

---

## Performance review process report

### Leeds Beckett University, 2018-2022

---

#### Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of Leeds Beckett 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.
- Undertook 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.
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed.

#### Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
    - Engagement with learners on the impact of Covid-19. We noted the blended approach to delivery that has resulted from the impact of Covid-19. Through a quality activity we were able to determine that learners' views and opinions were considered in the delivery of the blended approach.
  - The following are areas of best practice:
    - We noted the development of a "Freedom to Speak Up Guardian" which resulted from discussions with local Trusts to ensure the equity of learning experience for all.
    - In relation to learners, the visitors noted the education provider has put actions in place to provide learners with advanced notice of timetable in the 2023/24 academic year for the entire academic year.
  - The following areas should be referred to another HCPC process for assessment:
    - We noted a Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group was established to highlight best practice across both Schools in relation to the quality of practice-based learning. As it is early days, the visitors would like to receive reflections on how this group is progressing, and outcomes from the working group, through the next performance review.
    - The education provider recognised the ongoing concerns about the cost-of-living crisis. As of the 2022/23 academic year (and therefore outside this
-

---

review), the education provider is putting in place measures that reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, reduces the cost of meals on campus and introducing a free shuttle. As it is early days, the visitors would like the education provider to reflect upon how these support measures worked through the next performance review.

- The provider must next engage with monitoring in 5 years, the 2027-28 academic year, because:
  - They have adequately addressed issues raised by the visitors and supported their response with a range of thorough and comprehensive reflections. The visitors considered the education provider low risk and where they are showing risk, for example in practice-based capacity, they have a risk register in place and governance structure to manage this, providing good assurance. Therefore, the visitors were content to recommend a 5-year review period.

---

**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
- whether issues identified for referral through this review should be reviewed, and if so how.

---

**Next steps** Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:

- Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2027-28 academic year
- Subject to the Panel's decision, we will undertake further investigations as per section 5.

---

## Included within this report

Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:.....	2
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 – engagement with learners on the impact of Covid-19 .....	10
Section 4: Findings.....	10
Overall findings on performance .....	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	15
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection .....	17
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection.....	18
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions .....	20
Data and reflections .....	21
Section 5: Issues identified for further review .....	22
Referrals to next scheduled performance review.....	23
Outcome of the newly established Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group.....	23
Measure put in place to reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, cost of meals on campus and the newly introduced free shuttle.....	23
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes.....	23
Assessment panel recommendation.....	23
Outcome of the newly established Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group.....	25
Measure put in place to reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, cost of meals on campus and the newly introduced free shuttle.....	25
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution .....	27

## 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:

Julie-Anne Lowe	Lead visitor, Occupational therapist
Paula Charlesworth	Lead visitor, Dietitian
Manoj Mistry	Service User Expert Advisor
Temilolu Odunaike	Education Quality Officer
Tracey Samuel-Smith	Education Manager

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 15 HCPC-approved programmes across five professions, and two post-registration programmes for supplementary prescribing / independent prescribing annotations. It is a Higher Education Institution (HEI) and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1994. The oldest being their Dietetics programmes from 1994.

HCPC approved programmes are within two Schools. The Speech and language therapy programme sits in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, while the other approved programmes sit in the School of Health. The practice-based learning for all HCPC approved programmes is managed by the Health and Social Care Practice Learning Team within the School of Health.

Through the legacy model, the education provider engaged with the approval process for their Occupational Therapy provision in 2019. Increase in learner numbers on their Physiotherapy and Dietetics provision was reviewed via our annual monitoring audit process in June 2020. They have had programme closures for the PG Dip Dietetics programme and their Art therapy programme in 2019 and 2021 respectively. The last annual monitoring in the legacy model for the education provider was in 2019-20.

The education provider engaged with our focused review process for the introduction of a new part-time route to their existing MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) full time programme (first intake September 2023). All these interactions have been concluded with no actions referred to other processes.

### **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
<b>Pre-registration</b>	Arts therapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2004
	Dietitian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1994
	Occupational therapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2005
	Physiotherapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1995
	Speech and language therapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2013
<b>Post-registration</b>	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2015

### 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	569	801	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 above the benchmark.</p> <p>We explored this through the assessment. We were satisfied that the education provider's learner number planning model helps to ensure resourcing continues</p>

				to be adequate and their network and partnership approach continue to positively influence capacity of practice-based learning.
Learner non continuation	3%	2%	2020-21	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 10%.</p> <p>We explored this through the assessment and noted the improvement was a result of the several actions that the education provider put in place to address issues promptly.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	97%	2019-20	<p>This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained.</p>



Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Silver	2017	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."
Learner satisfaction	75.8%	74.1%	2022	<p>This NSS data was sourced at the summary level. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</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 4%.</p> <p>We explored this through seeking further clarification with the education provider. We were satisfied the education provider has appropriate plans in place to improve the scores and this has reflected in their 2023 scores where they have improved by 5% to attain a score of 81.9%.</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 – engagement with learners on the impact of Covid-19

**Area for further exploration:** The visitors noted the ongoing blended approach to delivery was adopted with clear reasoning provided for this in response to the impact of the pandemic. This was clearly articulated within the reflections. However, the visitors noted the education provider did not engage with learners to understand their opinion about changes that were made to their learning as a result of the impact of Covid-19. Therefore, the visitors requested to know if learners' opinion was considered and if yes, how it was used.

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

**Outcomes of exploration:** The education provider confirmed that learners' views and opinions were considered for the ongoing blended approach to delivery. An example of this was the learner feedback that was gathered via the survey with BSc and MSc learners in February 2022 about the blended approach to teaching undertaken in the academic year 2021-2022. Responses showed the majority (65%) of learners considered that the balance of learning activities was appropriate and helpful. As a result, the education provider decided to maintain the balance of blended learning at Levels 5, 6 and 7. The education provider also mentioned the learner consultation exercise that was undertaken at the Physiotherapy re-validation event of 2022 where they discussed all aspects of learning to inform the new curriculum.

The visitors were therefore satisfied that learners' opinion were considered in how the education provider managed the impact of Covid-19 and the learning taken forward. The visitors did not have any further concerns following the quality activity.

## 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 reflected on the amalgamation of four Schools into two within the organisation. This resulted in there being a School of Health (the majority of HCPC approved programmes) and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences from January 2023. The Speech and language therapy programmes sits within this latter School.
  - The Speech and language therapy programme maintains its links with the School of Health through reciprocal teaching, practice-based learning organisation and support and inter-professional learning.
  - Both Schools submitted accounts showing their continued financial stability. These had been confirmed by external auditors.
  - In providing clarity, the education provider submitted additional information that supported their financial statement. Their reflection on their modelling and planning structure reassured us they considered risks such as fluctuations in learner recruitment, changes to government funding etc in ensuring their financial viability and sustainability. In addition, their five-year Internal Funding Model (IFM), five-year staffing forecasts together with their establishment structures for each School and Service helped to ensure the level of resourcing reflected the level of learners and that it is appropriate.
  - In addition, both Schools reflected on their increase in staff numbers. This has been in line with the relevant professional body guidance about staff: student ratios. For example, this meant for the occupational therapy programme, new staff were recruited to deliver the new BSc (Hons) programme.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
  - The education provider reflected upon their strong relationships with partners, locally and nationally.
  - The visitors also noted the strong partnership working with NHS England (formerly Health Education England) to address concerns about practice-based learning.
  - From further clarifications received, we noted how the education provider worked with different partners, including other HEIs to ensure sufficient practice-based learning capacity and sustainability. For example, in West Yorkshire, they worked with an Occupational Therapy / Physiotherapy Delivery Group which helped to resolve placement capacity jointly with the education provider and other education providers in the region.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **Academic and placement quality –**
  - As part of the merger of Schools, new developments, including the combining of processes had to be worked through. These were assessed with appropriate strategic planning and monitoring. For

example, pedagogical working practices were integrated into the two new Schools.

- It was clear the education provider had put in place benchmarks, with appropriate monitoring, during this process. For example, there were robust Annual Monitoring Reviews (AMRs) and External Examiner feedback considered.
  - The visitors noted the sharing of positive developments internally, such as exploring how PebblePad could work alongside personal tutors to enhance learning engagement and support understanding.
  - In addition, in the 2022/23 academic year, a Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group was established to highlight best practice across both Schools. It is early days, and the visitors would like the education provider to reflect upon how this group is progressing and performing through the next performance review.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Interprofessional education –**
    - Health and social care learners from across the School of Health and the School of Humanities & Social Sciences participate in inter-professional learning workshops in which they learn about and experience the value of multi-professional working. Workshops were co-developed and led by co-ordinators from each School. The workshops are also supported by people with lived experiences of accessing services, administrative staff and academic staff from across all professions.
    - During and since the pandemic the interprofessional learning (IPL) sessions have been undertaken online with success. Workshops reflect current policy and practice across health and social care and to embed service users and carers as a core part of the learning experience.
    - Learners accessed the HEE-led multi professional Student Council fora that enabled development of leadership skills and networking with other learner professionals from various other HEIs. We noted IPL Champions were needed to further develop the IPL provision.
    - In providing clarity, the education provider submitted additional information that outlined:
      - how the IPE champions contributed to each programme area;
      - how service users supported in the delivery of IPE events;
      - how the education provider ensured IPE was delivered across the range of HCPC and other health provision; and
      - how learning outcomes for IPE were met.
    - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Service users and carers –**

- The education provider noted they have a strong network of service users and carers who have been involved across the programmes over the years with roles ranging across admissions and teaching.
  - The education provider has now set up a Lived Experience Group whose function is to review existing documents and provide new guidance for the Schools regarding best practice for the involvement of people with lived experiences, in programme delivery, learner selection and research.
  - In providing clarity, the education provider submitted additional information on the involvement of the Lived Experience Group. We understood the group aims to scope current practice in service user involvement across a range of activities. These will include module design, delivery and assessment, learner recruitment and research / patient and public involvement. They will also identify best practice for service user involvement both internally and externally.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the reflection and clarification received was sufficient to reassure them that the education provider is performing well in this area.
- **Equality and diversity –**
    - Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) is embedded within the strategic plans of the Schools with the plans recognising and prioritising the learner attainment gap.
    - The education provider recognises that learners experience education in different and unequal ways which is reflected in patterns of differential outcome. The education provider is committed to working with their learner body to better understand their experiences and change practice so that all learners can benefit from learning opportunities.
    - A new EDI Committee has been established at School level. The Committee advises the School Academic Committee on aspects of the School Plan relating to equality, diversity and inclusion. The EDI Committee will help to support the School Academic Committee in monitoring the School's performance in relation to equality and diversity. The EDI Committee will also act as a forum to discuss and develop proposals and actions to enhance equality and diversity within the school.
    - Within practice-based learning, the education provider noted that some Black, Asian, Minority Ethnic (BAME) learners were experiencing microaggressions, and as such they have opened discussions with local Trusts to ensure the equity of learning experience for all. This has led to the development of a "Freedom to Speak Up Guardian". This individual is a counsellor and not part of a programme team. They are available to any learner who is experiencing difficulties in practice-based learning.
    - Further clarity was received from the education provider on monitoring and risk management of EDI. We understood a Corporate Risk Register was set up to consider EDI issues in relation to staff engagement and performance as well as failure to recruit required learner numbers amongst other things. From summary reports,

minutes and notes received from the EDI Committee, the education provider's Academic quality and standards committee was able to monitor EDI and manage risk.

- The visitors determined there was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
  - The education provider has robust policies, processes and working groups in place to consider a range of potential / actual issues impacting the training of healthcare professions going forward.
  - For example, the portfolio talked about practice-based learning capacity across the geographical region. The education provider recognised the development of new programmes (i.e. in Speech and language therapy) was a result of wider workforce needs. However, this had the potential to impact on availability of practice-based learning for their learners. They therefore recognised the need to expand capacity and have set up working groups to consider timings and share paperwork across education providers, while attending steering groups to develop and maintain a collaborative approach.
  - On a different front, the education provider recognised the ongoing concerns about the cost-of-living crisis. As of the 2022/23 academic year (and therefore outside this review), the education provider was putting in place measures that reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, reduces the cost of meals on campus and introducing a free shuttle. It is early days, and the visitors would like the education provider to reflect upon how these measures worked through the next performance review.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** Regarding placement quality, we noted that in the 2022/23 academic year, a Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group was established to highlight best practice across both Schools. It is early days, and the visitors would like to review reflection on how this group is progressing and performing through the next performance review.

As part of their horizon scanning, the education provider recognises the ongoing concerns about the cost-of-living crisis. As of the 2022/23 academic year (and therefore outside this review), the education provider is putting in place measures that reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, reduces the cost of meals on campus and introducing a free shuttle. It is early days, and the visitors would like the education provider to reflect upon how these measures worked through the next performance review.

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** We noted the development of a “Freedom to Speak Up Guardian” which resulted from discussions with local Trusts to ensure the equity of learning experience for all.

## Quality theme: Thematic reflection

### **Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
  - The education provider reflected on how each profession is embedding each SOP. For example, on Active implementation of standards, we understood the Dietetics programme has reviewed documentation and delivery content to ensure wording and approach reflects those found within the SOPs. The education provider also noted that reviewing each level and module provision ensures the programme continues to meet the new SOPs for Dietetics including practice placement core skills.
  - Regarding registrant's mental health, programmes have specific mental health strands and modules focused on recognition of mental health in all aspects of the lifespan for the learner and the service user. Processes and mechanisms are in place to support and refer learners on where appropriate. These include academic advisors, counselling opportunities, use of the fitness to practise and study process, as well as other mechanisms. Each learner is allocated an academic advisor for support in the University and a practice liaison lecturer for support within practice learning. These enable access and guidance to bespoke and appropriate services as well as enabling self-reflection on the learner's current wellbeing.
  - Further reflection received on embedding the SOP around service user involvement showed their involvement in teaching, learning and assessment has been reviewed across the programmes. For example, we noted specific increase in content around communication and consent has been built into the course introduction modules of the Physiotherapy programmes.
  - The education provider's reflection together with the further clarification received satisfied the visitors the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
  - There were a number of strategies initiated to support learners and practice educators remotely during the pandemic. For example, learner progression was monitored via Placement Assessment Review and Evaluation' system (PARE) online assessment tools for some programmes including the Dietetics and Physiotherapy programmes.
  - The education provider reflected on how they worked with AHP teams in Trusts and other HEIs to manage placement shortfalls and plan capacity on a three-monthly basis. They also reflected on elements of changes that were implemented during Covid-19 but which they are retaining as good practice. For example, placement provision of five placements running for six weeks each on the Physiotherapy programme. The education provider noted this has helped to reduce administration and has led to greater time for learners on each placement to stretch or recover learner grades, among other benefits.
  - Through [quality theme 1](#) we understood learners' view and opinion was considered in establishing the blended approach to delivery.

- The visitors were satisfied the reflection and quality activity showed the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
  - Prior to, and because of Covid-19, the use of technology within teaching and assessment has increased. For example, the flipped classrooms, recordings of lectures and online library materials.
  - Covid-19 meant most of the teaching and learning was quickly moved online. Since the pandemic, hybrid and blending learning has come to the fore.
  - We noted examples of the use of technology, both within the curriculum and wider context and processes. These examples showed how the education provider had reflected on how the development of technology was used, and will be used, going forward.
  - For example, live lecture capture and the recording of sessions reduced the need for note taking for learners, allowing them to progress at their own pace. It also meant that learners who were unable to attend in person, continued to have the opportunity to learn.
  - The education provider noted how simulation had been used for some years, using actors and virtual case studies. We understood this provided a safe space to practice as well as developing understanding.
  - The education provider reflected upon the ongoing enhancement of development of virtual case studies. These supported pre-placement learning and help to increase capacity. They are currently working on “Beckett Town” to produce case studies of individuals in collaboration with the School of Arts multi-media centre.
  - Additional information received reassured the visitors that the use of technology was monitored. Ongoing evaluation of module learning was monitored by Course Directors. This fed into their annual reports and action logs as part of the ‘Monitoring, Annual Review and Enhancement’ (MARE) activities processes.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Apprenticeships –**
  - We noted the education provider does not currently run any HCPC approved degree apprenticeship programmes. However, they do run degree apprenticeship programmes in a range of other areas.
  - The education provider acknowledged they are keen to expand their degree apprenticeship provision, as they reflected on the “exponential growth” in demand from employers.
  - We noted the degree of caution from the education provider regarding the management and delivery of additional programmes. They reflected on how these programmes are resource intensive and must be adequately resourced and supported to be developed. For example, with specialist staff in place to deliver the apprenticeships functions.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well 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 –**
  - The education provider noted how, in the 2018-19 academic year, they had undertaken a significant mapping against the UK Quality Code.
  - The visitors noted that since then, the education provider had undertaken a review of all the programme documentation to ensure they incorporated the mapping for the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and Subject Benchmark statements.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
  - The education provider noted that there had been no reports from the relevant Clinical Commission Groups (CCGs) regarding allied health practice-based learning in the region.
  - The education provider outlined the process for identifying if reports are received and how these are taken forward by the Director of Health Partnerships and Practice Learning.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
  - The education provider reviews and evaluates their NSS outcomes as part of their annual monitoring and review activity. The review is done by each School and a Deans Summary report is presented to the Academic Quality Standards Committee following the review. The outcomes of the review work feed into the education provider's Annual Good Standing process.
  - Through clarification received about the action plans in place to improve the NSS scores and the outcomes, we understood that as part of their annual review and Good Standing processes, Course Directors engaged with the NSS outcomes. Where there was underperformance, Course Directors included actions related to these in the programme annual action plan, as a requirement of the annual monitoring and review process and Good Standing process. These were monitored at School Academic Committee.
  - We were therefore satisfied there was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
  - The visitors noted the detailed and comprehensive reflection from the education provider regarding how they responded to each of the revised conditions of registration.

- These outlined full engagement and compliance with the conditions, including identifying further planned development to enhance their engagement. For example, relating to the role and purpose of the external examination.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
    - We noted the clear engagement the education provider had with the relevant professional bodies.
    - For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider reflected on their engagement with the Association of Chartered Physiotherapists in Neurology (ACPIN). This is a professional network recognised by the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP). The education provider described this involvement as “informing and enhancing the physiotherapy curriculum”. For example, the Course Director is the education provider’s representative on the CSP’s HEI group. This involvement has enabled learning and development with other HEI provision to discuss current issues and share good practice.
    - The education provider also outlined, how they were specifically involved with each of the other relevant professional bodies.
    - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Curriculum development –**
  - All programmes are expected to undertake the annual good standing process, which could require revalidation, modification or enhancements to curriculum.
  - The education provider’s reflection included both internally and externally driven curriculum development. For example, the education provider reflected on their process of embedding the revised SOPs as part of externally driven curriculum development.
  - An example of internally driven curriculum development is the changes to the module structure of BSc (Hons) Speech & Language Therapy to bring the Eating Drinking and Swallowing module from year 3 into year 2. We understood this will provide learners with the required academic learning earlier in the programme and give a foundation for practical application during placement activities across year 2 and year 3.
  - From further clarification on contributions to curriculum development, we noted module modifications were based upon current agendas, programme reports, module evaluations and learner forums. Clinical educators, clinical managers and service users also contributed to curriculum development. Other external groups such as HEE North

East Yorkshire 'Learning Environments and Placements team' (LEAP) team also contributed to the development of the curriculum.

- The visitors were satisfied that curriculum development continues to be driven by both internal and external influences. As such, they determined the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
  - The education provider reflected on developments across the different programmes, which have been as a result of changes in professional body guidance. For example, for their Speech and Language Therapy programme, there is now a requirement for learners who enter the BSc programme from 2023 and the MSc programme from 2024 to meet the new Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy (RCSLT) dysphagia competencies. We understood the change would ensure graduates are equipped with a comparable level of knowledge and skill when working with clients with Dysphagia.
  - For their Dietetics provision, the education provider noted they meet the professional body requirement of 1000 practice-based learning hours with aspects of it as simulation or alternative emerging placement styles not more than 350 hours. Developments to meet the staff: student ratio have enabled a pathway for preparation for fitness to practise, self-awareness and declaration of wellness for study but also for practice placement.
  - There was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they managed capacity of practice-based learning across their AHP professions. Given the differences in the size of the workforce and availability of practice educators, we understood this is managed differently across the professions. For example, for Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy, the placements are more local, predominantly at one of the three NHS Trusts. Whereas the smaller professions (Speech and Language Therapy and Dietetics) placed learners in a wider geographical area, due to the number of practice educators and therefore placements available in West Yorkshire.
  - The education provider reflected on how regular placement coordinator meetings with the Director of Health Partnerships and Practice Learning and local NHS AHP leads for all of their four AHP professions have helped to promote a planned approach to ensuring capacity of practice-based learning.
  - For the Dietetics programme, practice-based learning capacity was agreed with providers on an annual basis and there are current developments of alternate ways of working through NHS England. As an example, the education provider noted they have explored fully digital provision of practice-based learning to afford increased capacity and are in continuing discussion with their colleagues to continue to offer this provision.

- Further clarification was received about the education provider's review of their monitoring procedures to deal with practice-based learning capacity issues due to the increased demand from their own programmes and other regional providers. For example, we understood the Dean and Director of Health Partnerships worked closely with the Integrated Care System (ICS) People Boards and the Leeds Health and Care Academy (Leeds One Workforce Strategic Board, LOWSB) to align workforce needs to learner growth. The mapping of placement capacity was a part of this process.
- As such, there was sufficient reflection provided to determine the education provider has performed well 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 –**
  - Learner evaluation is done at both programme and module level throughout the provision with involvement of the student representatives. We noted mid and end of module evaluations allowed direct feedback and actioning through the student representatives.
  - As a result of their NSS and Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) outcomes, action planning for improvement has been based on the learner voice and reflections on feedback in relation to action / transparency has been addressed.
  - There is action plan in place for the education provider to provide learners with the 2023-24 academic timetable for the whole academic year. We noted this is happening for the first time.
  - Programme directors will continue to oversee the implementation of methods of gaining and responding to feedback from learners, with an emphasis on communicating how feedback has been acted on. This will be done both to cohorts who gave feedback and as a basis for enhancements to future cohorts. We noted no formal complaints have been received from 2018-19 to date.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the reflection showed the education provider has performed well in this area.
  
- **Practice placement educators –**
  - We noted the education provider runs regular placement coordinator meetings and Trust senior management meetings with AHP leads, Practice Learning Facilitator (PLFs) and service managers. These helped to ensure issues, concerns, capacity and allocation matters are responded to quickly and a forum is provided for discussion around approaches and policy.
  - The education provider reflected on some of the issues of concern they received from practice educators during the Covid-19 years. These related to risk assessment of learners and identifying vulnerabilities. In

responding to the issues, the education provider developed a learner self-assessment of risk form. This allowed learners to identify any vulnerabilities against government guidance at the time and this information was shared with placement providers so that specific measures could be put in place to protect them.

- Another example was around their online assessment process. The education provider reflected on how they responded to the practice educator's request to have access to assessment processes online, rather than paper-based documents, to aid efficiency and transparency in progression documents. The Dietetics Practice documentation has been fully integrated onto the online platform and work is currently with the Speech and Language Therapy and the Occupational Therapy professions to do the same for them.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the reflection showed the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **External examiners –**
    - The education provider reflected on the external examiner feedback for 2021-22 academic year both for their undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes. They noted:
      - the threshold academic standards set for their modules / awards are appropriate and achieved by learners, met the applicable national academic standards (100%).
      - learners awarded qualifications have had the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold that are reasonably comparable with similar courses or subjects in other UK institutions (100%); and
      - the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are reliable, rigorous and fairly conducted (100%).
    - We noted qualitative feedback was collected from the external examiners and collated into themes. Feedback on the education provider's approach to learning and teaching showed the practice continue to benefit the learners as they move towards graduation and their careers.
    - The visitors were satisfied that the reflection showed the education provider has performed well in this area.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** In relation to learners, the visitors noted actions to provide learners with advanced notice of timetable in the 2023/24 academic year (for the whole year).

Data and reflections

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

**Non-continuation rates:**

- The visitors noted the learner non-continuation rate was 1% lower than the benchmark and a 10% improvement from the previous year's data. We noted the education provider was able to achieve this through their reflection on continuation, completion and graduate outcomes as part of their Annual Monitoring and Review activity. Responses from reflections were shared with course teams for their review and action plans. The course teams shared their approach to dealing with issues raised, as well as good practice across the wider subject group or School.
- The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection and considered they have performed well in this area.
- **Graduate outcomes:**
  - The Aggregation of percentage of those who complete the programmes who are either in employment or further study was 3% higher than the benchmark. Again, this shows the education provider has continued to perform well in this area and the visitors have no concerns.
- **Teaching quality:**
  - We noted the education provider received a Silver award in 2017. Although this is outside of the review period, we noted the education provider has reflected on how they are maintaining this, and how it is embedded strategically and operationally across their activities.
  - We noted an Education plan, annual monitoring processes, and Developing Excellent Academic Practice activity to focus on areas to develop.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - We noted an overall slight decrease in learner satisfaction. The visitors considered this is a reflection of the national picture post Covid-19. Through further clarification received, we noted the education provider's plans to improve / reinstate learner satisfaction score to pre-Covid-19 levels.
  - The visitors were satisfied the reflection together with the further clarification showed the education provider is performing well in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
  - The programme level data submitted by the education provider indicated satisfactory performance against HCPC data. Staff: student ratio appears to be within normal range, and we were satisfied with the education provider's resourcing.

**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**

### Outcome of the newly established Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group

**Summary of issue:** We noted that in the 2022/23 academic year, a Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group was established to highlight best practice across both Schools in relation to the quality of practice-based learning. As it is early days, and the visitors would like to review reflection on how this group is progressing through the next performance review.

### Measure put in place to reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, cost of meals on campus and the newly introduced free shuttle

**Summary of issue:** As part of their horizon scanning, the education provider recognises the ongoing concerns about the cost-of-living crisis. As of the 2022/23 academic year (and therefore outside this review), the education provider is putting in place measures that reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, reduces the cost of meals on campus and introducing a free shuttle. As it is early days, the visitors would like the education provider to reflect upon how these measures worked through the next performance review.

## **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.
- The issues identified for referral through this review should be carried out in accordance with the details contained in section 5 of this report.

### **Reason for next engagement recommendation**

- Internal stakeholder engagement
  - The education provider engaged with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were NHS England and a number of Practice and AHP Groups in the Leeds Integrated Care System (ICS). They also engaged with the West Yorkshire, North Yorkshire (HNY) ICS and the Northeast and North Cumbria (NENC) HEE groups.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engaged with a number of professional bodies including the RCSLT, Royal College of Occupational Therapists (RCOT) among others. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
  - The education provider engaged with the OfS and considered their findings of 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 education provider noted their newly established Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group which was set up in 2022/23 and will impact on their provision from the 2023/24 academic year. They also noted the measures they have put in place to reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, cost of meals on campus and the newly introduced free shuttle. We will need to review the impact of these when the provider can reflect on implementation, which will be at their next performance review in the 2027-28 academic year.

### **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 2027-28 academic year.
- The issues identified for referral through this review should be carried out in accordance with the details contained in [section 5](#) of this report.

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



## Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on the next steps for the provider. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation (including their reasons) and any referrals.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Leeds Beckett University	CAS-01236-K6X9J2		2018-22	The education provider has adequately addressed issues raised by the visitors and supported their response with a range of thorough and comprehensive reflections. The visitors considered the education provider low risk and where they are showing risk, for example in practice-based capacity, they have a risk register in place and governance structure to manage this, providing good assurance. Therefore, the visitors were content to recommend a 5-year review period.	<p><u>Outcome of the newly established Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group</u></p> <p><b>Summary of issue:</b> We noted that in the 2022/23 academic year, a Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group was established to highlight best practice across both Schools in relation to the quality of practice-based learning. As it is early days, and the visitors would like to review reflection on how this group is progressing through the next performance review.</p> <p><u>Measure put in place to reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, cost of</u></p>

					<p><u>meals on campus and the newly introduced free shuttle</u></p> <p><b>Summary of issue:</b> As part of their horizon scanning, the education provider recognises the ongoing concerns about the cost-of-living crisis. As of the 2022/23 academic year (and therefore outside this review), the education provider is putting in place measures that reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, reduces the cost of meals on campus and introducing a free shuttle. As it is early days, the visitors would like the education provider to reflect upon how these measures worked through the next performance review.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

<b>Name</b>	<b>Mode of study</b>	<b>Profession</b>	<b>Modality</b>	<b>Annotation</b>	<b>First intake date</b>
MA Art Psychotherapy Practice	FT (Full time)	Arts therapist	Art therapy		01/09/2004
MA Art Psychotherapy Practice	PT (Part time)	Arts therapist	Art therapy		01/09/2004
BSc (Hons) Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/09/1994
MSc Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/09/2018
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2020
MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2005
Pg Dip Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/03/2011
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/1995
MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	PT (Part time)	Physiotherapist			01/01/2024
MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/02/2005
Pg Dip Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2011
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2013
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	PT (Part time)	Speech and language therapist			01/08/2019
MSc Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2019
MSc Speech and Language Therapy	PT (Part time)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2019

Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/05/2015
Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/05/2015