downstream of their integration of the revised SOPs. For example, they noted some new assessment activities had been introduced to test learners' understanding of public health advocacy and equality and diversity. However, other developments were distinct from the SOPs revision. For example, they were already undertaking planning for full integration of the updated RCSLT guidance on Eating, Drinking and Swallowing, which must be complete by 2026. They were also co-operating with Queen Margaret University to ensure a pan-Scotland approach to this area.
  - The visitors considered performance was good in this area, because the education provider was clearly reflecting on their curriculum in a structured way and making changes where appropriate.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance** –
  - The education provider noted that professional body guidance had changed in several key areas. The BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology programme had integrated new Eating, Drinking and Swallowing competencies, which meant updating the expectations of learners and practice educators, and developing new ways of ensuring that learners understood the new competencies.
  - During the COVID-19 pandemic, the education provider relied on BAPO virtual assessment guidelines. These guidelines are now used more widely in programme delivery, and have shaped the education provider's creation of new assessment materials and placement planning. The integration of BAPO guidance is a work in progress but the education provider reports that they have nearly completed this work.
  - The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had shown evidence of considering and adapting to updated guidance.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level)** –
  - The education provider reflected on some of the challenges they experienced around capacity. For the P&O programme, these included:
    - re-establishing capacity after the COVID-19 pandemic; and
    - the Scottish government not funding placement expenses for learners in Scottish institutions who undertake placement in England, making it hard to find appropriate placements for all learners.
  - The education provider described how they were addressing these problems by appointing specific staff members to particular liaison

roles. They also soughtseeking more funding from central government in Scotland to meet any shortfall. Additionally, they were ensuring that communication with learners around placement was prompt and accurate so that any capacity issues could be raised and resolved.

  o Regarding SLT, the education provider reflected on successes and challenges. The successes included a growth in available placements, made possible by a Scottish government pandemic recovery fund, and a new placement development team, which has developed new placements across the country. Challenges include ongoing poor relationships with some practice-based learning providers, which make it difficult for the education provider to expand or even maintain capacity.

  o The visitors considered performance was good, as the education provider had reflected on their opportunities and issues around capacity, and given examples of action being taken to capitalise on, or address, these.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learners** –
  o The education provider gave examples of some of the learner feedback they had received, and how they had reflected on the feedback. For example, learners on the P&O programme identified digital skills gaps that were preventing them from achieving at their best on the programme. They also reported that they were not feeling appropriately prepared for placement. The education provider responded to both of these by introducing additional skills sessions and by restructuring some modules to better prepare learners for clinical settings.

  o On the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology programme, learner feedback is received in real time and results are reported back to learners as promptly as possible on a "You said, we did" basis. An example of the education provider's reflection was their clarification for learners, in response to a complaint, of expectations around attendance and what steps would be taken if attendance was not adequate.

  o The visitors considered performance was good because they had seen evidence of the education provider receiving feedback and considering how best to implement it.

- **Practice placement educators** –
  o The education provider reflected on the feedback received from practice educators during the review period. Some examples of this feedback and the action taken in response include:
      - On the P&O programme, practice educators felt under-prepared to supervise effectively, and so were offered a redesigned

training package. After this training they report feeling more confident.

- Also on the P&O programme, practice educators noted a growing number of learners struggling with mental health and wellbeing, and the education provider delivered extra training to help them manage these situations.
- On the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology programme, practice educators requested, and were given, extra training to help them manage learners who were failing.
- Also on the SLT programme, high-level feedback was received from a Health Board who said that they would like more direct contact with the programme team.
  - o The visitors considered that performance was good because the education provider had demonstrated responsiveness to practice educator feedback on the programme.
- **External examiners** –
  - o The portfolio reflection included several examples of the education provider acting on feedback received from external examiners. For example, on the P&O programme, external examiners suggested more uniformity and reliability in learner access to digital resources, and changes were made to ensure this. External examiners for that programme also contributed to discussions about whether assessment in the post-COVID "new normal" should remain mostly online or not. For SLT, the education provider noted that the external examiners had commended their approach to moderation.
  - o The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had shown they had good and constructive relationships with their external examiners.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel: We considered the data available about the education provider and concluded that the data indicated good performance across various areas.

- **Learner non continuation:**
  - o At 1%, the learner non-continuation rate is very low and we considered that this reflected good performance from the education provider in supporting learners to complete their programmes.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - o The education provider is performing above benchmark in this area. The visitors were satisfied that there were no concerns about the education provider's ability to help learners move on to the next stage of their academic or professional careers.
- **Learner satisfaction:**

- o The visitors considered that support for learners was strong, and that they were provided with a good experience by the education provider. The data confirmed that the education provider scored well in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
  - o The programme level data did not raise any concerns for the visitors.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

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

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

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year

Reason for next engagement recommendation
- Internal stakeholder engagement
  - o The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, the senior team, external examiners, practice educators and service users.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - o The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision
  - o The education provider engaged with the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists, the International Society for Prosthetics and Orthotics, and the British Association of Prosthetics and Orthotist
  - o The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
  - o Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period
- What the data is telling us:
  - o From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider [considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.

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 education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year.

Reason for this decision: The Panel agreed with the visitors' recommended monitoring period, for the reasons noted through the report.

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 the next steps for the provider. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation (including their reasons) and any referrals.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
University of Strathclyde	CAS-01379-Y1R5M2	Hazel Anderson Lucy Myers	Five years	The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users and practice educators. The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way. Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance	N / A

				areas within the review period. From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes.	

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics	FT (Full time)	Prosthetist / orthotist			01/01/1998
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/01/2002