
Performance review process report

De Montfort University, 2021-22

Executive summary

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken to review HCPC-approved provision at the education provider. This assessment was undertaken as part of our quality assurance model in the 2021-22 academic year.

In our review, we considered that this institution is performing well, and visitors have recommended the education provider should next be reviewed in five years' time from the date of the submission, the 2026-27 academic year.

There are no referrals and issues to highlight. This report was considered by our Education and Training Panel on 31 March 2023.

Based on all information presented to them, they decided that the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2026-27 academic year.

Previous consideration Not applicable. The performance review process did not come from another 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 Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:

- Subject to the panel's decision, the education provider's next performance review will be in the 2026-27 academic year.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	3
About us	3
Our standards	3
Our regulatory approach	3
The performance review process	3
Thematic areas reviewed	4
How we make our decisions	4
The assessment panel for this review	4
Section 2: About the education provider	5
The education provider context	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	5
Institution performance data	5
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	6
Portfolio submission	6
Quality themes identified for further exploration	7
Quality theme 1 – principles and monitoring of service users and carers involvement	7
Quality theme 2 – work to ensure equality and diversity	8
Quality theme 3 – amendments due to, and learner support during COVID-19 ..	9
Quality theme 4 – ensuring the availability of practice-based learning for the paramedic programme	10
Section 4: Summary of findings	11
Overall findings on performance	11
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	11
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	13
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	14
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	15
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	16
Data and reflections	17
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	17
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	18
Assessment panel recommendation	18
Education and Training Committee decision	18
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution	19

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:

Lucy Myers	Lead visitor, speech and language therapist
Andrew Jones	Lead visitor, paramedic
Prisha Shah	Service user expert advisor
John Archibald	Education quality officer

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers nine HCPC-approved programmes across five professions. It is a higher education institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2000. The speech and language therapy programme which started in 2000 has since closed.

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	Hearing Aid Dispenser	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2011
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2019
	Radiographer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2019
	Speech and language therapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2017
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2019

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	Bench-mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	268	268	2022	This data comes from the education provider and is compared against the records we hold. As there is no disparity here, there are no issues to highlight about the sustainability of the programme.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	3%	2019-2020	This data comes from Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). As the value is the same as the benchmark, this indicates the education provider is performing as expected here.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	94%	97%	2019-2020	This data comes from Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). This is 3% above benchmark and indicates the education provider is doing well here.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	n/a	Gold	June 2017	A gold award would indicate that the institution is doing well.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	74.0%	72.4%	2022	This data comes from the Office for Students (OfS). This score indicates the percentage of learners who are satisfied with their learning is slightly lower than average.

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

Quality theme 1 – principles and monitoring of service users and carers involvement

Area for further exploration: The education provider informed us the paramedic programme had laid out a series of principles around service user involvement within the period under review. The visitors were unsure how these principles have worked in practice and whether the education provider had reflected on how they were meeting them. We were also unsure whether this system of principles is one which has been adopted by other programmes. The visitors sought information about how the education provider evaluated and monitored how well they were meeting the strategic objectives and compliance with policies for service user and care involvement.

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 reflected their service user and carer involvement principles continued to work well. We were informed the paramedic programme had met with Lived Experience Advisory Forum (LEAF) to discuss curriculum redesign, service user and carer input into staff selection and observed structured clinical examinations. The education provider explained other programmes have adopted the same approach as the paramedic programme, whereby service users and carers were integral to the programme. For example, a senior lecturer and a service user and carer taught consultation skills on the prescribing programme.

The education provider informed us all curriculum developments were discussed and presented through programme management boards where service users and carers reflected on the previous academic year and set objectives for the forthcoming one. LEAF were responsible for evaluating and monitoring how well the education provider met the strategic objectives and complied with policies for service user and care involvement.

The education provider reflected that service users and carers had effective involvement with the delivery of IPE. This was done through different ways. For example, service users and carers hold interviews with small groups of learners, where they talked about their experiences accessing health and social care. Learners asked them questions and prepared a presentation to talk about themes and issues discussed with the service users.

The visitors considered they understood how the education provider has evaluated and monitored how well they were meeting the strategic objectives and compliance with policies for service user and care involvement. They also understood how

effective the process of receiving service user and carer feedback has been. Following this quality activity, we had no further questions going forward.

Quality theme 2 – work to ensure equality and diversity

Area for further exploration: The education provider informed us there were areas which were challenging regarding diversity of cohorts on the programmes within the period under review. An example of this was recognising how teaching style and delivery session content can affect learners from differing cultural and religious backgrounds. The visitors were unsure about how effective the education provider's work in relation to equality and diversity was. The visitors therefore sought more information about the work the education provider has done around diversity and how it was reflected upon..

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 informed us they have a diverse learner body, with a significantly higher proportion of ethnic minority learners and more learners who classify themselves as disabled than the sector average. We understood this diversity of learners meant it was imperative for the education provider to consider how this diversity impacted on learners' needs. We noted initiatives were embedded into teaching, learning and assessment design to ensure diversity is inherent.

We were informed in 2018 / 19 the education provider launched an initiative of decolonising itself. This encouraged staff and learners to examine norms of education provider life to identify and eliminate systems, structures and behaviours that create disadvantage for ethnic minorities. The education provider explained the aim of this was to close the attainment gap for ethnic minority learners in higher education. We recognised this work links with the education provider's ongoing commitment to the race equality charter to make cultural and systemic changes that will have a positive difference to ethnic minority staff and learners.

The education provider reflected on how they had listened to learners. We understood learners had fed into work which had been undertaken, such as decolonising the education provider. Learners had been involved in the co-creation of the decolonising agenda and implementation of associated actions.

The education provider also stated they have reflected on the challenges of online learning in terms of learner engagement. We understood this was exacerbated by the education provider being situated in the geographical region which was subjected to the UK's longest lockdown period of over a year. The education provider informed us COVID-19 impacted on ethnic minority staff and learners disproportionately. The responded to online delivery by developing resources and

guidance to support staff on a range of different types of online learning. They also established a portal for learners and prospective learners to access information related to COVID-19, including safety measures and advice.

The visitors therefore understood the work the education provider had done concerning diversity. Following this quality activity, we had no further questions going forward.

Quality theme 3 – amendments due to, and learner support during COVID-19

Area for further exploration: The education provider explained COVID-19 had a significant impact on programmes which led to a considerable number of changes being made in a short time within the period under review. The visitors were unclear what changes had been made, and how learners were supported during the pandemic. They were also unsure whether any adaptations following COVID-19 had been retained. The visitors therefore sought more information about whether any changes had been made, and how were learners supported during the pandemic. They also sought further information whether any adaptations following COVID-19 had been retained, or had programmes reverted to how they used to be.

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 informed us they introduced both a safety net policy and a no detriment policy. These ensured adaptations to assessments were appropriately made, and no learner was disadvantaged academically by COVID-19. The education provider explained they developed new forms of remote assessments and introduced a 24-hour window for learners to complete their summer 2020 exams. This supported learners with specific learning difficulties and led to a significant closing of the disability attainment gap in 2019 / 20. The no detriment policy ensured learners would not be unfairly affected by changes made to learning, teaching and assessment. We were informed the education provider's analysis of the impact of the no detriment policy stated learner's reasons for leaving associated with academic failure fell by over 13%. Retention for learners studying at level 4 improved by over 2%.

The education provider informed us they had supported learners through COVID-19 in different ways. For example, they developed a mini-module for all learners at the start of the 2020 / 21 academic year to prepare them for learning online. The education provider reflected engagement with this was not consistent across programmes. The mini-module was therefore redesigned as a result of feedback. As part of this feedback a new provision called DMU (De Montfort University) Basecamp was created. This is an online resource to develop learner's confidence studying and to gain easy access to learning support.

The education provider stated they had evaluated the impact of changes made during the pandemic. They informed us some adaptations were retained if they were deemed beneficial, and many programmes returned to pre-pandemic assessments. An example of this is the prescribing provision which moved numeracy and pharmacy exams online because of COVID-19. Following positive feedback to this change, they were made permanent.

The visitors considered changes to assessments had been made because of COVID-19, and learners were supported appropriately. They also fully understood whether any adaptations following COVID-19 had been retained. Following this quality activity, we had no further questions going forward.

Quality theme 4 – ensuring the availability of practice-based learning for the paramedic programme

Area for further exploration: The education provider informed us capacity of practice-based learning has remained stable across programmes within the period under review. The visitors noted paramedic practice education is supported by one provider, East Midlands Ambulance Service (EMAS). However, we were unclear how the education provider's processes had guaranteed practice-based learning for the paramedic provision. The visitors therefore sought more information about this.

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 visitors were informed the education provider's process were effective to assess, review and mitigate challenges in practice and the extent to which they could impact on provision. The education provider outlined how they had worked with EMAS using a two-pronged approach. We understood the education provider used simulation to enable learners to demonstrate competence in areas which they have not been exposed to in practice. We were also informed fallow weeks had been built into the paramedic provision when learners could gain more exposure to aspects of practice within EMAS. The education provider informed us they continued to develop initiatives to fill gaps in learning. For example, they had discussed with secondary care partners about holding masterclass sessions where learners can discuss issues not covered in practice. The education provider explained the change to the paramedic programme will have a positive effect on the learner experience.

The visitors considered the education provider's processes to guarantee practice-based learning considering challenges to ambulance services and changes to the programme were effective. Following this quality activity, we had no further questions going forward.

Section 4: Summary of 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 –**
 - We understood the education provider successfully validated programmes and negotiated learner numbers with major practice-based learning providers including East Midlands Ambulance Service and University Hospitals Leicester. We were informed partnerships with regional practice-based learning providers were formalised with agreements negotiated on a periodic basis to secure stability.
 - We understood the education provider enhanced the learner experience of practice-based learning. We considered they had done this by enhancing physical resources, such as simulation suites and equipment, and the practice experience. The visitors considered all programmes were well-resourced and sustainable.
 - We understood the education provider worked to increase capacity and learner numbers. We understood the number of applications is strong. The education provider reviewed resourcing regularly and had effective means to respond if appropriate.
 - The education provider has an effective process to reflect and act where necessary to ensure programmes are appropriately resourced.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The visitors noted the education provider has successful and long-term relationships with a variety of organisations. We recognised the education provider has created partnerships with private, voluntary, and independent practice education providers which benefits learners with an increase in the range of practice settings they can gain experience in.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - We recognised the education provider monitors both academic and placement quality through several mechanisms. For example, the programme assessment and enhancement document. This is presented via the health and wellbeing programme management board. The programme assessment and enhancement document included collated information taken from module enhancement plans,

learner voice, National Student Survey, external examiner reports, learner feedback, and analysis of academic data sets.

- Practice-based learning is kept under continuous review, by meeting regularly with practice partners to ensure sufficient mentors and effective placement support was available, and to provide training.
- We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Interprofessional education (IPE) –**
 - We understood IPE is rooted in all programmes. The education provider informed us there have been challenges in maintaining learner engagement, which have been common to the move to more online learning in general. This is because learners have had to adjust to a different style of learning and of interacting with each other and with teaching staff.
 - The education provider has reflected on the challenges of maintaining learner engagement. All IPE events have consequently been redesigned to be accessible remotely.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - We understood the education provider is committed to effectively involving service users and carers with each programme. We recognised service users and carers engage with programmes in a variety of ways such as teaching events, meetings, and consultations. The Lived Experience Advisory Forum (LEAF) coordinate their activities. LEAF is comprised of people with different types of lived experience and academic representatives from a range of clinical programmes.
 - The programmes continue to promote the service user and carer's perspective as being central to patient care. This is embedded in course design and curriculum. We considered their inclusion means learners have a rounded learning experience.
 - As detailed in [Quality theme 1](#), we understood how the education provider has evaluated and monitored how well they were meeting the strategic objectives and compliance with policies for service user and care involvement, and how effective the process of receiving service user and carer feedback has been.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - We understood the education provider aims to support learners and staff to reach their full potential in a fully inclusive environment where difference is accepted, valued, celebrated, and supported. We understood the education provider's equality and diversity strategy sets out their ambition to create a fairer organisation.
 - The education provider informed us programmes reflect on their provision to meet agreed standards for supporting equality and diversity in marketing, recruitment, delivery, teaching and learning, and assessment.

- As detailed in [Quality theme 2](#), we understood the work the education provider had done concerning diversity, and how effective learner representation has been.
- We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - We noted the education provider informed us their strategic development plan Education 2030 requires all programmes to move to a blocked teaching and assessment approach. This necessitates course redesign and revalidation to take place in the academic year 2022 / 23.
 - We consider the education provider had appropriately recognised their future needs across all programmes.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - We understood COVID-19 had a significant impact on the education provider. We noted the education provider responded quickly to the challenges of COVID-19. Placements across all programmes were impacted by restrictions on learner access.
 - They provided effective support for learners during COVID-19 and had introduced a range of alternative teaching and assessment methods.
 - We considered the education provider was responsive to changes to regulations and guidance, while being committed to delivering quality education. Learners were able to graduate to the required standards expected by all professions.
 - As detailed in [Quality theme 3](#), we understood why changes to assessments had been made because of COVID-19, and learners were supported appropriately. They also fully understood whether any adaptations following COVID-19 had been retained.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - We considered the education provider recognised COVID-19 had necessitated putting into place technological changes. The education provider increased onsite simulation facilities. Programmes introduced or expanded technological changes for teaching and learning. All teaching was forced to a virtual format. We understood the use of technology has facilitated developments and new ways of working. For example, online case-based learning and telehealth practice-based

learning. Simulated practice-based learning had been introduced during COVID-19 and had been retained.

- We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - We understood existing apprenticeships within HCPC-regulated provision applied to hearing aid dispensers and paramedics. We consider the education provider has effective plans for the development of apprenticeship programmes in the future. This includes the development of both speech and language therapy and diagnostic radiography programmes.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing 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 –**
 - We recognised there have been no assessments against UK quality code for higher education standards during the review period.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - We understood the education provider does not have a unified approach to this area. The education provider informed us individual programmes relate to this issue differently due to significant differences in the range of providers used.
 - However, all programmes require placements to self-declare any issues identified in quality reviews as part of the service agreements. Prescribing and paramedic provision use an audit tool which captures information about quality reviews.
 - We understood the education provider recognises they can further improve their audit processes so that the status of quality reviews is specifically addressed in audit tools used by all programmes and service agreements.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
 - We understood during the review period the overall satisfaction with the education provider and provision had fallen. We considered the education provider has effective processes to identify areas of development. For example, the education provider is developing approaches to support assessment and feedback and enhancing and promoting learning resources.
 - We recognised programme data shows the provision exceeds the institutional average and is in line with the overall sector average.

- We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - We noted the education provider stated there were no Office for Students monitoring events during the review period. However, we considered the education provider has effective means to ensure they consider learner feedback. For example, module level feedback from learners was collected, summarised, and discussed at curriculum development meetings. These led to programme enhancement planning. We noted the education provider was committed to improving the learner experience and outcomes.
 - We are satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - We understood none of the programmes within the scope of this review were reaccredited or reapproved in the timeframe covered by this performance review. However, where applicable, programmes have maintained accreditation with their specific professional bodies during the review period.
 - We recognise significant reapproval and reaccreditation events are planned for the coming year.
 - We are satisfied with how the education provider is performing 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 –**
 - We understood there have been very few internally or externally driven curriculum developments, focused at a high or principles level. We recognise the education provider is about to enter a period of significant curriculum development.
 - We considered the education provider has effective means of exploring how the curriculum can be reviewed to ensure it is accessible. Programme teams were involved with external groups who feed into curriculum development work.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - We noted the education provider engaged effectively with professional bodies. The education provider informed us they adjust programmes in accordance with recommendations from professional bodies. For example, the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy developed guidance relating to dysphagia competencies and

placement provision in response to COVID-19. The education provider has changed the dysphagia curriculum and placements. Learners will have two designated dysphagia placements, increased dysphagia teaching hours on campus and engage in online dysphagia simulation activities.

- We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
 - We considered the education provider has an effective process for guaranteeing the availability of practice-based learning. We noted the education provider has effective process for responding to challenges regarding the availability of practice-based learning. We recognised there have been various pressures on NHS placement capacity and a significant impact from COVID-19 on placement providers, waiting lists, staff morale and service capacity.
 - We recognised the education provider has strong working relationships with practice partners. This ensures learners have the practice-based learning opportunities, so they gain the experiences and competences required.
 - As detailed in [Quality theme 4](#), we understood how the education provider's processes guarantee practice-based learning considering challenges to ambulance services and changes to paramedic programmes.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing 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 –**
 - We considered the education provider has a variety of effective means of gaining feedback from learners. For example, the learner voice forum and module level feedback.
 - We considered the education provider is committed to supporting learners. For instance, online exams were challenging for learners with young children at home. The education provider recognised this and learners were subsequently allowed to start the exam within a 24-hour window.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - We considered the education provider has effective means of gaining feedback from practice partners, such as tripartite meetings between the education provider, practice partners and learners.

- We understood programme teams support practice educators in diverse ways and respond to feedback. For example, practice educators requested they receive more information about the learner who was due to begin practice-based learning. After discussing what type of information was useful, the education provider devised and now uses a learner profile.
- We are satisfied how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **External examiners –**
 - The visitors considered feedback from external examiners is positive. External examiners provided specific feedback about issues. We recognised that where external examiners have noted areas for enhancement, the education provider has the means to reflect and respond. For example, a theme within the feedback was the consistency of approach to providing feedback to learners. The education provider developed a set of rubrics based on the grade descriptors, and a consistent approach to preparing assignment briefings.
 - We are satisfied how the education provider is performing 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: We noted the appropriate and honest reflection undertaken by the education provider. We also noted, through the data, the education provider has performed well. For example, the visitors noted the low continuation rates for the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) programme. We were informed this occurred due to a higher than usual number of learners failing their first year. We understood the education provider had reflected on this and were unsure whether all learners in that year group understood they had to pass all year one modules. We understood the education provider had undertaken work in response to this and reiterated to subsequent year groups the need to pass all modules. Continuation rates and progression data had subsequently improved.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

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

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

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

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

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2026-27 academic year

Reason for this recommendation: We have come to this recommendation because we consider:

- the education provider has performed well during the review period;
- the education provider responded positively to the challenges of COVID-19;
- the education provider is committed to quality assurance;
- the education provider received positive feedback from formal review activities;
- the education provider has identified areas that need attention, and they have appropriate and effective plans to address them;
- all programmes gather and respond to feedback from different stakeholders; and

where we did have areas we wanted to explore further, the education provider responded with sound thinking and evidence.

Education and Training Committee decision

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

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

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2026-27 academic year

Reason for this decision: ETC made this decision based on the above visitors' recommendations.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)	FT (Full time)	Hearing aid dispenser			01/09/2011
Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology	FT (Full time)	Hearing aid dispenser			01/01/2008
Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology (Degree Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	Hearing aid dispenser			01/09/2019
BSc (Hons) Paramedicine	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2019
BSc (Hons) Paramedicine (Apprentice Pathway)	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/05/2021
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2019
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/10/2017
Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (V300) Level 6	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/10/2019
Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (V300) Level 7	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/10/2019