Performance review process report

University College London, Review period 2018 - 2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of University College London. 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 our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Recommended the institution should be reviewed again in three years and the matter of increased learner numbers be referred to the focused review process.

Through this assessment, we have noted:
- The areas we explored focused on:
  - We explored how the education provider has implemented and embedded interprofessional education into their provision. We noted from the education providers submission that they are working to introduce and embed interprofessional education in their processes. Following the exploration, we found the education provider to have detailed their approach to interprofessional education and how this is developing going forward.
  - We also explore several areas through points of clarification, these are detailed in section 4. The information gained through these explorations are detailed in the findings through clarification.
- The following are areas of best practice:
  - The education provider has conducted an Orthoptics project over academic year 2022/23. The aim of this project is to assess innovations in clinical placement delivery designed to increase placement capacity and close gap in workforce needs.
- The following areas should be referred to another HCPC process for assessment:
  - We have referred one area to our focused review process regarding the increase in learner numbers on the programmes. This is detailed in section 5 of the report.
- The provider should next engage with monitoring in 3 years, the 2025-26 academic year, because:

- o We have determined this is an appropriate length of time for the education provider to continue developing their process and reflect on how this has gone.
  - o This gives us an appropriate length of time to continue to monitor the education providers increases in learner numbers.
-

Previous consideration	This is the education providers first engagement with the performance review process. The outcome of this process will determine their future ongoing monitoring period.
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 • whether issues identified for referral through this review should be reviewed, and if so how
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: • Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2025-26 academic year • Subject to the Panel's decision, we will undertake further investigations as per section 5.

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:

Susan Lennie	Lead visitor, dietitian
Lyn McLafferty	Lead visitor, educational psychologist
Sarah Hamilton	Service User Expert Advisor
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh	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, we considered 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 without needing to consider professional areas outside of their own.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 8 HCPC-approved programmes across 5 professions. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1993. The orthoptist profession programme that commenced in 2021 also has the Prescription only Medication (POM) - Sale / Supply (OR) annotation. The practitioner psychologist programmes joined our register when the profession onboarded in 2009. This includes a programme that started in 1995.

The last annual monitoring in the legacy model of quality assurance was in 2018-19.

Within the review period, University College London engaged with the approval process in the legacy model of quality assurance in 2020 for the orthoptist profession, and in 2021 for the dietitian profession. For the dietitian programme at the 26 May 2021 panel, the Education and Training Committee (ETC) considered the visitors' recommendation that the outstanding condition was not met, and the recommendation was to not approve the programme. The ETC also considered observations submitted from the education provider in response to the visitors' recommendation. This was reviewed at the May 2021 panel and following further discussions and meetings with the visitors determined the conditions were met and the programme could be approved. The ETC (September 2021) agreed the programme had demonstrated that the remaining condition had been met and approved the programme. They have not previously engaged in the current model of quality assurance model.

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
	Dietitian	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	01/10/2021

Pre-registration	Hearing Aid Dispenser	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	01/09/2014
	Orthoptist	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	01/09/2021
	Practitioner psychologist	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	01/01/1995
	Speech and language therapist	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	01/09/2000
Post-registration	Orthoptist Exemptions			01/09/2021

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	Bench-mark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	192	467	02/05/2023	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. The education provider is recruiting learners significantly above the benchmark.

---

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

				We explored this by requesting clarifications from the education provider on the exact learner numbers. We have since decided to explore this further via a focused review.
Learner non continuation	3%	2%	2020-21	This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) 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 dropped by 1% in line with the benchmark also dropping We explored this by making the visitors aware of this data ahead of their review. This formed part of their overall assessment and factored into their ongoing monitoring recommendation.
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	92%	2019-20	This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery / summary data / a combination or other HEI]. 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 below sector norms When compared to the previous year's data point,

				the education provider's performance has dropped by 3% We explored this by making the visitors aware of this data ahead of their review. This formed part of their overall assessment and factored into their ongoing monitoring recommendation.
Learner satisfaction	78.7%	78.0%	2023	This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the subject level / the summary. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects The data point is broadly equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been broadly maintained with a slight improvement less than 1% We explored this by making the visitors aware of this data ahead of their review. This formed part of their overall assessment and factored into their ongoing monitoring recommendation.

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. 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 was performing well against our standards.

Quality theme 1 – The introduction and development of Interprofessional Education (IPE)

Area for further exploration: We note from the education providers submission that they are working to introduce and embed IPE in their processes. This is presented as very much still in development, but they did not provide sufficient explanation about their plans to embed this. It is important that the education providers run IPE and that this is embedded in their processes.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this area by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained how there are no central policies or procedures in place regarding interprofessional learning. Nor is there any central co-ordination of interprofessional education. Where IPE has been introduced it has been evaluated by learners and staff as successful and worthwhile. It is being achieved at a local level with Programme leads and individual module co-ordinators agreeing on timetabling and learning outcomes for specific sessions. They then jointly plan and deliver these sessions. They review and assess IPE through learner feedback at either the session or modular levels.

The visitors agreed the educator provider have satisfactorily addressed their concerns in this area. They have shown how they are developing IPE and how this is an area of priority for them. The visitors are satisfied with their response and look forward to future reflections on how these progresses going forward.

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 education provider has discussed how their 'Business Partnering' teams provide management accounting support to faculties, departments and programme directors. They support them when they are submitting tenders for teaching contracts, putting forward proposals to establish new programmes or amend existing programmes.
    - Their business partnering teams work with local representatives to produce business cases showing the resources that are required to deliver teaching and learning and support activities for the associated learner numbers. Once business cases have been approved any additional resources are added to faculty budgets and learner numbers adjusted.
    - To ensure ongoing financial sustainability, they conduct detailed financial modelling and stress testing. Budgets are prepared annually and tied to the education provider's strategic plan. After which there is regular review of financial performance and liquidity. The education provider recognises the challenge the higher education sector faces and recent inflationary pressures have led to a programme of savings to protect ongoing strategic investment. This will be completed by 2026-27 through savings and tight cost control.
    - The visitors found the learner number to be in excess of what our systems had indicated they would be. This is detailed in the above data table and shows that their learners' numbers are far above the benchmark.
    - Through clarification, the education provider explained that this is the result of gradual increases in their total learner numbers. They clarified that the total number of learners is 467, above the 192 expected that dates from the programmes' original approval.
    - The visitors find these increases to be quite high and determined that a certain level of risk might be prevalent. The visitors made a recommendation for this to be explored further to determined that appropriate resources are in place for the number of learners. We are therefore recommending this to be explored further via a focused review.
- **Partnerships with other organisations** –
    - The education provider reflected on the range of different partnerships they have in place with a variety of different organisations. These partnerships are at several levels, including programme and profession level partnerships with professional bodies such as the British and Irish Orthoptic Society and the British Dietetic Association. Institutional level partnerships are in place with the Council of Deans and the London Higher Education Group (LHEG). Regional-level partnerships are in place with London South-East Area Placement Partnership and NHS England (NHSE) in London (formerly Health Education England HEE).
    - They reflected on how over the height of the covid-19 pandemic there were challenges with maintaining these partnerships. They identified good communication is the key to maintaining and enhancing these

relationships. The education providers aims to ensure good communication and shared decision-making with other organisations. Specifically, regarding selection, placement allocation and quality monitoring of placements. In future, a formal mechanism for sharing partnership collaborations and intelligence across programmes is being developed.

- o Through clarification, the education provider explained how they have changed doctoral training to a single programme based in their institute of education (IoE). They didn't identify any obvious challenges in terms of partnerships with other organisations resulting from this change at the time of their submission. They will continue to monitor the change in management process carefully.
- o The visitors found this clarification useful in their assessment. They therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

- **Academic and placement quality** –
  - o The education provider has discussed how academic quality is driven by their academic regulations and monitoring processes. These include external examiner engagement and reports, end of programme evaluations and their internal quality review (IQR) processes. Since 2022/23 all programmes now provide an in-class continuous module dialogue process to provide learners with mid-term opportunities to feedback on the quality of teaching for each module.
  - o The education provider has reflected on the methods and mechanisms learners have to feedback on their placements. This previously involved paper feedback forms, but they have transitioned to an online feedback system, piloted during term one of 2022/3 and rolled out fully in term two. This has been met with positive feedback from clinical tutors at placement sites. The education provider continues to collect feedback from learners at end-of-placement assessments too. This feedback is shared with and between partner HEI's at bi-annual placement co-ordinator network meetings to monitor placement quality.
  - o Feedback on all aspects of their programmes is sought through regular meetings of staff-learner consultative committees. The minutes are reviewed at the termly Programme Committee meetings to ensure that issues are known about and understood across the whole programme team and agreed actions are reviewed and implemented.
  - o Through clarification, the education provider detailed how their psychology provision placements require compliance with the nationally agreed Practice Placement Partnership Framework (PPPF). There are no nationally agreed standards for placement quality for other programmes they stated. They detailed how the incidence of significant or systemic placement quality problems is low in the absence of any formal complaints. Additionally, each programme addresses any concerns on a case-by-case basis as these are often multi-factorial in relation to leaner learning issues.
  - o The visitors considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Interprofessional education** –

- o The education provider discussed how interprofessional education (IPE) and learning occurred across all their programmes, but they do not have a central IPE strategy. Instead, each programme arranges its own teaching in line with programme specific learning outcomes.
  - o In future, the education provider plans to bring their approach to IPE together into a co-ordinated HCPC programme panel for specific operational oversight of their HCPC approved programmes. In doing so they aim to facilitate greater sharing of teaching and learning resources across programmes.
  - o The visitors noted the education provider was making efforts to introduce and deliver IPE. But could not determine how this is being formalised and embedded into their processes. We therefore explored this further via quality theme [one](). Following this expansion, the education provider detailed the importance of introducing IPE and that IPE is in place but run on the programme level. The visitors were satisfied with their response and had no further questions on this area.
- **Service users and carers** –
  - o The education provider has detailed how service users and carer (SU&C) involvement is managed at a programme-level. SU&C's are involved in learner recruitment, programme design, delivery and evaluation. Each programme has the responsibility for managing their own SU&C involvement. They reflected on the advantage of local decision making and responsiveness to specific needs of the programme.
  - o The education provider discussed how there was no institution-wide governance of SU&C involvement for their programmes nor any current centralised mechanism for monitoring service user involvement. Professional body monitoring of SU&C involvement is in place and used in their internal monitoring. They recognised this is an area for development and going forward are working across faculty to establish a centralised approach.
  - o Through clarification the education provider explained how typically SU&Cs are paid for their involvement. At present there is no institutional level oversight or management of service user and carer involvement. Payments are organised individually at a programme level and as such SU&C's payment arrangements cannot be considered consistent across the Institution.
  - o The visitors noted the education providers reflections on the barriers and ethical considerations to service user involvement noted. They note the experts by experience group and the breadth of experts by experience this brings with multi-level involvement in the programme.
- **Equality and diversity** –
  - o The education provider discussed how they have a number of co-ordinated initiatives and networks to support equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) across their institution. They reflected on how they developed rapidly over 3 years and have gained far more prominence. They reflected on how they are continually making progress in developing EDI and in line with their professional body requirements. They plan to continue to develop this area going forward.

- o Their policy compliance is managed through the 'UCL Education Committee' with heads of departments having final responsibility of implementation and monitoring through to programme leads. Elements of underpinning policies and principles are discussed in teaching committees, tutor team meetings, stakeholder advisory committee meetings and EDI Strategy Group meetings for staff, learner and alumni.
  - o The education provider has identified three main challenges to tackle regarding recruitment, experience and awarding gaps. They reflected that several programmes were not diverse across their student body. The plan to expand their programmes appeal to a wider gender and ethnicity base in their recruitment and selection. The education provider recognises that experience of those from under-represented groups still requires greater investigation and understanding. At the time of their submission, there was no specific mechanism for monitoring EDI experience across programmes, but individual programmes are working to monitor sense of belonging and inclusion on an annual basis.
  - o Through clarification the education provider explained how a new institution wide 'Student Access and Success Committee' was in the process of being formed. Plans were also being developed to bring postgraduate data into gap dashboards like their undergraduate dashboards. They now have data regarding their doctorate awards by gender, age, disability and ethnicity for the past five years. They also noted how the number of withdrawals or fails on these programmes was extremely small.
  - o The visitors found this clarification useful in their assessment. They therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Horizon scanning** –
  - o The education provider reflected on how long-term challenges and opportunities were considered via their institution-wide strategic plan of 2022-27. This includes planning for the future with reference to education and learner experience in four key areas:
    - Teaching and assessment framework
    - A new Institute for Higher Education (HE) Development and Support
    - A revised structure for the academic teaching year by 2026-27
    - A new programme structure for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes
  - o The education provider discussed the impact the cost-of-living crisis is having on their efforts to widen participation. They reflected that this could also impact overall programme stability and considered this in their institution-wide sustainability strategy.
  - o The education provider had also identified several programme-level challenges and opportunities and discussed actions to mitigate these. Issues have included;
    - A lack of placements places constricting the expansion of the programmes.

- Increased learner numbers on their Dietetics provision, which has led to building collaborations with non-traditional placement providers to ensure placement capacity.
- Practical restrictions on teaching space
  - Through clarification the education provider explained how they are currently appointing a clinical director for psychology practitioner training who will lead on the development and oversight of the relationship between them and their NHS partners. This is to ensure high quality psychology practitioner training across the DClinPsy programme as well as other psychology practitioner programmes. They plan to work more closely and collaboratively with other psychology practitioner programmes, including sharing resources.
  - The visitors found this clarification useful in their assessment. They therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: We identified the education providers approach to IPE as a potential risk as this appeared to be still in development. The education provider was able to provide further information, and we have determined there is no risk to their provision going forward.

Area of good practice: The visitors wanted to recognise an area of good practice for the education provider surrounding their Orthoptics project that was conducted over academic year 2022/23. The aim of this project is to assess innovations in clinical placement delivery designed to increase placement capacity and close gap in workforce needs. The visitors have found this to be innovative concept and wanted to recognise this good practice.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
  - The education provider acknowledged the changes made to the SOPs and implemented plans to understand and implement them. They attended the HCPC-delivered webinar on embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency and referred to the HCPC website for more information.
  - They discussed how each programme devised its own implementation plan according to local needs and prioritisation. There was no central oversight or co-ordination of this process across programmes with each programme being responsible for embedding the revised standards.
  - Through clarification the education provider explained how they were using IPE as an opportunity to further embed the new standards. Thus far there has been no central co-ordination of approved programmes, and no forum for cross-programme development. Programme Leads as a result of this review process implemented a mechanism for

interaction and will be meeting in terms one and two to action activities arising from this review process and develop this going forward.

- o The visitors found this clarification useful in their assessment. They therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

- **Impact of COVID-19** –
    - o The education provider reflected on the impact the covid-19 pandemic had on their provision. They detailed how prior to the pandemic, almost all learning prior to the pandemic was conducted in person with very little digital infrastructure in place. Training was required for staff in using new software to facilitate online learning.
    - o The education provider utilised Zoom and MS Teams to facilitate online learning. Clinical placements were hosted via telehealth and the education provider continued to engage with HCPC and professional bodies to gain guidance and advice on clinical hours and a more flexible nuanced approach to clinical learning. The education provider introduced a weekly 'meet the expert' online hour, where a service user would talk about their work and answer questions. This learning was shared with their regional partners and adopted by other HEI's within their network.
    - o Through clarification, the education provider explained how they have aimed and made their priority to return to their pre-pandemic mode of teaching. There are accessible online learning resources including readings, podcasts, recorded lectures for revision etc. Hybrid teaching itself is not part of the usual education operating model. At the time of submission, there were no expectations that hybrid teaching will form a new pedagogy or delivery mode at the education provider.
    - o The visitors found this clarification useful in their assessment. They therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** –
    - o The education provider reflected on how technology has changed during the review period. They are mindful of wider societal changes in areas such as telehealth and how service users access information and expert opinion.
    - o The introduction and implementation of new technology has impacted teaching and learning throughout the review period. They recognised the importance in learners having access to the software and hardware (including reliable internet access) necessary for remote teaching during the pandemic.
    - o The education provider detailed how simulation is used across a number of their programmes. A joint funding bid for their Dietetics and Speech & Language programmes was successful in 2021 to develop virtual reality scenarios. Here learners will be able to interact with the virtual environment and engage with simulated patients.
    - o The visitors noted the education providers reflections on this and were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.

- **Apprenticeships in England** –

- o The education provider does not currently run any HCPC approved apprenticeship programmes. They have reflected that the main challenge to introducing HCPC-approved apprenticeships, is a lack of demand for such programmes and therefore sustainability for such programmes. They have found support from local NHS managers to be variable. They noted that apprenticeship programmes require employer interest, to be able to fund apprentices on programme and to support throughout the programme.
- o The education provider will continue to monitor this and remain up to date on regional changes including the introduction of apprenticeship routes within their region. They may look to run HCPC-approved apprenticeships in the future.
- o The visitors noted the education providers reflections on this and were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.

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 detailed how they underwent a higher education review by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). The purpose of the review was to make judgements on whether their quality and academic standards met expectations outlined in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. The review team identified several features of good practice during the review and two areas of recommendation covering consistent implementation of the policy for Student Staff Consultative Committees. Secondly the promotion of greater awareness of, and signposting to the complaints policy. The education provider worked to implement the required changes across the review period.
  - o The education provider reviewed the updated code in 2019 against former quality assessments finding the overarching principles to have remained broadly the same. They have mapped to the new code in preparation for a future review by the QAA and shall continue to monitor this to be aware of future updates to the code.
  - o The visitors noted the institution level actions with implications / benefits for each programme. Similar to other areas of this submission, it indicated a high level of policy oversight at institution level that means despite the number of programmes this portfolio covers, there is consistency in ways to manage and drive quality. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **Office for Students (OfS)** –
  - o The education provider registered with the Office for Students (OfS) in July 2018. During the Covid pandemic, the OfS paused many of their regulatory activities and the education provider has not been subject to

any specific conditions of registration, enhanced monitoring or an OfS investigation during the review period.

- o The education provider has acknowledged the revised ongoing conditions of registration and devised a system to understand and embed these. Their education committee is formally responsible for this, and they use the institutions quality and standards mechanisms and their regulatory structure to embed changes.
- o The visitors found open and honest reflections from the education providers submission. They found they had responded to OfS guidance and advice and to have a system in place to monitor this and ensure compliance going forward. The visitors found the education provider to be performing well in this area.
- o The visitors found honest reflections and the education provider is responding to everything that the OfS has asked them to do. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.

- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies** –
  - o The education provider discussed how all programmes engaged with their relevant professional regulators/bodies in different capacities. Both formally through mandated accreditation processes, and informally through committee work and collaborations. They recognise the importance of these collaborative links and view these relationships as integral to the ongoing development of their programmes and how they can contribute to wider professional developments.
  - o The education provider has discussed how they work with professional bodies on a programme level. Here different programme teams work with their relevant professional body and remain compliant with their guidance and standards.
  - o Through clarification the education provider explained how no other professional regulators are directly relevant to their Programmes. The education provider explained that there is a wider range of health care professional programmes at the education provider including medicine and dentistry. They will engage with their relevant bodies. The visitors noted but would have appreciated some detail on how the education provider interacts with the General Medical and General Dental Councils (GMC and GDC.
  - o The visitors had no further questions following this expansion but recommend they consider their feedback going forward. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education providers performance 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** –

- o The education provider discussed how all their programmes are actively engaging with the revised SOPs and were working to embed these by the set deadline date. Specific sessions have been introduced dedicated to explaining the new standards. This will ensure learners are aware of the importance of active implementation of them and how important reflection is to assess themselves against each standard.
  - o Through clarification the education provider explained other developments that have occurred throughout the review period. Examples of these included:
    - Service users are more actively involved in designing and delivering components of the curriculum (e.g. lectures on co-production and core assessment skills).
    - Externally facilitated peer spaces have been organised for racially minoritized trainees.
    - Cultural Humility guidance was developed to support lecturers and seminar facilitators to become more responsive and inclusive to the impact of inequitable power, privilege and injustice on individual experience, health and wellbeing. This guidance focused on both 'what' and 'how' we teach to support speakers (and trainees) in considering these dimensions, facilitate an inclusive learning environment for diverse cohorts of trainees, and ensure trainees can work effectively with clients from a wide range of ethnic, cultural, sexual, religious and socioeconomic backgrounds.
  - o The visitors found this clarification beneficial in their assessment. They therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance** –
  - o The education provider has discussed how the responsibility for keeping a programme up to date with professional body guidance often falls to programme leads This has led to several changes during the review period to keep programmes up to date. This included their speech and language therapy provision responding to the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy's (RCSLT's) guidance on their Eating, Drinking and Swallowing (EDS) competencies.
  - o The education provider detailed how they worked closely with their associated professional bodies during the pandemic. They worked to keep up to date with ongoing guidance produced by these bodies. This includes the infection control policy that was produced in response to the pandemic.
  - o The visitors noted the education providers reflections on this and were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level)** –
  - o The education provider detailed how there were no centralised organisation or management of practice-based learning across their programmes. The responsibility is with each programme team to ensure the capacity of practice-based learning is sufficient. The annual intake of learners on each programme was stable with faculty-wide planning in place for any changes in numbers.

- o The education provider discussed the challenge of establishing and developing new partnerships and collaborations with clinical and non-clinical services. There was also the potential for competition with other HEIs looking to establish placements in a competitive field. Their programme was working successfully to address this.
- o Through clarification the education provider submitted more detail on their relationship and interaction with NHS England. This includes how they submit placement hours to NHS England who then set the rate for placement tariff and calculates the amount due to each organisation.
- o The visitors found this clarification useful in their assessment. They therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

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 reflected on how learner feedback is central to their quality cycle. There are various mechanisms in place to ensure learner feedback opportunities are maximised. These include their newly implemented (2022/23) mid-term continual module dialogue (CMD) process for all modules, as well as more formal end of year feedback. This applies to all their programmes, and they have introduced a faculty-level action plan. Each department will be provided with learner outcomes and satisfaction survey data and will use this to put together a Department Education Plan for the next academic year.
  - o The education provider detailed a considerate method for collecting and utilising feedback from learners. However, they noted a lower than desired uptake from learners in completing the feedback. They will continue to monitor this and encourage learners to participate in the feedback mechanisms going forward.
  - o The visitors were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **Practice placement educators** –
  - o The education provider explained how they have programme level processes and systems for collecting, and responding to, feedback from placement providers. They have gradually moved to an online format for collecting this feedback. This involved setting up a Microsoft Teams group for each placement educator to enable quick and easy interaction in terms of feedback and any learner issues. An electronic feedback capture system was introduced in 2022 to replace the paper feedback forms and reduce administrative burden on placement educators. Feedback about the new system they stated has been positive and has also reduced workload for the programme team in chasing missing or incomplete data.

- o The visitors noted the existing mechanisms in place to collect and record feedback. Going forward, having methods in place to share this feedback may be beneficial to the education provider. They were therefore satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **External examiners** –
  - o The education provider discussed how external examiner is a central part of their overall quality review. Each of their programmes generates its own annual external examiner report and this is reviewed at each exam board to ensure actions have been addressed. Any negative feedback is discussed with the chair of the exam board, programme leads and faculty tutor, with review as required. This process monitored by their central quality and standards committee.
  - o They have reflected on the positive feedback they have received from External Examiners (EEs)including praise for their assessment boards and their overall transparency. EEs have noted their responsiveness to feedback and EE reports and their willingness to change and follow recommendations for improvement.
  - o The visitors noted the education providers systems in place to receive feedback from the EEs finding them to be robust and effective. Going forward they would benefit in receiving external examiners reports as part of the performance review submission. The visitors considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily 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:**
  - o The education provider reflected on their 1% non-continuation rate and how this demonstrated the robustness of their recruitment, admissions and learner support processes.
  - o They stated that it is inevitable that some learners will have to interrupt their studies at some point due to for various reasons and/or in rare cases opt to leave their programme before completion. In such circumstances the learners are fully supported by their programme teams to make decisions that prioritise their wellbeing. For those learners that have to interrupt their studies, a scheduled process for returning is developed with support.
  - o The visitors considered the education providers reflections in this area and also the data available. They determined that the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - o The education provider discussed their appeal as a provider and there is competitive entry for places on their programmes. There are high employability prospects following completion of their programmes that contributes to their high completion and low attrition rates.

- o They discussed the high levels of employability, but also detailed their continued ambition of improving this further. They organise profession bespoke preparation for work events and job fairs. New developments include more tailored careers support for international learners and their 'Careers Extra' team providing support for learners from under-represented groups.
  - o The visitors considered the education providers reflections in this area and also the data available. They determined that the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Teaching quality:**
  - o The education provider has discussed how the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) score is less relevant for this review as their approved programmes are at post-graduate and doctoral level. The education provider has engaged with TEF in 2017 where they gained the silver award and have submitted in March 2023 for the updated reward.
  - o The visitors noted the education providers silver award and look forward to seeing the future award they gain. The visitors considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - o As outlined in the data table above, the national student survey (NSS) data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is at the subject-level public data.
  - o This data shows the education provider is performing above the benchmark. The education provider has discussed how the NSS refers specifically to undergraduate programmes. Therefore, less relevant to their approved programmes. The education provider utilises the Post-Graduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) and Post-Graduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) scores.
  - o Through clarification, the education provider reiterated how NSS scores do not apply. They will continue to strive for higher standards across all of their programmes. This will be achieved through engagement with their institutional departmental education planning process and ongoing quality improvement activities. This includes actions to feedback via the mandatory staff-learner consultative committees process (applicable to all programmes).
  - o The visitors recognised how the education provider is scoring above the benchmark. They noted the other mechanisms the education provider utilises including PRES and PTES and welcomed the clarifications provided by the education provider. The visitors therefore considered the education provider to have performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
  - o The education provider supplied programmes level data as part of their submission. This suggests that there are currently 325 learners across all of their programmes. However, we expected there to be a total of 192 learners.
  - o Through clarification the education provider explained that there are in fact 467 learners in total, far higher than our expected 192 learners.

o The visitors determined this should be explored further via a focused review.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: The learner numbers currently sit around 467 per intake as opposed to the approved number of 192. We have explored this further with the education provider and have also checked our records to determine if this expansion has been looked at before. We have determined that there is a risk due to this expansion and will look at this further via a focused review. We have to ensure that sufficient resources are available for the increased learners, that sufficient staff are available to run the programmes and that sufficient placements are available for all learners.

Outstanding issues for follow up: The expansion of learner numbers in recent years shall be referred to the focused review process.

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).

Referrals to the focused review process

<u>The total number of learners on their programmes being higher than expected.</u>

Summary of issue: Through this review we noted the education provider reporting higher numbers than expected and approved. We explored this further via a point of clarification to ensure we have the correct numbers on file. Here the education provider explained that we should have 192 learners on file for all their programmes (based on the year of entry). This number is based on their programmes at their point of approval. The current number of learners entering onto the programmes is 467 learners. The education provider explained that this is due to incremental changes, but we don't appear to have assessed this via a major change process in the legacy model. We determined that it would be appropriate to explore this further via the focused review process.

We shall review the increase in learner numbers and how the education provider has ensured sufficient staffing, resources and placements being in place.

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.
- The areas identified for referral through this review should be carried out in accordance with the details contained in this section of the report

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 include learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
    - The education provider engaged with a number of professional and regulatory bodies. These included British Dietetic Association, the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists, the London South-East Area Placement Partnership, the South East, East and London (SEEL) Consortium, the British and Irish Orthoptic Society and the council of Deans among others. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision
    - The education provider engaged with other professional or system regulator(s) including British and Irish Orthoptic Society, the Office for Students and the British Psychological Society. They considered their findings in improving their provision.
    - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply:
    - 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:
    - From the data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considered data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.
- In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a 3-year monitoring period is:
    - Based partly on our decision to refer the issues around learner numbers to our focused review process as detailed in this section.
    - We have determined 3 years is a sufficient time for the provider to continue their ongoing and incremental developments and embed these before review.
    - This period allows us a time period to review the education provider and monitor the learner number increases.

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 College London	CAS-01251-J8R1C4	Susan Lennie Lyn McLafferty	3 years	3-year ongoing monitoring period is being recommended. This will allow us to engage with the education provider in an appropriate length of time and monitor their learner number increases.	The total number of learners on their programmes is higher than expected. This will be explored via a focused review

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
MSc in Dietetics (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/10/2021
MSc Audiological Science with Clinical Practice	FT (Full time)	Hearing aid dispenser			01/09/2014
Postgraduate Diploma Audiological Science with Clinical Practice	FT (Full time)	Hearing aid dispenser			01/09/2014
MSc Orthoptics (pre-registration)	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Orthoptist		POM - Sale / Supply (OR)	01/09/2021
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/1995
D.Ed.Psy Educational and Child Psychology	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Educational psychologist		01/01/2005
Doctorate in Professional Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DEdPsy)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Educational psychologist		01/09/2011
MSc Speech and Language Sciences	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2000