
Performance review process report

The Academy for Healthcare Science, Review Period 2021-23

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of The Academy for Healthcare Science. 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

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The following are areas of best practice:
 - Visitors acknowledged how active the education provider had been in recruiting numerous lay members from various professional backgrounds and some lay members also had public and patient representative experience. These new lay members had various roles throughout the programme, which highlighted how service users and carers were involved in the programmes which offered an experiential route to HCPC registration, rather than an educational taught programme. Twelve new lay members had active roles in the programme such as members on the Education, Training and Standards Committee, working in conjunction with others as lay assessors of applicants' submissions or as Chairpersons of interview panels. The education provider recognised the importance of training and ensured all lay members were trained in relation to their specific lay roles as well as EDI. This training as well as shadowing experienced lay assessors optimised the education providers support for these lay assessors and ensured consistency of the role of these assessors. This demonstrated the lay members had several opportunities to contribute in a meaningful manner throughout the programme.
 - Visitors noted the education provider publishes a Leadership Journal on their website, which aims to foster an interest in leadership by showcasing examples of how leadership in healthcare science can influence and support excellent patient care. This journal also provides applicants with the opportunity to further enhance their professional development on topics such as healthcare policy, scientific leadership and horizon scanning,
-

which are issues that may affect the whole of the healthcare science workforce. This is an excellent example of best practice and aligns with the revised standards in relation to leadership.

- The provider should next engage with monitoring in two years, the 2025-26 academic year:
 - Due to the lack of established data points. We shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26).

Previous consideration	Not applicable. The performance review process was not referred from another process.
-------------------------------	---

Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be
-----------------	--

Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2025-26 academic year
-------------------	---

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	4
About us	4
Our standards	4
Our regulatory approach	4
The performance review process.....	4
Thematic areas reviewed.....	5
How we make our decisions	5
The assessment panel for this review.....	5
Section 2: About the education provider.....	6
The education provider context	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	6
Institution performance data	7
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	8
Portfolio submission.....	8
Quality themes identified for further exploration	8
Section 4: Findings.....	9
Overall findings on performance	9
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	9
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	13
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	14
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection.....	15
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	15
Data and reflections	16
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	17
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes.....	17
Assessment panel recommendation.....	17
Appendix 1 – summary report	19
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution	20

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:

Natalie Fowler	Lead visitor, Clinical Scientist
Beverley Cherie Millar	Lead visitor, Clinical Scientist
Sarah McAnulty	Service User Expert Advisor
Saranjit Binning	Education Quality Officer
Hugh Boothe	Advisory visitor, Biomedical Scientist

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, we did not require professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because the lead visitors were satisfied, they could assess performance and risk. However, we did involve an additional advisory visitor to provide them with the opportunity to be involved with the performance review process to expand their knowledge of the process.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers one HCPC-approved programme across one profession, clinical scientist. The provider is a registration body and has been running their HCPC approved programme since 2012.

The HCPC approved Certificate of Equivalent (CoE) Programme is an Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning process. It is a comparative and retrospective assessment of the learner's education, training and experience and therefore is an assessment process, without any teaching or learning.

The education provider awards the Certificate of Equivalence to individuals who have worked in healthcare or science seeking recognition and clarification that their previous training, qualifications and experience meets the specified programme outcomes for the Scientific Training Programme (STP) in their chosen modality. Thus, avoiding the need to repeat education or training unnecessarily. The STP is a three-year programme of work-based learning, supported by a university accredited master's degree. The STP was developed as part of the Modernising Scientific Careers: The UK way forward policy and comprises of an academic award (MSc in Clinical Science) with a period of work-based learning.

The Certificate of Equivalence is the approved programme and leads to eligibility to apply for registration and inclusion on the HCPC Register.

The education provider are a United Kingdom (UK) wide body working with a number of organisations in each country such as the National School of Healthcare Science (NSHCS) and Health Education and Improvement Wales.

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	Clinical scientist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2012

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 programmes¹.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	500	520	2024	<p>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 assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission.</p> <p>The education provider is recruiting learners broadly at the benchmark.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	N/A	2020-21	<p>There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they</p>

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

				decided not to establish this data point through the submission.
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	N/A	2020-21	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided not to establish this data point through the submission.
Learner satisfaction	N/A	N/A	N/A	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided not to establish this data point through the submission.

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

Visitors reviewed the portfolio and the supporting documentation. Through their review they acknowledged the level of detail and reflection in the submission was appropriate. They recognised the education provider had produced a high quality document with appropriate evidence to indicate good performance. Due to the quality of the submission visitors did not identify any quality themes that required further exploration.

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 unpredictable number of learners who engaged with the assessment process was challenging, however the increased funding from various health education bodies, such as NHS England, helped to mitigate this issue. The merger of Health Education England (HEE) into NHS England created some uncertainty about future funding. Despite this the education provider remained financially stable and maintained a consistent process, which enabled them to respond to issues quickly. These processes included regular reviews of learner fees and making robust assessment decisions.
 - The development of the moderation process and the pool of moderators resulted in a rise with the use of assessors. This ensured there was a consistent and thorough review of the portfolios across the healthcare science specialities.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The education provider reflected on their response to partnership opportunities, such as the funding received from NHS England for 200 places on the programme and how they had benefited from this. Processing a large number of applications highlighted the strong working relationship they had with other health education bodies, which included the National School of Healthcare Science (NSHCS).
 - They recognised they were increasing the number of partnerships and acknowledged how important it was for them to establish clear communication links, roles, responsibilities and expectations early with partners. It was noted they would be increasing capacity through the wider AHCS projects team. This was because the education provider recognised staff had the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to work on projects, however this was limited to a small number of staff and therefore there was a need to expand.
 - Reflecting on recent developments and successes, the education provider collaborated with the National School for Healthcare Science and new colleagues in NHS England, which demonstrated good working relationships. The Head of Standards also built closer ties with Lead Healthcare Scientists across NHS England regions, which

expanded the network for recruiting assessors and supporting STP Equivalence learners.

- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Academic quality –**
 - The education provider engaged with the performance review process in 2021 and through this review visitors highlighted the lack of engagement with learners to evaluate and action their feedback. The education provider therefore outlined how they had addressed this area through this current review. The actions taken included conducting two online surveys with current and past learners and reporting the results of the survey to their internal Education, Training and Standards Committee who approved the report and action plan.
 - The education provider acknowledged they had a small team and due to this they experienced some challenges with delivering the programme effectively. To address these challenges, they established the STP CoE Reference Group who worked on progressing the survey action plan. This approach helped manage workloads and maintain high quality outcomes.
 - Reflecting on recent developments, the extension of the moderation process significantly improved efficiency and quality assurance in the assessment process. By reducing the number of assessors needed per portfolio and involving specialist assessors and moderators, the process became more streamlined and consistent. This ensured robust quality assurance for the programme. The establishment of a moderator group further enhanced this, allowing for continuous monitoring and improvement. Moving forward, the focus will be on monitoring the impact of these changes to ensure they continue to benefit the assessment process and maintain high standards.
 - On reflection, the quality assurance model, which included annual reviews, learner surveys, and an ongoing action plan, enabled the Equivalence team to continually improve the programme. The education provider intended to continue using this model and develop the STP CoE Applicant Reference Group and use a biennial survey schedule. This enabled them to maintain and enhance the quality.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Placement quality –**
 - The programme is an Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning process. It involves a comparative and retrospective assessment of the learner's education, training, and experience, meaning there is no teaching or learning involved.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The programme is an Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning process. It involves a comparative and retrospective assessment of the learner's education, training, and experience, meaning there is no teaching or learning involved.

- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - In response to the Performance Review feedback from the last review, new lay assessors and a lay member on the Education, Training and Standards Committee (ETSC) were appointed.
 - The education providers contracts for ETSC members and lay members ensured compliance with underpinning policies. The performance of the lay assessors was monitored and feedback was obtained, which enabled the education provider to take relevant action and feedback to them. They acknowledged the new lay member contributed to ETSC meetings and highlighted the recruitment of an increased pool of lay assessors with varied experience. The recruitment of new lay assessors led to new service user perspectives being introduced to the programme through the lay assessor forum. It was noted the education provider's priority was to ensure they had adequate lay assessors to progress the assessments effectively.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - Some difficulties were experienced with the analysis of assessment outcomes by protected characteristics due to incomplete data from learners and the lack of benchmark data. The lack of data and a small sample size due to the low completion rate, created some complications with identifying patterns and trends, which limited the ability to assess the programme's fairness and inclusivity.
 - In November 2023, the HCPC published EDI data relating to clinical scientist registrants and the plan was to undertake a comparative data analysis and use this data in the biannual STP CoE outcomes report. This report would be submitted to the Education, Training and Standards Committee (ETSC). The education provider highlighted the importance of this data, as it would enable them to compare the profile of CoE learners and their outcomes. In addition to this, it would help them understand the programmes equity and make improvements where necessary.
 - The education provider reflected on the appointment of an EDI fellow. It was noted their expertise would assist the Equivalence Team with gathering data about the healthcare science workforce, as this data was not currently recorded as a separate profession in the NHS Employee Record System.
 - The education provider highlighted the importance of the Equality and Diversity policy which was referenced in all documentation. It was clear they were committed to this area and therefore provided training to all assessors to ensure they were applying the assessment criteria consistently and fairly. They were also required to complete all mandatory EDI training. Additionally, the lay assessors and members were required to complete online EDI modules. The purpose of this training was to ensure there was no unconscious bias, however it was noted further efforts were being made to understand and support

neurodiverse learners, particularly through the reasonable adjustment process to ensure its effectiveness.

- It was noted how the learner surveys and the follow-up work had improved the education providers understanding of learners who were neurodiverse. This led to an accessible assessment process and enhanced the quality assurance model, which contributed to their commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion. They noted how they would share the outcomes of the survey and any actions taken and would also review the assessment process with a focus on neurodivergence.
- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider recognised there was a challenge in promoting clinical scientist registration among employers. To support this issue, they continue to be actively involved in promoting it through membership and involvement on working groups with the aim of encouraging employers to change their approaches.
 - The education provider recognises the importance of registration for the profession, and worked with national organisations to promote it. As such, the education provider actively collaborated with external stakeholders, such as Health Education and Improvement Wales. They also contributed to a healthcare science careers handbook.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: Visitors acknowledged how active the education provider had been in recruiting numerous lay members from various professional backgrounds and some lay members also had public and patient representative experience. These new lay members had various roles throughout the programme, which highlighted how service users and carers were involved in the programmes which offered an experiential route to HCPC registration, rather than an educational taught programme. Twelve new lay members had active roles in the programme such as members on the Education, Training and Standards Committee, working in conjunction with others as lay assessors of applicants' submissions or as Chairpersons of interview panels. The education provider recognised the importance of training and ensured all lay members were trained in relation to their specific lay roles as well as EDI. This training as well as shadowing experienced lay assessors optimised the education providers support for these lay assessors and ensured consistency of the role of these assessors. This demonstrated the lay members had several opportunities to contribute in a meaningful manner throughout the programme.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
 - The Good Scientific Practice (GSP) are the professional standards of behaviour and practice for the healthcare science workforce, published by the education provider. They use the SOPs and the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics as its benchmark. The GSP standards form the basis of the portfolio which learners submit as part of the programme. The GSP standards were last updated in 2021.
 - To ensure the revised SOPs were embedded within the portfolio, the Education, Training and Standards Committee (ETSC) formed a task group to review any potential changes. This included a mapping exercise to cross reference the revised SOPs with the GSP. After this review, the ETSC concluded they would continue to use the GSP standards within the portfolio as the GSP was already aligned with the revised SOPs.
 - However, they recognised that some additional guidance was required to support learners. These updates would enhance the guidance, templates and resources for learners.
 - For example, an EDI Clinical Fellow was appointed. They worked on developing an EDI toolkit where learners could access material, which would provide them with support and guidance. The material also included guidance in relation to neurodivergence. Other changes included signposting learners to guidance relating to self-care and mental health.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The education provider reflected upon the need to consider the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI), which they had planned to do in 2024-25 as part of their work schedule. They recognised there was a risk of learners using AI dishonestly for their portfolios, however noted there were also some developmental benefits to using it as well. It was clear they had a plan, which outlined the issues they needed to consider and address in relation to this, which included, accessibility, expectations and guidance on using AI.
 - It was noted how the education provider had maintained their current use of technology for the programme. This online platform was used for all processes, which included the submission of application forms and portfolios and managing extensions, data and outcomes. This platform worked effectively and clearly served a purpose to support the learners but also the assessors, which enhanced its impact.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Apprenticeships in England –**

- The education provider currently has no plans to develop apprenticeships in the HCPC regulated professions.
- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: Visitors noted the education provider publishes a Leadership Journal on their website, which aims to foster an interest in leadership by showcasing examples of how leadership in healthcare science can influence and support excellent patient care. This journal also provides applicants with the opportunity to further enhance their professional development on topics such as healthcare policy, scientific leadership and horizon scanning, which are issues that may affect the whole of the healthcare science workforce. This is an excellent example of best practice and aligns with the revised standards in relation to leadership.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
 - Due to the nature of their provision, the education provider was unable to provide a reflection in this area.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section.
- **Office for Students (OfS) –**
 - Due to the nature of their provision, the education provider does not engage with the Office for Students. This was noted by the visitors and no issues were highlighted.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - It was noted how the education provider had their own Healthcare Science Practitioner Register, which was accredited by the Professional Standards Authority (PSA). This accreditation demonstrated they had achieved the PSA's high standards in governance, standard-setting, education and training. Due to this, and the nature of their provision, there were no other regulators or professional bodies involved with their activities.
 - The Professional Bodies Council was a senior council within the education provider, who provided strategic discussions on healthcare policy, scientific leadership, and workforce issues. The Council played an important role in enhancing the programme processes and addressing any emerging workforce issues.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.

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 –**
 - As outlined above in the embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) section, the education provider made updates to the GSP due to the revised standards of proficiency.
 - No further updates to the curriculum were reflected upon.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider leads on healthcare science and collaborates with over 40 professional bodies through the Professional Bodies Council. This collaboration was effective in gaining valuable input for the programme, such as contributions to the review of Good Scientific Practice and the STP CoE Question Bank. However, the Equivalence Team lacked direct contact with the appropriate level within some professional bodies, as Council membership was at the Executive level. They reflected this was an area that could be improved to enable closer collaboration with key contacts within professional bodies.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**
 - Due to the nature of their provision, the education provider was unable to provide a reflection in this area.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section.

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 –**
 - Reflections were provided on the two online surveys that were conducted to gather feedback from current and previous learners. It was noted the overall response rate to these surveys was positive. The feedback allowed the education provider to develop an action plan to address the frequently raised issues, which was approved by the STP CoE Applicant Reference Group.
 - In addition to this, they undertook work to gain a better understanding of neurodivergence and the impact of it on assessments. This involved meeting with neurodiverse learners to gather feedback and suggestions.
 - The survey enabled the education provider to gather interest from learners to join the STP CoE Applicant Reference Group. The purpose of the group was to support the development and implementation of the action plan. Due to how large the group was there was also the option to create smaller working groups to focus on specific actions.

- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - Due to the nature of their provision, the education provider was unable to provide a reflection in this area.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider reflected on the consistent positive feedback they received from the external examiner. This provided them with assurance that their assessment processes were robust and fair. To ensure there were continuous improvements in response to external examiner feedback, the education provider ensured they responded to all recommendations even though they may have not been changes but enhancements.
 - The data considered by the external examiner for selecting portfolios included monitoring data related to protected characteristics. This approach provided the external examiner with oversight of equality, diversity and inclusion data. It was noted how the education provider had considered increasing the minimum percentage of portfolios reviewed by the external examiner to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of protected characteristics.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learner non continuation:**
 - As a non-traditional education provider i.e., not a Higher Education Institution (HEI), they lack access to externally validated data such as the National Student Survey (NSS). They recognise the challenges this creates and are aware of the barriers it creates with them securing a longer monitoring period than two years.
 - In order to address this, the education provider is working with the HCPC to establish a regular supply of data points that can be used to assess their performance going forward.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area and acknowledged they were engaging with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data points.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - As above, the education provider recognises the challenges with the lack of data and are working with the HCPC to establish a regular supply of data points that can be used to assess their performance.

- The visitors were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area and acknowledged they were engaging with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data points.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - As above, the education provider recognises the challenges with the lack of data and are working with the HCPC to establish a regular supply of data points that can be used to assess their performance.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area and acknowledged they were engaging with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data points.
- **Programme level data:**
 - Reflecting on the process for the programme, it was clear that the flexibility of allowing applications throughout the academic year meant that learner numbers could only be reported at the end. This approach ensured continuous access for learners, however, required reviewing to understand application trends.
 - Based on the data supplied it was clear there was a significant increase in both the number of applications received and the number of programme achievements.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area and acknowledged they were engaging with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data points.

Proposal for supplying data points to the HCPC: The education provider confirmed they will continue to work with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data points. The new updated guidance for establishing data points will be used, as this guidance has been designed to support education providers in this position where data is not captured through the same sources as HEIs due to the nature of their provision.

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 2025-26 academic year.

Reason for next engagement recommendation

- Internal stakeholder engagement
 - 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, partner organisations, external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with over 40 professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision
 - The education provider did not engage with other relevant professional or system regulator(s) (e.g., NMC, OfS).
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
 - The education provider is willing to work with the HCPC in accordance with our guidance on establishing data points. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26).
- In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a two year monitoring period is:
 - Due to the lack of established data points. As detailed above we shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26).

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 2025-26 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
The Academy for Healthcare Science	CAS-01380-T9F5Z4	Natalie Fowler Beverley Cherie Millar	Two years	<p>In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a two year monitoring period is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the lack of established data points. As detailed above we shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26). 	No referrals.

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
Certificate of Equivalence	FT (Full time)	Clinical scientist			01/10/2012