
Performance review process report

University of Greenwich, 2018 - 2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of University of Greenwich. 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 to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities

Through this assessment, we have noted the areas we explored focused on:

- Outcomes of complaints which have gone to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). The education provider clarified the outcomes of the 12 complaints they mentioned in their portfolio and the changes made as a result;
 - The processes the education provider had in place to address issue around bullying on placements. The explorations through quality activity confirmed there were no issues around bullying and there were robust processes in place to address them if they arose;
 - The reasons for the differences between the formal and informal feedback. The exploration enabled the education provider to further explain why they use both methods and the advantage of each one.
 - The education provider should next engage with monitoring in 5 years, the 2027-28 academic year, because:
 - This is a reflection of the education provider's submission and engagement throughout this process. The visitors have found the education provider to have engaged well with this process and been forthright and open in responding to the quality activity queries. The visitors remark they were initially impressed with the education provider original submission, but the further information submitted as clarifications and quality activities satisfied any queries they had and provided further information for their assessment.
 - They found the education provider to have a range of well-established programmes with thought out and robust expansion plans. The visitors found the education provider to be engaging with the professional bodies and other groups like OFSTED who shall also keep a check on programme expansions and placement capacity. The visitors have no areas of concern going forward and are happy to recommend a 5-year ongoing monitoring period.
-

Previous consideration	This is the education provider's first interaction with the performance review process. Their last annual monitoring was in 2019. They engaged with our approval process in 2023 to gain approval of new physiotherapy and speech and language therapy programmes.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the education provider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Subject to the Panel's decision, the education provider's next performance review will be in the 2027-28 academic year

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
Data / intelligence considered.....	9
Quality themes identified for further exploration	10
Quality theme 1 – reflection on complaints considered by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)	10
Quality theme 2 – processes in place to manage and address issues around bullying and undermining within placements.....	11
Quality activity 3 - discrepancy between the outcomes of results between formal and informal feedback.....	12
Section 4: Findings.....	13
Overall findings on performance	13
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	13
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	16
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	18
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection.....	20
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	22
Data and reflections	23
Section 5: Issues identified for further review.....	25
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes.....	25
Assessment panel recommendation.....	25
Appendix 1 – 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:

Jason Comber	Lead visitor, paramedic
Alexander Harmer	Lead visitor, operating department practitioner
Jenny McKibben	Service User Expert Advisor
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh	Education Quality Officer
Kabir Kareem	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 the professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because the lead visitors were satisfied, they could assess performance and risk from the institutional level based portfolio. They felt like programme specific examples were informative and they were confident in making the recommendation

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 11 HCPC approved programmes across 3 professions of operating department practitioner, paramedic and speech and language therapy. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2007.

This Performance Review is the Providers first Performance Review since the introduction of our new model. The Provider previously engaged with our legacy systems Annual Monitoring in 2019. Following this review ongoing approval of their programmes was confirmed.

The Provider also engaged with our major change process in 2020 which discussed the introduction of their degree apprentice routes for their paramedic provision.

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	Operating Department Practitioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2021
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2011
	Speech and language therapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2018

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
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	266	266	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.</p> <p>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 at the benchmark</p> <p>We explored this by making the visitors aware of this prior to their assessment. The visitors will factor this into their ongoing monitoring recommendation.</p>
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	2%	2019-2020	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from a data delivery.</p> <p>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 education provider is</p>

				<p>performing above sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 2%</p> <p>We explored this by making the visitors aware of this prior to their assessment. The visitors will factor this into their ongoing monitoring recommendation.</p>
<p>Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study</p>	<p>94%</p>	<p>96%</p>	<p>2019-2020</p>	<p>This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery / summary data. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the education provider is performing above sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 4%</p> <p>We explored this by making the visitors aware of this prior to their assessment. The visitors will factor this into their ongoing monitoring recommendation.</p>
<p>Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award</p>	<p>Silver</p>		<p>June 2017</p>	<p>The definition of a Silver TEF award is "Provision is of high quality, and significantly and consistently exceeds the baseline quality threshold expected of UK Higher Education."</p> <p>We explored this by making the visitors aware of this prior</p>

				to their assessment. The visitors will factor this into their ongoing monitoring recommendation.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	76.1%	75.2%	2022	<p>This NSS data was sourced at summary. This means the data is the education provider-level public data</p> <p>The data point is broadly equal to the benchmark, which suggests the education provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 2.8%</p> <p>We explored this by making the visitors aware of this prior to their assessment. The visitors will factor this into their ongoing monitoring recommendation.</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.

Data / intelligence considered

We also considered intelligence from NHS England (Formerly Health Education England) who have been able to advise us of the challenges around placement capacity affecting London providers.

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 – reflection on complaints considered by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)

Area for further exploration: From our review of the portfolio, we noted the education provider stated 12 academic appeals have gone to the OIA. They are the independent student complaints scheme for England and Wales who review unresolved complaints from learners about their higher education provider. The education provider confirmed they had reviewed their approach to investigating complaints and trained Senior Leaders to be workplace investigators. However, we did not receive any reflections on further outcomes or learning from these 12 appeals. Although they indicated changes were made, it is important to explain how the outcomes of these cases had impacted the education provider's performance. The visitors sought more information about any changes to processes as a response.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We explored this through email clarification and additional evidence as we considered this the most appropriate and proportionate way to address the issue.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider submitted a clarification in their response to this quality activity. They confirmed not all 12 cases were the result of academic appeals as stated in their portfolio. The OIA considered complaints relating to several of their procedures including attendance and engagement appeals, complaints, and Fitness to Practice. They provided a breakdown of the outcomes of the 12 learner complaints which went to the OIA of which they made a decision on nine. One learner complaint, which the OIA partially justified, related to the fitness to practice decision and they made a recommendation for the education provider to form another Fitness to Practise Panel to reconsider the case. The education provider revised its guidance relating to Fitness to Practise because of the outcome.

For three cases, which the OIA did not make a decision on, a settlement was reached with the learners. One learner did not pursue the complaint and one withdrew their complaint. The visitors were satisfied with the updates the education provider submitted. The information in their portfolio and the updated information the education provider presented outlined how they had reflected on the OIA's decisions and have made changes in response. The visitors found it beneficial to understand the outcomes of those complaints and do not have any concerns regarding this area.

Quality theme 2 – processes in place to manage and address issues around bullying and undermining within placements.

Area for further exploration: From our review of the portfolio, we noted the education provider presented limited reflections with regards to the outcome of the feedback about bullying and undermining from the National Education and Training Survey (NETS). The narrative they submitted indicated they were satisfied with their performance in this area because the results were “well below the benchmark” at one of their placement partners. They stated a culture of bullying and undermining had not been raised within the informal and formal evaluation data they received. Based on the information they reviewed, the visitors were unable to determine if bullying and undermining was an area of concern and the education provider’s approach to reflecting upon it and addressing it.

They decided to explore if bullying and undermining is an area of concern within placement and the approach used to collect formal and informal feedback. As a result, the visitors requested further reflections from the education provider with regards to their performance with regards to bullying and undermining within placements. It is important they reflect on their processes to determine if they are able to identify and address any issues within this area. This should help to ensure learners are provided with the required support and are placed in safe working environments during their placements.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We explored this through email clarification and additional evidence as we considered this the most appropriate and proportionate way to address the issue.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider confirmed there were no blanket concerns around bullying and harassment across their paramedic science programme. This issue had not been captured within internal practice placement evaluations they distributed to learners on placements throughout the academic year. The visitors reviewed the detailed explanation the education provider submitted as part of this quality activity in relation to the processes they have in place to identify and address concerns. They stated learners are approached at the end of their placement period to submit a placement evaluation anonymously via a feedback form. The data was reviewed by the programme team and the Quality Lead for practice based learning. Learners were also able to raise concerns directly with the programme team.

The process for reporting is within their Practice Learning Guideline which is available to all learners. There is also a separate institute Safeguarding Policy and a bespoke version between the Schools of Health Sciences and the School of Education which is focused on learners on placements. They stated they have discussed individual incidents with learners around potential concerns with specific Practice Educators. They have dealt with these through informal discussions with all parties involved in face-to-face settings. If issues cannot be resolved through informal discussion, the education provider would consider firm actions such as referring to the reallocation mentorship team.

The education provider have presented reflections on how they address issues around learners' health and wellbeing within placements. The visitors agreed the education provider have satisfactorily addressed the concerns explored through this quality activity. They are satisfied with the confirmation bullying and undermining is not an issue.

Quality activity 3 - discrepancy between the outcomes of results between formal and informal feedback

Area for further exploration: The education provider submitted reflections on their approach to collecting formal and informal feedback from learners. They explained how they collect formal feedback through the NETS and informal feedback is routinely collected by the programme teams. Based on the analysis of the results they provided in the portfolio, the visitors noted there was a difference between the results of the formal and informal feedback. The education provider had not presented reflections about why there was a difference between the feedback learners gave via the NETS and internal surveys. There is a concern about the impact of having two different sets of results could have on the actions undertaken based on learner feedback. There is a risk that areas of concerns may not be identified and addressed effectively. The visitors decided to explore this further through quality activity to sought further reflections from the education provider about how they collect and use the NETS and internal surveys.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We explored this through email clarification and additional evidence as we considered this the most appropriate and proportionate way to address the issue.

Area for further exploration: The visitors have reviewed updated reflection submitted by the education provider explaining the discrepancy between the formal and informal surveys. They confirmed the internal surveys are meant to be any reflection of the specific practice placement provider the learners complete their placements. The formal NETs survey provides an overall evaluation of the practice placement experience. The rationale for using both methods is to enable wider opportunities to capture specific issues. Placement providers typically host many learners from multiple education providers, so the sample feedback from these learners is not necessarily representative of the education provider's learners. Despite this, internal surveys do not reflect the results from the NETs.

The visitors agreed the education provider had submitted a reflective rationale about why / how they use both formal and informal methods to collect learner feedback. They reviewed the detailed examples of the differences in the outcome the learner feedback via informal and formal routes from two different placement providers. Their reflections show they have a good rationale for collecting learner feedback using these two methods. They have demonstrated they have appropriate processes in place which enables them to use the learner feedback effectively. Based on the outcomes of this exploration, the visitors do not have any concerns about the differences between the outcomes of the internal and external surveys.

Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
 - The education provider has a strategic plan to grow their provision named 'This is Our Time; Strategy 2030'. This translates at Faculty and School level to increases in learner numbers and the development of new programmes, including apprenticeships and continuing professional development (CPD) which are priority groups across the sector. The financial sustainability of new programmes is considered throughout their internal programme approval process via a business case form.
 - The education provider has an annual planning process that enables them to secure resources for new programmes, support growth in existing programmes and enable necessary changes to existing programmes. This system has enabled them to properly resource the growth in programmes as well as develop new programmes.
 - The education provider has made considerable investment over the review period including £8 million in new simulation facilities and £2 million OfS capital investment in a critical care unit complete with operating theatre. £260,000 was invested at their Medway campus to support Paramedic Science and Speech and Language therapy programmes. The education provider has also developed Greenwich Learning and Simulation Centre (GLASC) that supports simulated learning across their provision.
 - The visitors found there to be a strong financial model in place which allows for developing new provision as well as increasing resource allocation where required for existing provision. They note evidence of significant investment in simulation and related technologies with appropriate support mechanisms in place.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they work with a broad range of organisations including Health Education England (now NHS England, NHSE), NHS and private hospitals, independent sector and voluntary organisations, regulatory bodies, other institutions of further and higher education. The Head of School (HoS) for health sciences liaises at a strategic level with Heads of Clinical Education and, Heads of AHP (Allied health professions) services.
 - The education provider meets their practise-based learning providers on a bi-monthly basis. These meetings allow them to discuss and review the learner experience within the organisation and check how

apprentices are progressing. The school of health sciences that hosts their provision also hold strategic meetings with placement partners to ensure placement quality.

- The visitors note robust process and supporting roles are in place in relation to its clinical and practice partners. With regular meetings with stakeholders and assigned leads for each area. They note a strong relationship with Royal Cornwall Hospital Trust with open communication, they are satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - The education provider detailed how academic quality is embedded into their annual programme monitoring, module monitoring reports, presentation of modules at Subject Assessment Panels, External Examiner feedback and peer reviews. Academic quality is also assessed when considering new programmes and their internal approval process stipulates that proposed programmes are scrutinised by an approval panel with external members. Programmes additional scrutiny is required from the Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) who must approve and ensure that the programme meets their standards.
 - The education provider has introduced a Quality Lead role which provides oversight and governance of practice-based learning across all their approved programmes. They introduced pro-forma for the practice learning panel which ensures the information discussed at meetings are up to date. Their placement partners also self-report which has led to an increased amount of data from partners that the education provider can utilise. An active expansion of placements has increased opportunities for learners and led to changes in the education provider's processes.
 - The education provider has introduced 'link lecturers' for all their programmes that will help with communication between the institution and placement providers. They are also supporting existing placement partners in growing their opportunities and link lecturers can help facilitate this. In response to the visitors query, the education provider confirmed the learners on Speech and Language Therapist programme delivered under the Canterbury Christ Church partnership will remain on the programme until completion of their studies.
 - The visitors found appropriate policies, processes and personnel in place to support both academic and placement quality. They found the education provider had been candid in their reflections and are satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The education provider stated that interprofessional education (IPE) is well established at their institution and underpinned by a strategy that supports IPE. They reflected on how they provide IPE opportunities where nursing, midwifery, paramedic science and operating department practitioner learners can learn together. Their curricula have been designed to support this considering the need for discipline specific learning. Learners have combined timetabled sessions for all learners to attend. Their strategy allows for shared learning in the first

year of programmes, but the shared modules in later years allow for more interprofessional learning.

- The education provider has introduced 'Schwartz rounds' in collaboration with another HEI. These are structured forums where staff come together to discuss the emotional and social aspects of working in healthcare. The underlying premise of Schwartz Rounds is to enable healthcare staff to work compassionately. Their learners will also be in attendance with learners from other institutions.
- The visitors' found mechanisms are in place for shared teaching of different professional groups and has identified some key touch points. They found IPE to be clearly embedded into the processes and are satisfied with the reflections.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider stated that their Faculty of Education, Health and Human Science's Service User and Carer strategy underpins their approach to engaging with service users and carers. The aim of the strategy is to collaborate with service users and carers (SU&C) in a respectful manner which recognises and values their experience and expertise. To seek and promote opportunities for service users to meaningfully contribute and collaborate in education activities.
 - The education provider reflected on how SU&Cs are involved in many aspects of their provision. These include in curriculum and programme development roles where they sit on stakeholder meetings and provide feedback on module specifications and assessment documentation. During the review period, they have contributed to the reapproval of the Paramedic Science programme and approval of the Operating Department Practitioner programmes and most recently the new Physiotherapy and Speech and Language Therapy programmes. The pandemic did impact SU&C involvement, but the education provider worked to continue SU&C engagements via online meetings.
 - The education provider has invested and developed simulation facilities throughout the review period. SU&Cs have been involved in designing and evaluating the simulated scenarios. They have been able to deliver this by working with various charities and through NHS partner groups and contacts.
 - The visitors are satisfied with the education providers reflections in this area. They found this to demonstrate a breadth and depth of involvement of service users across a range of programmes and activities within its portfolio.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they have extensive equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) policies in place. In 2021, they published their new 'This is our time - University of Greenwich strategy 2030' strategy. The aim of this is to achieve 'education without boundaries'. The education provider discussed the diversity they have in their subject expertise, in the lived experience of their staff, learners and alumni. They considered diversity a strength and inclusivity and culture is identified as a strategic priority within the new strategy. They will continue to monitor this and measure their success against meeting these aspirations. The outcomes they aim to achieve include being

recognised by Athena swan, Stonewall, the Race Equality Charter, the Technician Commitment, and the University Mental Health Charter. In February 2023 they retained their Gold rating and are now ranked 20th in the UK Stonewall top 100 Employer list.

- The visitors agreed it was clear that is a central feature of the education provider, and they have robust policies and strategies in place to support this which are actively monitored and engaged with. They note the aspirations to improve further, achieving national level recognition and are satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they continue to monitor on challenges and opportunities as they arise. They have established a speech and language therapy provision as a collaboration with another HEI. They discuss how moving from a two-year PGDiP to a three-year undergraduate programme had its challenges. Learners also made their discontentment known reflecting poorly during this time. The education provider devised an action plan in 2022 to respond to this feedback, the joint programme is closing with a teach-out plan in place. The education provider are now seeking approval for an independent BSc Speech and language therapy programme.
 - The education provider has also established a partnership with a college in Cornwall and are delivering joint programmes with this college including an operating department practitioner (ODP) programme. They stated this has benefited the Cornish workforce and wider health economy which was previously lacking.
 - The education provider is planning to continue to expand their AHP (Allied health profession) provision. Following their introduction of their ODP programme and the ongoing approval request for speech and language therapy and physiotherapy. The education provider is also considering expanding the range of degree apprenticeships they offer and will consider this an area for growth going forward.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have reflected well on their recent achievements and future challenges. Expanding their apprenticeship offerings offers great potential for growth and they have already established discussions with employers to support this.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
 - The education provider reflected on various updates which have already been made across their provision meaning they are in line with the new standards. For those areas not currently in alignment, the education provider has made plans to embed these prior to September 2023 and have mapped these where necessary.

- The education provider also has several programmes currently being considered for approval. These they discuss were developed with the new SOPs in mind and are already in alignment.
- The education provider has reflected on the key areas of change in the SOPs and identified where they already address these. The visitors found the education provider to have either already met or is making minor changes where needed to ensure they meet the new SOPs for September 2023.
- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - The education provider reflected on how the pandemic presented unprecedented challenges for them. They worked to develop new ways of working, to continue delivering services and to adapt to online delivery of teaching. They put measures in place to upskill their staff and support learners, requiring a collaborative approach from all stakeholders. The pandemic accelerated the moving of teaching online and the education provider had several obstacles to overcome. This included ensuring staff were equipped to deliver the teaching online. They acknowledge not all learners had equal opportunities to access the online learning, so measures were put in place to tackle digital poverty. Applications including Moodle also helped facilitate online learning and provided a platform for learners to access recorded lectures, reading materials and documentation.
 - Additional measures were required to adjust curriculum and to review assessments to enable student learning to continue. For some programmes adjustments were made at Progression and Award Boards using a university-wide adopted formula for modules impacted by covid restrictions. The purpose of this was to ensure learners were not disadvantaged by the circumstances of studying during a pandemic. Exams were delivered on-line and external examiners supported these arrangements.
 - The education provider have reviewed the measures they put in place and will retain a hybrid learning approach. They found some aspects of online learning enhanced the learner experience including project work. They have listened to learner feedback regarding face-to-face lecturers and have moved this back to the campus with recorded versions existing for those learning remotely.
 - The visitors found the response to the pandemic to be in line with the rest of the sector. They demonstrated providing learners with grade scaling at exam boards and the expected adjustments to assessments and addressing safety concerns. The visitors are satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The education provider stated they had a strong commitment to embracing new technology to support the delivery of their programmes. This includes new technology in teaching spaces, automated processes for submission of extenuating circumstances, online submission of assessments and online Progression and Award Board reports. The pandemic accelerated their plans to adapt to online learning. Teaching and learning activities continued utilising a flipped

classroom technique using technology to record lectures, to deliver teaching and provide access to resources / session slides. MS Teams, Class notebook and cloud-based solutions from external partners such as Oracle facilitated engagement with learners.

- Since 2018, they have invested in further simulation facilities. They have been fitted with modern software that were utilised throughout the pandemic. This allowed for learners who could not attend in person to attend virtually as the sessions were streamed. In 2021 their simulation centre was awarded £2 million to develop a critical care unit, this complements their existing facilities and means they now provided the full-spectrum of healthcare services for learners to experience.
- The visitors noted the adoption of blended learning moving forwards out of the pandemic and the heavy investment and focus on simulation and technical innovation. This has been well received by learners and the visitors are satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - The education provider discussed the nine apprenticeships currently in place and their ongoing developed of a further four currently. These are all within the same school as the existing approved programmes and the education provider is also considering future apprenticeship developments.
 - They reflected on their longer-term plans involve the continued development of apprenticeships and this is outlined in their 'Student Success Sub-strategy 2022–30'. This has been approved internally and they have a designated partnerships team and a newly created lead for apprenticeships at the institutional level, the 'Associate Director of Employability and Apprenticeships' With the large number of apprentices within the Faculty of Education, Health & Human Sciences, a defined structure has been implemented with an Apprenticeships Manager with professional services support. This structure allows for institutional support, with a Faculty and School orientated approach.
 - The visitors found a clear strategy to grow the apprenticeship provision moving forwards and reflections on lessons learnt so far. They note the inclusion of OFSTED reports in this planning and are satisfied with their performance in this area

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
 - The education provider stated that all their programmes are designed to ensure that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications' frameworks. This is quality assured through a central quality team, clear guidance in relation to validation, approval, programme, and module changes. New

programmes are subject to an internal panel approval that will contain an external subject specialist.

- The education provider stated that they continue to meet all requirements of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. They conduct annual programme and modular level review to ensure they remain in line with national standards.
- The visitors found the education provider to have a robust set of systems in place so that their programmes, policies and procedures align with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. The visitors note this is echoed by the external examiner. The visitors are satisfied with the education providers reflections in this area.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - The education provider reflected on how the School of Health Sciences (where their approved programmes sit) monitors several data streams to ensure that knowledge on the sector is contemporary. This includes NMC, the CQC and NHSE (NHS England, formerly Health Education England), but also consider local and national news, and intelligence from contacts in practice areas. The schools' system involves regular contact with practice partners at all levels and utilising informal relationships to receive notification of adverse intelligence. This is used alongside other intelligence to establish such adverse concerns early.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have clear processes in place for monitoring external reports on providers and processes in place to take swift action when required. They are currently developing an automated tool to assist with identifying and auditing reports. The visitors were satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
 - During the review period, the education provider engaged with the Office for Students (OfS) responding to their request for further information. This included how the governing body managed degree classifications. They have considered the feedback from the OFS monitoring and build the NSS outcomes into their processes. They reflect on their quality assurance procedures to inform the planning and to ensure they meet they meet the required conditions. They confirmed an external audit was completed by KPMG, which reaffirmed their procedures are robust.
 - The visitors agreed the education provider to have made significant steps to addressing the revised conditions of registration. They have subjected themselves to an external audit, the results of which were positive. The visitors are satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - The education provider have reflected on their engagement with the Office for Students (OfS) when they provided information about their approach to securing degree standards. They have responded to the revised ongoing conditions of registration and mapped the quality assurance mechanisms to ensure ongoing compliance.
 - The explained in detail how the developments which have been made to align with OfS requirements. Examples of these include reviewing their approach to external examiner reporting and updating the

assessment and feedback policy. As part of their annual review cycle, all programmes which are at risk of meeting OfS conditions have added monitored via action plans. They have referred to their strong quality assurance procedures that inform planning and ensure OfS conditions are met.

- The visitors agreed the education is performing well in this area. They have made significant steps to addressing the revised conditions of registration and have subjected themselves to an external audit.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider reflected on their positive engagement with the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) which has resulted in:
 - successful approval of new programmes;
 - successful outcome for new programme reporting – reporting process for new programmes completed early no further reporting needed;
 - successful outcome of annual monitoring;
 - successful approval of the new standard to allow inclusion of 600 simulated practice hours for nursing programmes; and
 - exceptional self-reporting processes.
 - The visitors agreed the education provider is performing well in this area. Their reflections suggest there are effective systems in place to engage with professional regulators. There has also been positive engagement with AHP professional bodies seeking accreditation for programmes.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Curriculum development –**
 - The education provider has presented a detailed reflection on their approach to curriculum development which demonstrated they have a planned and structured approach. They explained how they considered whether existing pedagogical practice reinforced BAME attainment gap. They considered their assessment strategy to introduce practice components on cultural adaptations as a fair addition to the assessment process. They explained how the assessment was designed to support inclusive curriculum.
 - The development of their new Operating Department Practitioner programme has incorporated the requirements of the HCPC Standards for Education and Standards for Proficiency for the subject. They have established a plan to continuously review the programme to ensure topics are revisited with an increasing level of complexity. This approach aims to ensure topic matter is reinforced and learners acquire the required level of understanding to complete their programme. They provided an example of how elements of the SOPs have been included into an updated programme curriculum to

encourage the use of digital technologies and embedding of leadership in skill sessions.

- The visitors agreed the education is performing well in this area because they have demonstrated how they have developed their curricular to meet regulators requirements.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider's reflection in this area was primarily focused on their relationship with the College of Paramedics. They noted it has been challenging getting learners on board with the College of Paramedics objective of diversifying the careers of Paramedics.
 - They confirmed the professional representative bodies are relied upon to offer a curriculum which contributes to programme design. They explained how they were currently using the most recent curriculum guidance from the College of Paramedics. They also listed how they are engaging with and incorporating the updated guidance and curriculum from multiple professional bodies.
 - They reflected on how the processes they have in place which enables them to respond to change in professional body guidance effectively and efficiently. This has resulted in their learners have received education which meets recent curriculum guidance and providing more placement opportunities in different environments.
 - The visitors are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They have demonstrated how they are engaging with PSRBs and have been honest about the challenges faced with diversifying placements for paramedic students.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider's reflection outlines their approach for identifying the number of placements required annually. Predictions are made based opportunities from the previous year, partners reactions to those learners and intelligence received about the placement provider. The numbers are agreed by the senior management team based on specific criteria and then they have meetings with placement providers. Due to the challenges of recruitment, they over recruit by 10% which is embedded into the perceived capacity calculations. They reflected on how the positive relationships they have built with placement provider over the year enables them effectively to deal with the challenge of placement capacity fluctuation.
 - The education providers plan to increase AHP pre-registration programmes has resulted in the development of new approaches to the provision of practice placements. They were actively developing new relationships which should result in increased placement capacity in the future. They reflected on how virtual opportunities have provided additional opportunities for learners to follow patient journeys; this would be difficult to facilitate in practice environments.
 - The visitors are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They highlighted their approach to modelling placements, relationships with stakeholders and their ability to respond to changes as evidence of good performance.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: 'None'

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learners –**
 - The education provider's reflection on this area focused primarily on the challenges experienced with collecting feedback from learners on placements. They reflected on the scores which were below the benchmark in all areas from the National Education and Training Surveys (NETS). They have found it challenging to encourage learners on some programmes to give consistent and formal placement evaluations. There were differences in the results from the NETS and internal surveys which was explored further through [quality activity 2](#). Despite the challenge faced, they have used the feedback to identify risks to learners and the creation of anonymous reporting tools.
 - The visitors explored the outcome of 12 complaints which went through the OIA as part of [quality activity 1](#). They provided an overall descriptions of learner feedback with regards to module delivery and assessment design. The information presented in this section suggests they have effective process on collect learner feedback and make improvements based on these. Their reflections show they have effective process to use feedback collected via nets or internally to develop action plans and continuously improve the learner experience. We explored the education provider's approach to addressing issues of bullying on placements in [quality activity 3](#).
 - The visitors are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They noted and highlighted the actions taken by the education provider to formalise and embed the learner voice and found this embedded in all activities across programmes.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The education provider has reflected on how they addressed the challenges with maintaining contact with practice educators because of the geographical spread. This was addressed through development of relationships with placement providers by appointing the Partner Relationship manager who passes relevant information directly to the education provider. They also reflected on how the adapting the academic assessor model based on feedback has led to a deeper understanding of practice education as a subject.
 - They have highlighted how improved stakeholder engagement activities has enabled the voice of the employer and practice educators to be incorporated in programme design. This has also resulted in changes to the delivery of curriculums to reflect the levels of mentors of learners on placements.
 - The visitors agreed the education provider is performing well in this area. They highlighted the improved stakeholder engagement as a positive. The also noted how the education provider have honestly reflected on the challenges they experienced, and the actions taken to address them.
- **External examiners –**

- The education provider have reflected on the external examiner feedback they have received during the review period. They informed us programme leaders are responsible for responding to external examiner feedback. This has contributed to institutional changes being made to their feedback forms and training. Their reflective planning approach enables all programmes to respond to external feedback on a cyclical basis. Our review of the external examiner feedback suggest external feedback has been generally positive and they have acted as a critical friend.
- The visitors agreed the education provider is performing well in this area and have received positive feedback on their provision from external examiners to date.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Non-continuation rates:**
 - The education provider has reflected on their scores and note how health and care programmes attrition rates can be linked to the complexities and challenges of healthcare setting. They are working to bring down their attrition rate and are currently reviewing the assessment burden of their programmes to combat attrition. They aim to ensure learning outcomes are not being assessed more than once and that assessments are proportionate to the credit weighting and level of the module. They reflected on how programme teams will continue to combat attrition from a programme level.
 - The education provider also presented reflections from a programme level that their BSc Paramedic science programme has a lower attrition rate. They reflect this is partly due to the quality of teaching and learning within the delivery of the programme. But also, the motivation of learners to continue the programme and meet the requirements of it. The large proportion of practice placement within the ambulance services in London and the Southeast and the support received from Practice Educators also factors into this.
- **Graduate outcomes:**
 - The education provider has reflected that it is normal for a high graduate employment rate for health care programmes and that their data reflects this. They reflected that some learners would defer or change programme following enrolment, but this remains a small percentage.
 - The visitors note the educations providers performance in this area, and they are exceeding the benchmark figure of 93% by achieving 97% in the most recent figures. This may be reflected by the close working relationship that the education provider has within its practice partners.

The visitors were satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.

- **Teaching quality:**

- The education provider stated that they have achieved the silver level award from TEF (Teaching Excellence Framework) in June 2017. The education provider is now engaged in the next TEF review and are awaiting the outcome of this.
- The visitors were satisfied with the education providers score in this area. They showed clear aspirations to engage in future TEF reviews and have evidenced high teaching quality recognition through such awards.

- **Learner satisfaction:**

- The education provider reflected that the pandemic had an impact in the levels of learner satisfaction. This has affected HEI's nationally as can be seen by a drop in both the benchmark and the University of Greenwich's score. The education provider has remained above the benchmark in most years of the review period. The education provider acknowledges the scores they received and are working to implement recommendation made from learner feedback. This includes them receiving a lower score in the specific 'assessment and feedback' survey, this is being addressed by the programme team with support from the Academic Learning Enhancement team and the Deputy Head of School for Teaching and Learning.
- The education provider is also making changes to their school structure to reflect that of the wider institution. One such change is to move Student Success and Teaching and Learning into a single role of Associate Head of School for Student Success. The aim is to create a more structured approach to the operationalisation of developments to support the learning experience.
- The visitors found the education provider to be exceeding the benchmark figure on a regular basis and to have done so for most years in the reporting period. The visitors found the education provider to be performing well in this area and are satisfied with their performance

- **Programme level data:**

- The education provider does not hold staff-learner data for individual programmes, but instead collects and monitors an aggregate. This is aggregated under the cost centre for financial planning, and the staff to learner ratio for this cost centre is 24.8 learners per member of staff. Health care programmes they reflect, also rely on several visiting lecturers to support the programmes and bring a wealth of knowledge, expertise and experience. But also experiences from service users and carers allowing learners to build their understanding of the future profession.
- The education provider stated that they continue to recruit well on their programmes following a strong year of recruitment in 2022. They expect for the high levels of recruitment to continue and are planning for this. They also state they have the necessary practice partner
- relationships required to ensure that all students have a quality experience whilst studying at the University.

- The visitors found the education provider to have sufficient staffing resource and note the education provider high levels of growth and projected learner numbers. The visitors found the staff-learner ratio to be sustainable and note the business case for further resourcing and recruitment required due to expansion in the future.

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 2027-28 academic year

Reason for next engagement recommendation

- Internal stakeholder engagement
 - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with 4 professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision
 - The education provider engaged with the NMC. They considered the findings of the NMC 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.

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

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

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner	PT (Part time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship)	PT (Part time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) (Truro & Penwith College)	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) (Truro & Penwith College)	PT (Part time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Truro & Penwith College)	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Truro & Penwith College)	PT (Part time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/01/2011
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London)	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2012
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2018