
Performance review process report

Anglia Ruskin University, Review Period 2018 - 2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of Anglia Ruskin University. 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.
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
 - The education provider's reflection on embedding the revised HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) around Registrant's mental health, and Leadership. Further reflection / evidence of the revised SOPs that was submitted reassured the visitors and helped them to understand that the revised SOPs will be part of the learners' learning.
 - The education provider's reflection on evaluating feedback from learners. There is an intranet page (MyARU) where learners provided their feedback and followed the progress of their feedback. There were also Student Staff Liaison Committee Meetings and module evaluation surveys which gave insight to learners' feedback evaluation.
 - The education provider's reflection on ensuring feedback from practice educators were actioned and fed back. Practice educators provided feedback via different forums. There was a clear progression detailing the feedback provided, how it was actioned and feedback given to the practice educators.
 - The education provider's reflection on ensuring adequate staff for the Operating Department Practice and Paramedic programmes. New data for the 2022/23 academic year showed both programmes have recruited additional staff. Although the staff to student ratio (SSR) still appears to be slightly high, we were satisfied it is moving in the right direction.
-

-
- The provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2027-28 academic year, because:
 - The education provider has comprehensively addressed the issues identified by the visitors and the visitors do not foresee anything from these that will need picking up prior to that time. Although there are a few areas which we would need to review developments on in their next engagement, we are satisfied these do not constitute a risk that would require an earlier review.
 - We consider the education provider to be high performing, from a data, intelligence and review perspective.
 - We consider there to be creative and innovative approaches across all the programmes we assessed, to ensure the continuing development of their learners.
 - We do not see any potential risks or issues which would mean a shorter review period is needed.

Previous consideration	This is the education provider's first interaction with the performance review process.
-------------------------------	---

Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be.
-----------------	--

Next steps	Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2027-28 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	9
Portfolio submission	9
Quality themes identified for further exploration	9
Quality theme 1 – embedding the revised HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs)	10
Quality theme 2 – evaluating feedback from learners.	11
Quality theme 3 – how feedback from practice educators were actioned and fed back.	12
Quality theme 4 – ensuring an adequate number of staff for the Operating Department Practice and Paramedic learners.	12
Section 4: Findings	13
Overall findings on performance	13
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	13
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	17
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	19
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	21
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	23
Data and reflections	24
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	26
Referrals to next scheduled performance review	26
Interprofessional education – voluntary attendance	26
Service user and carer involvement in the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Science and Engineering	26
Equality and Diversity	26
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	26
Assessment panel recommendation	26
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution	28

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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

This is a report on the 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:

Rosie Axon	Lead visitor, Arts Therapist, Music Therapy
Alexander Harmer	Lead visitor, Operating Department Practitioner
Sarah Hamilton	Service User Expert Advisor
Temilolu Odunaike	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 14 HCPC-approved programmes across six professions and including four Prescribing programmes. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2000.

The education provider has three faculties delivering HCPC approved programmes. These include the Faculty of Health, Education, Medicine and Social Care (HEMS), the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (AHSS) and the Faculty of Science and Engineering (FSE). They also operate across two campuses – Cambridge and Chelmsford.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

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

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Arts therapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2010
	Hearing Aid Dispenser	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2008
	Occupational therapy	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2022
	Operating Department Practitioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2017
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2014

	Physiotherapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2022
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2014

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.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
Numbers of learners	1240	1184	2022	<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%	2%	2020-2021	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered based on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the education provider is performing above sector norms.</p>

				<p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 1%.</p> <p>We explored this through the initial assessment and were satisfied there were no concerns about the education provider's performance in this area.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	90%	2019-2020	<p>This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered based on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 3%. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because the data (2018-19) available at the time of assessment showed the education provider's score was same as the benchmark which suggested they were performing in line with sector norms.</p>
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Silver	June 2017	<p>The definition of a Silver TEF award is "Provision is of high quality, and significantly and consistently exceeds the baseline quality threshold expected of UK Higher Education."</p>

Learner satisfaction	74.5%	73.7%	2022	<p>This NSS data was sourced at subject level – for HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has dropped by 1%.</p> <p>We explored this through our assessment of the education provider’s reflection. We noted the low score was caused by one of their programmes and the education provider is taking active steps to improve their NSS scores in the future. We were satisfied with the education provider’s reflection on this area.</p>
----------------------	-------	-------	------	--

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.

We have reported on how the provider is performing on all areas, including the areas below, through the [Summary of findings section](#).

Quality theme 1 – embedding the revised HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Area for further exploration:

The education provider submitted their reflection on how they have integrated, or plan to integrate, the seven thematic areas for learners starting their programmes from September 2023. Out of the seven areas, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection on how five areas have / will be integrated. However, two areas remained outstanding. These include:

SOPs – Registrants' mental health – We noted some professional groups appear to have registrant mental health embedded far more extensively than others. For example, in Music and Drama therapy, it was clear how the new SOPs are embedded. The visitors sought more specific examples from all professional groups of how this SOP is being embedded in the curricula. Therefore, we requested examples of how registrants' mental health is being embedded in curricula for all HCPC programmes. As an example, we requested information about where this theme was addressed in the module descriptors.

SOPs – Leadership – This SOP is already well established in the portfolio of programmes. However, the visitors considered the reflection was very brief and lacked any real examples of action. We sought a list of modules or areas where the changes to leadership will be implemented / how learners will demonstrate their understanding of leadership to assure the visitors that this will be covered in the curricula.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We requested further information through additional evidence as we considered this would adequately provide information that was previously missing in the submission.

Outcomes of exploration: In their response, the education provider submitted further information in the form of an outline for each profession showing how the two SOPs highlighted above are already embedded or will be. We also noted additional evidence such as module descriptors further supporting the narrative provided.

We understood that generally, safeguarding learners' physical, mental and emotional wellbeing is embedded in practice across the education provider's provision. Specific examples of reflection on how mental health is embedded into individual programmes was also provided. For example, for their Paramedic programme, we understood mental health is embedded into the level 4 module - Preparation for Placement MDF.

Similarly, regarding Leadership, the education provider highlighted where leadership and leadership values are already present in all curricula and included details of further developments planned in the future. For example, for their Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing and Non-Medical Prescribing programmes, we understood Leadership is embedded throughout the clinical governance section of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society competencies. The education provider noted that many of

the competencies in this section require learners to take the lead on maintaining / improving safe and quality care / prescribing and that they will have to evidence how they have achieved these in practice.

The visitors were satisfied with the response and evidence provided. They considered the education provider had provided further reflection / evidence that clearly explained how registrants' mental health is addressed and supported both in the curriculum and by the wider institution. In addition, the visitors considered the information provided in relation to leadership, was comprehensive. They noted the overview of the modules was clear and it helped them understand how these SOP's will be part of their learning.

Quality theme 2 – evaluating feedback from learners.

Area for further exploration: The education provider identified key challenges around obtaining feedback from learners. They noted response rates for the National Education and Training Survey (NETS) had been low across all their provision and may be attributed to survey fatigue. They also reflected on the decline in response rate since module evaluation surveys became an entirely online exercise. Their reflection included a specific example of where feedback had been used to adapt later events (the End of Life conference).

Aside from the conference example, there was little reflection on how feedback was actioned and fed back to learners. It was not clear how the feedback received led to action on amendments and changes in curriculum or other elements of the programmes. There was no mention of how the education provider evaluated their feedback processes or what they considered in terms of their development of these processes. Therefore, we requested that the education provider submitted further reflection on learners' feedback, including the actions that were taken in response to the feedback rather than just reflecting on the challenges. We also requested further reflection on how the education provider closed the feedback loop.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We sought further clarification through email response. We considered this the most effective way to seek answers to the questions highlighted above.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider described how learners used their dedicated intranet page - MyARU to provide feedback. We understood the education provider listened to and responded to feedback from learners via this page. The education provider also noted relevant programme leaders and members of management met once every trimester at the Student Staff Liaison Committee Meetings (SSLC) to discuss issues including feedback from learners. Relevant members of professional services staff as well as representatives from the Student Union also attended. The education provider shared examples from the minutes of those meetings which helped the visitors understand how learners' feedback was progressed and actioned. Specific examples of email responses where the education provider acknowledged learner's feedback and detailed the line of action were also shared, amongst several other pieces of evidence.

Following the quality activity, the visitors had no further concerns. They were satisfied that the additional information provided was comprehensive and provided better understanding of how the education provided ensured learner feedback had been collated and progressed in a way that aligned with the education provider's feedback policies. The programme specific information also gave a thorough picture of the education provider's ongoing work in considering and actioning this important area.

Quality theme 3 – how feedback from practice educators were actioned and fed back.

Area for further exploration: The visitors noted the education provider's reflection on the issues surrounding central contacts for placements. We understood some contacts did not always have oversight of the progression of a placement or learner. Lack of clarity around how feedback was given was also noted.

The education provider stated that there had been little feedback from practice placements during the reporting period. The visitors considered further reflection or examples of feedback for any of the programmes or practice educators was necessary to understand the education provider's reflection on actions taken in response to feedback from practice educators. We also requested further reflection on how the feedback had been actioned and fed back.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We sought further clarification through email response. We considered this the most effective way to address the issues identified by the visitors.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained that practice educator feedback was sought through various forums including Practice Education Committees, Practice Education Groups and Quality Learning Environment Groups. We understood programme teams met with local teams of practice educators in various forums, such as Practice Educator Forums for Operating Department Practice and Practice Educator Cafes for Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy. At the meetings, practice educators had the opportunity to ask questions or raise any concerns. Minutes of meetings showed a clear progression in discussion with actions from the previous meeting being revisited at the next, and feedback on actions provided to the practice educators.

Following the education provider's response to quality activity, the visitors were satisfied with the information provided and agreed no further concerns or information required. The visitors considered that the examples provided together with further reflections demonstrated the education provider had performed well in the way they managed and used feedback from practice educators. Additionally, the breadth of work showed a creative approach to making this area work as well as it can.

Quality theme 4 – ensuring an adequate number of staff for the Operating Department Practice and Paramedic learners.

Area for further exploration: The visitors noted many of the staff- student ratios (SSRs) supplied by the education provider, reflected that programmes had adequate

staffing resources. However, there were concerns around the high SSR for the Operating Department Practice and Paramedic programmes which indicated an inadequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff for those programmes. Therefore, the visitors requested to see what reflection and resulting steps / action plan had been / was being implemented to bring SSRs for Operating Department Practice and Paramedics back into more acceptable ranges to support staffing position.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We sought further clarification through email response. We considered this the most effective way to address the issues identified by the visitors.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider made it clear that the data submitted in the portfolio was for the 2021/22 academic year which is covered within the review period. We understood some changes have since been made and the education provider has now submitted data for the 2022/23 academic year. We noted additional staff had been recruited across the two programmes which has brought the SSRs to more acceptable ranges.

The 2022/23 data was helpful in reassuring the visitors that the Operating Department Practice and the Paramedic programmes have adequate number of suitable staff to deliver the programmes effectively. Following the quality activity, the visitors had no further concerns.

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 robust policies and practices in place for financial and staff resourcing. Staffing level appeared to be largely appropriate. The use of associate lecturers helped to underpin the provision at present.
 - The education provider's reflection detailed how their "Designing our Future 2017-26" enabled them to be dynamic and sufficiently innovative to remain financially stable and sustainable even through varying challenges such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the impact of Brexit.
 - We understood the strategy has also led to considerable investment in estate and infrastructure over the last five years. One of which is the

redesigning of their skills lab provision within the Faculty of Health, Education, Medicine and Social Care (HEMS).

- The visitors were satisfied about the education provider's performance in this area. They considered that risks and issues had been identified and reflected on well, with specific plans in place.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The education provider described they have “a varied and high-quality array of partnerships, particularly in the longer-running programmes.” These include their Music Therapy, Paramedic Science, Operating Department Practice, Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy, Advanced non-medical and non-medical prescribing programmes.
 - The education provider reflected on challenges for example, within placement opportunities for some departments such as Operating Department Practice programme. For example, how the introduction of the Operating Department Practice apprenticeship, on occasions, had an impact on placement capacity for direct entry learners. We understood this was managed at a local level with the organisations involved. We noted the education provider had reflected well on this and are now committed to monitoring this continually.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. Key Higher Education Institution (HEI) staff are strategically placed on relevant local committees to foster collaborative working with partners.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - The education provider has robust and well-established systems and mechanisms in place for managing placement and academic quality. These capable of alerting the institution to early identification of, and action, on issues. There are also appropriate monitoring systems that are revised regularly.
 - Changes to module delivery and assessments as well as placement capacity during the pandemic were significant in some cases but have been reflected on well and managed well considering the circumstances.
 - Two new roles were created in the Faculty of HEMS to support quality and the use of the Academic Workload Balancing Model showed the education provider's commitment to monitoring and evaluating this area.
 - There was sufficient information for the visitors to determine that the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Interprofessional education (IPE) –**
 - The education provider has robust processes in place for managing IPE. The use of 'Ruskin modules', introduced in the academic year 2021/22 demonstrated innovation in the space. We understood Ruskin modules are a 15-credit module at level 5 which sit outside the 'normal' modular/course structures but are designed to be cross-disciplinary and encourage interprofessional learning.

- We noted examples of co-study between relevant programmes and the introduction of innovative extracurricular events for all learners and staff, for example interprofessional learning conferences both face to face and online. There were also monthly evening seminars which were open to the public, learners, and qualified professionals, and bookable via Eventbrite. We considered the education provider had reflected well on the challenges in the uptake on this new module and are already reviewing how to improve this through a mandatory attendance requirement, trialling from September 2024. We noted the education provider was realistic about the challenges in learners integrating their learning or learning from, and with each other, but are trialling different methods to improve this.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They considered the education provider had been innovative in how they delivered IPE. Where there were issues, they had been able to identify what they were and have put improvements plans in place to address them. To assess the success of introducing mandatory attendance requirement from September 2024, we will review this at the education provider's next performance review in 2027/28.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider noted that there are no institutional level policies governing the involvement of service users and carers across their provision. Each faculty takes a different approach.
 - In their reflection we noted examples of how service users and carers were involved in different parts of programmes within the Faculty of Health, Education, Medicine and Social Science (HEMS), including in the design, admissions and teaching. The education provider reflected upon developments within the faculty such as the introduction of HEMSVILLE which is intended to be co-designed by service users and carers and integrated with personalised and person-centred care.
 - We noted however that other faculties - Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (AHSS) and Faculty of Science and Engineering (FSE) - had less activity. Therefore, there was lack of reflection on how the education provider had involved service users and carers in those other faculties.
 - The education provider had noted the current challenges in recruiting service users. They also noted challenges around engaging with the group during the COVID-19 pandemic. We understood the introduction of HEMSVILLE (a virtual simulation technology) within the Faculty of HEMS has now enabled HEMS to begin to develop a 'virtual community'. The community represents a diverse range of 'real world' people, families and communities who can interact with learners in a genuine and authentic way.
 - The visitors considered the education provider's reflection showed that they are aware of the issues surrounding service user and carer involvement and are implementing specific and realistic ways of continuing to improve in this area.

- The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education provider's current performance around service user and carer involvement. However, they considered further reflection on service user involvement around specific future tasks, plans or activities from Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (AHSS) and Faculty of Science and Engineering (FSE) would provide further support the education provider's position.
 - It would also be helpful to see how the Patient and Public Engagement plans link into the specific faculties. Therefore, the visitors would expect the education provider to reflect further on these when next they engage with the performance review process in 2027/28.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider has a robust set of policies and initiatives in place to tackle Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) issues. Specific roles have been created and work is ongoing to address issues. For example, the Race Equality Advocates roles have been created to look into attainment gaps in relation to race and other EDI factors.
 - We noted the strongest implementation and commitment appeared to be within the race equality area and considered it useful to see more information / reflection about any specific risks in future reviews.
 - The visitors considered the variety in learning types / sessions for implementing the policies impressive. For example, the education provider has embedded EDI into their learning outcomes throughout the programmes and has a range of initiatives in place (i.e. HEMSVILLE). We also considered the reflection on the challenges to in person events for this area caused by COVID-19 useful.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area as their reflection showed they continued to ensure compliance with underpinning policies. However, we considered future monitoring could look at feedback from learners and staff, and action planning within some of the other protected characteristics. Therefore, we will review this at the education provider's next performance review.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider has ambitious plans to extend their simulation experiences for learners using Virtual Reality (VR) and other methodologies. There is work underway to address the Ofsted rating for apprenticeships to allow these to expand further.
 - Although there were challenges identified in this area, the visitors considered they were reflected on well. It was clear that the education provider understood that practice expansion and development of role-emerging placements requires careful management to ensure it is:
 - sustainable;
 - quality assured;
 - appropriate to curriculum and SOPs; and
 - importantly, continues to provide an authentic and meaningful experience for learners.
 - The reflection showed the education provider had noted the need to define simulation and its potential limits and continue to effectively

identify and address issues and opportunities. Therefore, the visitors considered the education provider has performed well in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up:

- Interprofessional education – We will assess the success of the mandatory attendance requirement being trialled from September 2023 at the education provider's next performance review in 2027/28.
- Service user and carer involvement – Given service users and carers were less involved in the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences and Faculty of Science and Engineering, we will review the education provider's reflection on how they have involved service users and carers across the other faculties, at their next performance review.
- Equality and diversity – we will review how the education provider had managed feedback from learners and staff, and action planning within some of the other protected characteristics, at their next performance review.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:

The visitors considered the extracurricular events around interprofessional education, innovative. These included interprofessional learning conferences both face to face and online. In addition, they considered the monthly evening seminars which were open to the public, learners, and qualified professionals, good practice.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
 - **SOPs – General reflections** - The visitors noted the themes of the new SOPs are already largely well-established within the education provider's portfolio. They considered the education provider is aware of the need to signpost learners to the changes and have innovative plans in place to address this.
 - **SOPs – Active implementation of the standards** - As above, we noted plans to integrate changes to the SOPs into programmes and provide taught sessions and materials to support existing and future cohorts were all well established.
 - **SOPs – Promoting public health and preventing ill-health** – The education provider has considered the use of IPE and 'Ruskin modules' as a vehicle for delivering public health content appropriate alongside further reinforcement within individual curricula.
 - **SOPs – Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)** - We understood no changes will be made to HCPC approved programmes in light of the work currently planned on EDI for the institution as a whole. The education provider noted that learning outcomes, assessment methods and delivery in all HCPC provision, plus co-curricular activities, include EDI learning.

- **SOPs – Further centralising the service user** - Many assessments already focus on the experience of the service user and providing service user centred care etc.
 - **SOPs – Registrants’ mental health** – As outlined in [Quality theme 1](#), we understood that safeguarding the wellbeing of all learners whether mental, physical or emotional is embedded in practice across all programmes. It was clear that registrant mental health has been well thought out with planning and action taking place through all programmes identified.
 - **SOPs – Digital skills and new technologies** – The education provider’s existing plans and Digital strategy cover how the introduction of technology advances will be related to all HCPC programmes.
 - **SOPs – Leadership** – As part of the education provider’s reflection and through [quality activity theme 1](#), we were able to establish that leadership and leadership values are already present in all curricula, and we noted details of further developments planned in the future.
 - Overall, there was sufficient information provided to reassure the visitors that the new SOPs are already integrated, or that there are clear plans to integrate them in the curriculum from September 2023. The visitors were also satisfied with the education provider’s outline of how the SOPs will be integrated. Therefore, they were reassured about the education provider’s performance in this area.
- **Impact of COVID-19** –
 - The education provider acted swiftly to adapt to the pandemic and was in alignment with actions seen across the sector.
 - The education provider reflected on the positives and negatives relating to the legacy of the impact. They also showed understanding of how the fast response to multiple changes, had a lasting positive impact on how they can innovate and implement quickly in the future too. The education provider noted “meaningful and authentic assessment” is being reflected in curriculum revisions as the institution recovers from the pandemic. Changes made to assessment as a temporary measure have encouraged programme teams to develop new assessment and approaches to learning and teaching and review all curriculum to update and ensure relevance. In addition, the education provider has adopted approaches to practice-based learning on a longer-term basis to ensure sustainability of the provision.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider’s performance as it was clear that some lessons had been learnt as a result of the impact of COVID -19, and are being carried forward in relation to learning, delivery, assessment and other areas.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** –
 - We noted robust and substantial examples of use of technology both within the curricula and wider education provider context and processes. The examples showed how the education provider had reflected on how the development of technology was being used, explored and implemented. Some of the areas noted included:

- learning management system Canvas is now fully integrated
 - learners are able to access a Digital Literacy Toolkit
 - extensive digital strategy reflects the developments
 - improvements in the end-to-end point assessment / efficiency
 - Hemsville and simulation models
 - Operating Department Practice - use of video laryngoscopes
- The education provider acknowledged some of the challenges faced with implementation. The visitors considered the education provider had adequately reflected on the challenges, in particular the end to end point assessment glitches.
- The education provider's reflection clearly informed us that they are moving towards a digital campus. As such, we were satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - We noted the education provider currently runs two apprenticeships – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Degree Apprenticeship) and FdSc in Hearing Aid Audiology (Higher Apprenticeship) – both are very early in their set up so feedback had been limited so far. However, apprenticeship programmes under the healthcare remit appear to be progressing well and starting to embed and establish.
 - We noted the Ofsted report following a visit in May 2022, was critical around the apprenticeship provision, but the education provider has reflected well on the challenges and are investing time and resources into addressing the issues as an institutional priority.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area as it was clear how they have continued to manage any impact that apprenticeships have had on their provision.

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 –**
 - The education provider noted there were no significant changes to how the institution met the UK quality code. There is strong governance in place and specific documents (such as the Academic Regulations 15th Edition 2022 and Senate Code of Practice on Admissions (2022), amongst others, were adhered to.
 - We also noted clear details of how the education provider adhered to the Expectations for standards and Expectations for quality. For example, in relation to expectation for standards, the education provider ensured learners who are awarded qualifications have the

opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

- The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area as they considered the education provider had submitted a clear and extensive reflection on assessment against Quality Code standards.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - The education provider reflected that there had been minimal assessment by external providers during the reporting period.
 - However, they are now working with several Integrated Care Systems in the East of England – which contribute to regional audits and learner evaluations.
 - A significant challenge was identified with the East of England Ambulance Service (EEAST) being placed in special measures during 2020 by the Care Quality Commission due to concerns around patient and staff safety. This has been improved with two of the conditions of its license removed. An action plan was put in place to minimise the impact on the Paramedic Science programme and enhanced support was provided over the period.
 - The visitors considered the education provider has performed well in this area. Currently, there are no significant issues raised by external bodies with its stakeholders. Where the education provider had identified one such case, they have since worked to manage its impact.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
 - The education provider reflected on their NSS scores for their HCPC programmes, which is below the benchmark of 74.5% as provided in their portfolio for the year 2021/22. They noted the scores only related to two of their HCPC programmes – Paramedic and Operating Department Practice. Other programmes were either at postgraduate level or closing so were not included in the scoring. We understood the low score was specifically around the Paramedic programme as their other programme, Operating Department Practice scored 82% which is above the benchmark.
 - The education provider reflected on the various approaches they undertook to improve the Paramedic NSS scores. We understood new leadership and management have been introduced as well as new initiatives including mechanisms for learner feedback. Curriculum revisions are also being considered to the assessment of practice. The education provider noted the quality of the Paramedic Science programme remains a challenge. However, they recognise they need to do more to increase their NSS scores for their Paramedic programme
 - The visitors noted the education provider's honest reflection on their NSS scores, particularly in relation to the Paramedic programme, but we were reassured by the various steps the education provider is taking to ensure improvement. Therefore, the visitors are satisfied with how the education provider has performed well in this area.

- **Office for Students (OfS) monitoring –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they have responded to the consultation on the revised ongoing conditions of registration in March 2022 and how they have considered the published analysis of responses from July 2022, and used this information to inform their Education Action Plan.
 - The education provider noted that in 2019/20 all their undergraduate provision went through a programme design intensive in order to embed the University’s Active Curriculum Framework which aims to minimise barriers and maximise opportunities for all learners.
 - In their reflection, the education provider noted challenges in respect of the increasing first-class honours rate. The education provider had noted first class / 2:1s at 80% and 82% at their two campuses in the 2020/21 academic year, which is considerably above the sector benchmark.
 - They have reflected well on this and have taken and implemented actions to reduce this across the board. After a continuous increase in first class degrees between 2018 and 2021, the number of first-class degrees has now fallen to 27% which is nearly 9% decrease. The education provider attributed this to several interventions including staff CPD on assessments and marking and school -based reviews into assessment practices.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education’s performance in this area as they considered the education provider has reflected on their grade inflation issues and is taking steps to monitor and address this.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - We noted good reflection on / evidence of accreditation and relationships with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) across all the programmes. Existing and new relationships were explained well and in detail and were programme specific. No significant challenges were noted but the education provider noted they are awaiting feedback from other regulators including the General Pharmaceutical Council.
 - The visitors are satisfied with the education provider’s performance in this because there was clear engagement with relevant bodies and assurance that any feedback or actions from reviews will be appropriately dealt with.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Curriculum development –**

- The education provider submitted a thorough and detailed reflection on curriculum development for each of their programmes. There were no significant concerns noted and any challenges were reflected on in a clearly and transparent manner.
- For example, we understood the introduction of the Operating Department Practice apprenticeship programme in 2020 was a significant curriculum development. This required alignment to the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) and Institute for Apprenticeships & Technical Education (IfATE) standards and end point assessment plan.
- The education provider noted the IfATE Standard for Operating Department Practice was reviewed in December 2022 and amendments have been made to ensure the programme aligns with the new end point assessment arrangement. The education provider noted they were able to achieve this through standard curriculum revisions.

The visitors were satisfied the education provider has performed well as the reflection showed they have continued to engage different processes to drive curriculum.

- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**

- The education provider again noted here that there were no major changes. The visitors noted the reflection ties in with other parts of the portfolio in terms of the introduction of apprenticeships and the new PSRB accreditations.
- The visitors considered the education provider had reflected well on the challenges faced, for example, in relation to changes made by the Royal College of Occupational Therapists (RCOT). The education provider reflected on the challenge of keeping the curriculum relevant and contemporary, but within RCOT standards, despite lengthy accreditation periods. We understood the education provider is meeting this challenge using innovative technology as extensively as possible to ensure the most recent guidelines are embedded in their curriculum.
- The visitors were satisfied that the education provider is performing well in this area as their reflection showed they have continued to meet professional body guidance where relevant.

- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**

- The education provider submitted a thorough reflection which detailed the successes and challenges faced by each of their programmes. The visitors noted the education provider's transparent reflection on the potential future challenges if some of the changes and planning are unable to be implemented. For example, if a practice organisation simply cannot manage capacity at a particular time. If this should happen, the visitors considered this could impact on the education provider's performance and increase risk around ensuring capacity of practice-based learning in the future. However, the information provided reassured the visitors the education provider is taking a proactive approach to addressing concerns and improving capacity.
- Therefore, the visitors are satisfied about the education provider's performance 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 –**
 - The education provider uses a broad spread of organisations, tools, groups and committees and panels to ensure there were formal feedback processes in evidence, as well as more common informal feedback methods. They shared a specific example of where feedback has been used to adapt later events (the End of Life conference).
 - The visitors also noted the education provider's reflection on the challenges in 'survey fatigue' for learner representatives which they considered resulted in low response rates. We understood the Director of Student Experience and Engagement together with the Deputy Dean for Education and the Student Experience Manager and Officer monitor learner involvement and feedback. They also encouraged new initiatives to improve learners' engagement in feedback mechanisms.
 - As outlined in [quality theme 2](#), we understood how feedback was actioned and how it was fed back to learners, thus how the feedback loop was closed from the additional information provided.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area as the information provided clearly articulated how the education provider continues to use learners' feedback to improve their programmes.

- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The education provider stated in their reflection that there had been little feedback from practice placements during the reporting period apart from minor issues which they noted they had quickly identified and actioned. They noted how they had continued to maintain good relationships with practice educators but also how staffing and resourcing in the placement area had been a challenge.
 - Through [quality theme 3](#), the education provider submitted further reflection on how the programme teams were able to meet with practice educators in various forms to gather feedback from them and how actions were taken forward. For example, they reflected on the feedback and actions taken forward following email conversations between a practice educator and members of the Occupational Therapy team regarding an excellent Occupational Therapy learner's performance in practice. For their Paramedic Science programme, the education provider noted how they have responded to recent conversations between the London Ambulance Service and the paramedic programme team. We understood an agreement has been reached for the education provider to design and deliver some bespoke CPD modules to meet practice education needs.

- The visitors considered that the information provided both through the initial reflection and additional information assured them that the programmes continued to manage and use feedback from practice educators in a creative and innovative way. Therefore, they were satisfied the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **External examiners –**
 - The visitors noted the education provider’s comprehensive reflection on each programme and the feedback received from each external examiner as well as the challenges and developments being clearly identified in each case and reasons given.
 - We understood all HCPC registered programmes have received external examiner input and reports for appropriate levels for the reporting period and the education provider noted there have been no gaps in this.
 - In their reflection, the education provider noted some of the challenges they have had regarding recruitment of external examiners in the last few academic years. We understood this, together with the impact of COVID – 19, had resulted in a number of external examiners requiring an exceptional extension of contract. The education provider noted how this is perceived to be a sector wide challenge presently but also noted they are investigating this as an institution and have since made some progress across their programmes.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider’s performance in this area. They considered the thorough and detailed review of external examiner comments showed the education provider continues to use external examiner feedback and take appropriate actions in response to the feedback.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

Non-continuation rates:

- The education provider score is within the benchmark. The visitors noted good reflection on the reasons for the positive low rate of 1% against 3% benchmark in 2019 / 20. Despite the low non-continuation rate, the education provider discussed what they will continue doing and what they will develop, including the fact that they will continue to evaluate the impact of the pandemic.
- The visitors were satisfied the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Graduate outcomes:**

- The education provider's employability strategy shows clear thought and a deliberate means of ensuring they continued to meet the benchmark during this time.
 - The education provider reflected on the need for improvement in this area. They also recognised the potential impact of the advanced / non-medical prescribing programmes data not being included within this, as they have a separate standalone Continuing Professional Development module.
 - The visitors also noted the education provider's reflection on the challenges around gaining sufficient data from graduate. There was sufficient reflection to satisfy the visitors that the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Teaching quality:**
 - We noted the education provider achieved Silver in TEF 2017 and has recently completed the submission for TEF 2023. Until the results from the 2023 submission are received, we are aware it is only possible to reflect on the 2017 results.
 - The education provider noted the challenges around the actual submission of data to this particular framework and how it contributed to the existing learner surveys / challenges around completion of these. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance around teaching quality.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - The visitors noted that the below benchmark score for this was related to two of the education provider's HCPC approved programmes and for one of those, only one campus. They reflected on the low score and the visitors considered the reasons attributed to it appeared clear and reasonable.
 - Again, the focus on Paramedic Sciences was clear where they scored low in 2021/22, with a score of 50% in Cambridge and 38% at their Chelmsford campus. This was reflected on well. was clearly a high priority for the education provider, with new leadership and management in place to increase the promotion of the NSS for 2022/23 across the education provider.
 - The visitors were satisfied that where there have been issues resulting in low NSS scores, the education provider had quickly identified them are actively addressing the issues to ensure improvement across their NSS scores.
- **Programme level data:**
 - For this area, the visitors considered the education provider's reflection broadly mirrored the earlier reflections in the submission with clear reasons and explanation given for each programme – particularly where there were high staff: learner ratios.
 - The visitors considered the risks that these higher ratios contribute to, could be medium if the actions within the submission are not completed. However, as it stands, the education provider is aware of the potential risk and are identifying numerous methods to improve the

ratios in the coming years. Also, from their response to [quality theme 4](#), we had a glimpse into their 2022/23 data which was not part of the original portfolio.

- We noted there had been ongoing recruitment of staff to the Operating Department Practice and Paramedic programmes and the visitors were satisfied with this development.

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).

Referrals to next scheduled performance review

Interprofessional education – voluntary attendance

Summary of issue: Following the introduction of the Ruskin modules, we will review the education provider's reflection on the success of requiring mandatory attendance from September 2023.

Service user and carer involvement in the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Science and Engineering

Summary of issue: As noted earlier in the report, we will review the education provider's further reflection on the involvement of service users and carers in Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences and Faculty of Science and Engineering.

Equality and Diversity

Summary of issue: At the education provider's next performance review, we will review their reflection on feedback from learners and staff, and action planning within some protected characteristics as noted earlier.

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 2027-28 academic year. Although there are a few areas where the visitors have identified further reflection is required at the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process, the visitors considered this low risk. As such, they are satisfied that the education

provider's overall performance is reassuring enough for them to recommend a five-year review period.

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, practice educators, partner organisations, and external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with a number of professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - The education provider engaged with the Office for Students, Institute for Apprenticeships & Technical Education and Education and Skills Funding Agency. They also considered the findings of other regulators 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 data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change. The data supports the education provider's overall performance and provides further reassurance to the visitors that the education provider has minimal risk and as such we are confident to recommend a five-year review period.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/01/2014
Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) (SP only)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/01/2014
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/08/2017
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Degree Apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2020
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2014
Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Studies	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/01/2016
FDS in Hearing Aid Audiology	DL (Distance learning)	Hearing aid dispenser			01/07/2008
FdSc in Hearing Aid Audiology (Higher Apprenticeship)	DL (Distance learning)	Hearing aid dispenser			01/09/2021
MA Dramatherapy	FT (Full time)	Arts therapist	Drama therapy		01/09/2010
MA Music Therapy	FT (Full time)	Arts therapist	Music therapy		01/09/2006
MSc Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/01/2022
MSc Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/01/2022
Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/01/2014
Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) (SP only)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/01/2014