
Performance review process report

University of Sheffield, Review Period 2018-2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of the University of Sheffield. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area.
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
 - The delivery of interprofessional learning (IPL) in a structured way for the benefit of service user. From initial review of the portfolio, it was unclear how the education provider ensured IPL was delivered in a structured way for the benefit of service users. Through the quality activity, we received detailed information that shows IPL activities have been included in the curriculum in a structured and systematic way. We are satisfied that IPL would continue to support future practice and improve the environment and quality of care for service users.
 - Embedding the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy) programme. It was clear how the revised SOPs are being implemented in the other programmes but less information was provided for the DEdCPsy programme. Through the quality activity, details of how the DEdCPsy programme would embed the new SOPs were provided.
 - New graduate survey. We noted 20% of respondents to the new graduate survey 2021 disagreed with the statement "My education provider listened to learner feedback and responded with appropriate actions". It was unclear what actions are being taken to address this. Through the quality activity, the education outlined different actions they have undertaken and continue to undertake to negate this among learners.
-

-
- The provider should next engage with monitoring in 5 years, the 2027-28 academic year, because:
 - The visitors were satisfied with the overall performance of the education provider across the themes. Data shows the education provider is performing comparably to benchmark across the different areas. There were no risks identified which could suggest the need for an earlier review.

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

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

Next steps	Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2027-28 academic year.
------------	---

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	4
About us	4
Our standards	4
Our regulatory approach	4
The performance review process	4
Thematic areas reviewed	5
How we make our decisions	5
The assessment panel for this review	5
Section 2: About the education provider	6
The education provider context	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	6
Institution performance data	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	8
Portfolio submission	8
Quality themes identified for further exploration	9
Quality theme 1 – structured delivery of interprofessional learning (IPL).	9
Quality theme 2 – embedding the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy) programme	10
Quality theme 3 – new graduate survey	10
Section 4: Findings	11
Overall findings on performance	11
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	11
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	14
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	16
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	19
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	21
Data and reflections	23
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	25
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	25
Assessment panel recommendation	25
Education and Training Committee decision	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:

Tony Ward	Lead visitor, Practitioner Psychologist, Counselling Psychologist, Health Psychologist
Jim Pickard	Lead visitor, Chiropodist / Podiatrist with entitlements for Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing, POM – Administration, POM – Sale/Supply (CH) and Podiatric Surgery

Ann Johnson	Service User Expert Advisor
Temilolu Odunaike	Education Quality Officer

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we did not require professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because the lead visitors were satisfied they could assess performance and risk without needing to consider professional areas outside of their own.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers seven HCPC-approved programmes across three professions and including two Orthoptist Exemptions programmes. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1992.

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	Orthoptist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2017
	Practitioner psychologist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2005
	Speech and language therapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2018
Post-registration	Orthoptist Exemptions			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 programmes¹.

Data Point	Bench- mark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	194	194	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 at the benchmark.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	3%	2019-2020	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is equal to the benchmark, which suggests the 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 improved by 2%.</p>

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

Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	97%	2018-2019	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p>
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Silver	June 2019	<p>The definition of a Silver TEF award is “Provision is of high quality, and significantly and consistently exceeds the baseline quality threshold expected of UK Higher Education.”</p>
Learner satisfaction	76.5%	75.7%	2022	<p>This NSS data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has dropped by 3%</p> <p>We explored this through the visitors’ assessment of the education provider’s reflection. The visitors were satisfied the learner satisfaction rate remains comparable with the benchmark.</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 – structured delivery of interprofessional learning (IPL).

Area for further exploration: The education provider reflected briefly on challenges to providing IPL opportunities to learners. They noted interprofessional education opportunities were provided through specific modules. These included the Participation and Society module, shared professionalism sessions within professional practice modules for all first-year learners in the Health Sciences School, and mixed sessions between Speech and Language Therapy and Educational Psychology learners. The education provider added that learners were exposed to multidisciplinary working whilst on placement.

The visitors however noted a lack of reflection to show how IPL had happened systematically. The documentation made reference to it being difficult to ensure, but that it happened where possible. The visitors requested that the education provider further reflected on how they had undertaken interprofessional learning in a structured way and at programme level.

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

Outcomes of exploration: We understood learners on the Clinical Psychology, Educational Psychology, and Speech and Language Therapy programmes had joint learning sessions with shared learning aims and objectives. There are plans for Orthoptic and Speech and Language Therapy learners to be taught an additional module together from 2023/24 academic year.

Prior to Covid-19, speech and language therapy and orthoptics learners, along with nursing learners, shared sessions on professionalism. In addition, learners attended a series of seminars on topics such as child protection with social work, medical and Educational Psychology learners. We understood work is currently being undertaken

to reintroduce these sessions to the curriculum to enhance the shared learning experience.

The education provider also reflected on how learners within the Health Sciences School (speech therapy and orthoptics) joined with medical and nursing learners for a yearly faculty level interprofessional 'Street medicine' event.

The education provider also reflected on how teachers from different professions attended a one-day workshop with Educational Psychology and Social Work learners in practice-based learning. This allowed for further IPL.

As a result of the above, learners were able to recognise the relevance of interprofessional learning to their future practice through the assessment requirements within the specific modules as well as reflection in their professional practice portfolios.

The visitors were satisfied with this reflection as it was clear that learners across different professions were able to learn with and from one-another, in a structured and systematic way and for the benefit of the service user. The visitors determined the quality theme had adequately addressed their concerns.

Quality theme 2 – embedding the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy) programme

Area for further exploration: We noted most programmes were aware of changes to the revised SOPs and are addressing these, except for the Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy) programme which did not acknowledge the changes at all. Therefore, we requested that the education provider submit further reflection on how the DEdCPsy programme is embedding the revised SOPs.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We sought further clarification through additional information. We considered this the most effective way to address the issue identified by the visitors.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider described their ongoing work to ensure the DEdCPsy programme is embedding the revised SOPs. The education provider submitted additional evidence of their preparation for the implementation of revised SOPs, amongst other documents. Key changes in the document evidenced where the (2022/23) DEdCPsy meets new focus areas with a view to curriculum development. Their full SOPs British Psychological Society (BPS) mapping document focused on the general themes, that have been strengthened through the revision of the SOPs and how learning outcomes have been mapped to the revised SOPs. A mapping of seminars with learning outcomes related to the new SOPs was also provided. We understood there will be new seminars for 2023/24 related to digital skills and new technologies.

The visitors were satisfied that the DEdCPsy programme as well as the other programmes is embedding the revised SOPs. Therefore, they were satisfied that the quality activity had adequately addressed their concern.

Quality theme 3 – new graduate survey

Area for further exploration: A range of processes were evident across the programmes for engaging with learners, including feedback on teaching and modules and taking part in learning and teaching committees. In relation to the area in the portfolio ‘20% of respondents to the new graduate survey 2021 disagreed with the statement “My education provider listened to learner feedback and responded with appropriate actions”’, the visitors were unclear if the education provider had reflected on this and acted on this feedback and if there had been any outcomes. Therefore, the visitors requested to know if any actions had been put in place to negate this.

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

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider highlighted the actions they have taken to address the feedback from learners. They noted they have developed a central learner feedback mechanism that is being used across all their modules / programmes. We understood that from 2022/23 'the education provider's "closing the feedback loop" reports will be released to learners directly, via email. Learners will also be able to find the report via the online learning environment system. In the reports, learners will be able to see analysis and reflection relating to:

- a summary of scores on institutional questions;
- commentary from the module lead highlighting strengths and areas for development; and
- actions that will be taken to address these.

The education provider considered these steps would demonstrate that learners are being listened to and that their feedback is acted upon. As part of what they defined as ‘good practice’, the education provider described their plan to discuss the survey results with learners in class or via Student Academic Reps. This means results and actions taken will be available in Blackboard for each module at the start of the module, highlighting what had been changed.

The visitors were satisfied with the actions the education provider is taking to improve learner experience and therefore, they considered the quality activity had adequately addressed the issue.

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 stable financial position which reflects a surplus, as activities continue to return to 'normal' following the pandemic.
 - The education provider noted they have continued to adapt to their changing environment by developing dynamic solutions which have ensured their teaching, research and innovation activities are at world-class level.
 - They noted their Financial Operating Strategy has helped to ensure the following:
 - establishment of clear financial targets;
 - effective management of financial opportunities and risks;
 - maintaining high standards of financial probity and accountability;
 - and achieving value for money from all their activities.
 - We understood a new Finance Strategy will be implemented in 2023/24 to underpin the delivery of their new vision.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They considered the education provider's current financial position and outcomes reflect they continue to be sustainable.

- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The education provider noted their long-established relationship with NHS England (formerly Health Education England) who commissions programmes and modules alongside the education provider. They also noted partnerships with several other organisations including Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Sheffield Health and Social Care NHS Foundation Trust.
 - During the review period, their Health Sciences School successfully tendered for their provision to be listed on some national procurement portals for employers across the country. Through this, they were able to purchase programmes and modules from Salisbury Procurement Framework and the North of England Commercial Procurement Collaborative Framework. The education provider now has several contracts in place with employers from around the country who have commissioned provision via this portal. They have been using the portal to review and update their programme offers on an annual basis.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area as they considered their reflection indicated they have extensive relationships with a range of partners both at education provider and programme level. In addition, the visitors considered the relationships have supported effective governance and management across their provision.

- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - The education provider's focus on employability of their graduates drives improvement in academic and placement quality. As part of the pillars of their organisational strategy, the education provider works towards ensuring all learners have the opportunity to gain work-based

and / or work-orientated experience. This is in addition to their placement experience.

- The education provider has invested in a new system for managing placement activity which is being piloted by the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health with a view to extending its use institution-wide.
- The visitors were satisfied that the new system of placement approval, consistent documentation, new system of placement management and their best practice guide all support improvement in academic and placement quality.
- Therefore, they are reassured the education provider is performing well in this area.

- **Interprofessional education –**

- The education provider recognised the challenges they have had in providing interprofessional learning opportunities. They noted challenges around availability of learners given they had to bring learners from different professions despite the different times spent in clinical settings and core teaching sessions.
- Through [quality theme 1](#), we understood the education provider was able to deliver interprofessional education in a structured way. For example, we noted the education provider structured a shared module for the Orthoptic and Speech and Language Therapy learners and an additional module will be taught together from 2023/24 academic year.
- The education provider's initial reflections and quality activity provided the visitors with information that showed learners continue to have the opportunity to learn with and from one another.
- Therefore, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

- **Service users and carers –**

- Service users and carers participated in a wide range of activities including interviews / selection panels, clinical skills teaching, assessment and programme development for both new and existing programmes.
- The education provider's Patience as Educators initiative helped them to better understand the needs and experiences of patients by actively involving them in their research and teaching. They noted how service users have helped to shape their provision and supported learners by providing feedback.
- The education provider reflected on how they used digital technology to enable service users and carers to continue to contribute to programmes during the pandemic. We also noted their work on telehealth for individuals with communication difficulties and how they continue to use hybrid approaches to promote wider access to involvement for service users and carers.
- It was clear to the visitors that the programmes have benefitted from the involvement of service users and carers during the review period.
- Therefore, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider is committed to equality of opportunity and to fostering good relations, for learners and prospective learners.
 - The education provider has created five new Faculty Directors who are responsible for leading various projects and initiatives in relation to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI), wellbeing and sustainability to help create sustained improvement and positive change.
 - The education provider reflected on other new initiatives to support EDI. For example, we noted a new Disability Equality Strategy was created in Spring 2022 to improve the experiences of disabled staff and learners.
 - Their University Mental Health Charter was also developed in 2022 in a bid to have an education wide approach to mental health and wellbeing.
 - Following work done around reducing gender pay gap, the education provider's 2021 report showed a reduction in the gender pay gap from 11.1% in 2017 to 8.4% in 2021. The education provider reflected on several other strategies that have supported EDI.
 - It was clear to the visitors that a range of work had been undertaken in this area across programmes to ensure the education provider continues to comply with underpinning policies. In addition, new initiatives supported the education provider's overall performance in this area.

- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider linked their success to their ability to influence and respond, including to public policy and statutory and regulatory compliance, to safeguard their performance, sustainability and reputation.
 - The education provider reflected on how their Strategic Advisory Group to University Executive Board (UEB) on Student Recruitment and Population maintained oversight of the learner recruitment performance and monitored the trajectory on delivering target learner population.
 - Among several other developments, the education provider is delivering resources, training and development opportunities for programme teams and individual academic staff to improve their academic skills and to enhance their educational provision.
 - The reflection submitted informed the visitors the education provider continues to manage long term challenges and opportunities effectively.
 - Therefore, they were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
 - The education provider described how they are embedding the revised SOPs for all the thematic areas, across several of their professions. We understood the new SOPs have been fully integrated into some programmes, for example, the Speech and Language Therapy programmes.
 - In relation to ‘Active implementation of the SOPs’, we noted all learners have been informed of the revised HCPC SOPs and that these must be met from September 2023. For example, in the first semester of the first year, there will be an introductory session on Professional Behaviour and Ethics. Learners will be introduced to the new HCPC SOPs and the importance of meeting these upon graduation will be highlighted. For their Speech and Language therapy programmes, learners completed a practice-based portfolio where they evidenced and reflected on their development in relation to the HCPC SOPs across their programmes.
 - In relation to ‘Promoting public health and preventing ill-health’, Orthoptic and Speech and Language Therapy learners will undertake a module on Participation and Society. This would enable learners studying different healthcare programmes across the Health Science School (HSS) to participate in interdisciplinary discussions and learning.
 - To embed the theme ‘Further centralising the service user’ the education provider has developed further service user feedback to learners. This will assist in continuing to co-produce resources to support learner learning with service users. An example of this is development of the RCSLT Virtual Assessment module.
 - Through [quality theme 2](#), the education provider further outlined how the DEdChPsych programme will embed the new SOPs as this was missing in the original submission.
 - The visitors were satisfied that all the programmes are aware of the changes and have reflected well on how the new standards will be integrated into the curriculum.
 - Therefore, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider’s performance in this area.

- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - The education provider reflected on the developments across their institution to reduce an overall impact of Covid-19 to learners for them to be able to complete their programmes on time with the appropriate skills and knowledge. Some of the developments include:
 - Development of staff digital learning skills around remote teaching including the enhanced use of virtual learning environment.
 - Redesigning assessments so they could be undertaken remotely during the pandemic.
 - Rescheduling sessions to enable international learners attend online.
 - The education provider also reflected on how increased simulated learning enabled learners on health care programmes to continue to develop their skills and progress on their programmes during the

pandemic. We understood this increase in simulated learning has continued post pandemic and has contributed to their overall placement provision for health care learners.

- The visitors were satisfied that the education provider's reflection on how they managed the impact of Covid and the learning they are taking forward have demonstrated they have performed well in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - In addition to the education provider's reflection above, we also noted some developments that were pre-pandemic. For example, the development of their 'pathway to practice e-portfolio' for speech and language therapy learners. We understood learners developed their individual e-portfolio evidencing their learning (personal, clinical, and professional development) through the programme with lifetime access to this on graduation.
 - The education provider also reflected on the collaboration with academic staff and learning technologists from across their Health Sciences School (HSS). We understood the collaboration between the education provider's digital team and assessment team led to the development of completely digitising the marking of practical learner clinical exams using a digital platform called Pebblepad. In addition, examiners were able to use digital devices rather than paper to assess.
 - The visitors were reassured that the education provider's reflection showed they continue to use technology to develop their provision.
 - Therefore, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - The education provider's first HCPC approved Degree Apprenticeship programme - BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) is due to commence in September 2023, following approval in July 2023. We understood the programme was developed to support workforce concerns in the north of England. The education provider noted how they worked closely with NHS England and their other stakeholders across the region in the development of the apprenticeship programme, taking into consideration placement provision across the region.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection in this area and considered they are performing well.

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 they used the UK Quality Code as a sector reference point. They noted how they self-assess themselves to be meeting the expectations for standards and the expectations for quality. Although there were no specific assessments against the code, we understood the education provider reviews their provision in relation to the principles of the code.
 - The visitors considered the education provider's reflection reassures them they are performing well in this area.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - The education provider considers external assessment of placement providers a key component of ensuring quality provision for learners.
 - The education provider reflected on a challenge that occurred where concerns were raised at a particular setting which involved a recent closure of two schools. They noted all affected learners were removed from placement and placed in an alternative setting to complete their placements. We understood the need to take such measures is rare, but the education provider described how they have taken steps to ensure that there is a system in place to enable them to respond in a timely manner should the need arise.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection as it showed the education provider, and their programmes are aware of the need to be vigilant in terms of placement provider assessments. The visitors were also satisfied that policies and procedures are in place for flagging up issues.
 - Therefore, they considered the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
 - The education provider reflected on their NSS score of 75.7% against a benchmark of 76.5% for the year 2022. In 2021, we noted the education provider scored 81.9% against a benchmark of 76.3%. These scores demonstrate learners are generally satisfied with their programmes across the institution.
 - The education provider noted that their NSS scores for organisation (in relation to their HCPC programmes) were lower than what they would typically expect. We understood NSS data forms part of their annual reflection process for all programmes. We understood the Professional Lead and Departmental Director of Education work with the Programme Leads to develop NSS action plans for maintaining and improving NSS scores within and across programmes.
 - The information provided in the education provider's reflection demonstrated the education provider focuses on ensuring overall satisfaction in learning for their learners.
 - Therefore, the visitors are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - The education provider noted they had not been subject to any monitoring by the Office for Students (OfS) during the review period

- and that institutional oversight is in place to review compliance with new and updated conditions in the OfS regulatory framework.
- The education provider reflected on how the revised ongoing conditions of registration (B1, B2, B4 and B5) have provided greater clarity about the OfS' minimum requirements for quality and standards and how these will be applied. The education provider stated they continue to seek to exceed these minimum requirements and to identify improvements to their provision and learner outcomes.
 - As part of their reflection, the education provider noted they are undertaking a revision to simplify their degree algorithm, with reference to the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment (UKSCQA) principles for effective degree algorithm design. We understood this is not driven by the conditions of registration. However, the education provider noted they are mindful of the need to ensure the awards and qualifications granted to learners are credible and hold their value and to assess impacts of any proposed changes.
 - The visitors noted the education provider's specific reference made to how the OfS conditions have changed, and their desire to go beyond the threshold.
 - Therefore, they are satisfied the education provider continues to perform well in this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider noted their work with other professional regulators / professional bodies including those within their Health Sciences School. Some of the bodies include the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) for their nursing and midwifery programmes, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) for speech and language therapy programmes and the British and Irish Orthoptic Society (BIOS) for orthoptic ophthalmology programmes.
 - They also work with the British Psychological Society (BPS) for the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology and Doctorate in Education and Child Psychology. The education provider noted both of their doctoral programmes received ongoing accreditation from the BPS - Clinical Psychology in 2021 and Education and Child Psychology in 2019. Both their undergraduate speech and language therapy programmes were also revised in 2017 and these were accredited and began in 2018.
 - In addition, the education provider described their close work with NHS England (NHSE) for setting learner target numbers in relation to workforce planning / needs. We understood the education provider received NHSE funding to support simulated placements for learners across the Health Sciences School. This provided equipment and materials to support clinical training.
 - The visitors noted evidence of engagement with professional and regulatory bodies across the provision, where it is warranted.
 - Therefore, they are satisfied that the education provider has continued to perform 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 –**

- The education provider reflected on how curricula have developed for each of the professions.
- For Speech and Language Therapy, they reflected on how their new BMedSci and MMedSci Speech and Language Therapy programmes have replaced the old programmes following HCPC approval in 2017 and 2018 respectively. A part time MMedSci programme was also developed with funding from NHS England to widen diversity into the profession. As noted earlier, SOPs have been fully integrated into all three programmes. Assessments are streamlined and integrated with reduced repetition and assessment load for learners. The education provider also reflected on how their innovations to ensure minimal impact during the pandemic was recognised and awarded by the RCSLT.
- The education provider noted their Health Sciences School (HSS) was formed in 2019. The HSS includes the Division of Ophthalmology and Orthoptics, Division of Human Communication Sciences, and Division of Nursing and Midwifery. We understood the formation of the HSS has enabled closer collaboration between academic and administrative staff across Divisions. This has resulted in more collaboration in the delivery of teaching, learning and teaching resources, and administrative processes for both taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. For example, we understood it has enabled a HSS General handbook to be developed and an update of the BMedSci Orthoptics student handbook. The education provider noted both handbooks are on Google sites and learners found them easier to access and navigate than previous ones presented on Blackboard. The education provider also outlined how the revised SOPs will be integrated into these programmes.
- For the Doctorate Clinical Psychology, the education provider outlined some of the challenges they had faced during the review period. Some of these included challenges relating to delivering the programme online during Covid - 19 and then reverting to face-to-face teaching. The education provider also noted their progress in mapping to the revised SOPs. Their reflection also highlighted their new specialist placements in public health and housing. There is also an increased emphasis in the curriculum on mental health in the wider social and community context and in health promotion. We understood these placements also focus on leadership skills that form a core element of the programme's curriculum.
- The education provider reflected on how they have appointed new tutors in July 2022 to meet the BPS staffing ratio requirements for their Doctoral Educational and Child Psychology programme. We understood the number of applications for the programme has steadily

increased on a yearly basis. Regarding taught session learning outcomes, we understood the curriculum structure was given a commendation by the BPS at their last visit in 2019 demonstrating the programme is innovative.

- The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection on how curricula have developed across their professions. They were therefore satisfied the education provider has continued to perform well in this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - As above, the education provider reflected on developments that have occurred in response to changes in professional body guidance for each of their professions.
 - For Orthoptics and Ophthalmology, we understood the professional body, the BIOS does not have a role in accreditation of pre-registration programmes. The education provider noted BIOS Curriculum framework is being revised this year (2023) and will be reviewed once published.
 - For Clinical Psychology, the education provider is aware of the BPS' ongoing revision of standards for the DClinPsy programme. The education provider noted they are in the process of developing specific pathways within the programme that will enable some learners to end the programme with additional professional accreditation. We understood the education provider was awarded a contract from NHS England in August 2022 to continue the DClinPsy programme. The education provider noted the contract includes new developments for secondary accreditation and that the new pathways are currently in development.
 - The education provider noted there were no changes to professional body guidance during the review period for their Educational Psychology provision. However, they reflected on the flexibility of programme delivery during Covid -19 and how they have returned to live teaching.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They considered that where appropriate, there was evidence of development reflecting changes in professional body guidance and it is clear the revised SOPs are being integrated into the programmes.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
 - For their Speech and Language Therapy provision, the education provider reflected on how they managed the reduced practice-based learning capacity caused by the impact of the Covid -19 pandemic. They noted how they used their in-house clinics to establish telehealth clinics in response to reduced placement capacity. They also collaborated with local stakeholders to create online and simulated placements. In addition, the education provider noted they created clinical online learning resource including simulated learning software packages for learners to supplement their clinical hours. We understood this is now sustained in their programmes.

- For their Orthoptic provision, the education provider collaborated with other HEIs offering orthoptic training, their professional body, the BIOS, and clinical tutors at placement sites to respond to these challenges around placement capacity. We noted the development of their Placement expansion resource library (PERL) by BIOS. We understood PERL supported orthoptic learners whose placements were disrupted by Covid -19 and it continues to support and facilitate the roll-out of virtual placements into the future.
- For their Clinical and Educational Psychology provision, the education provider reflected on the challenges they have had in ensuring sufficient high-quality practice-based learning for their increased intake of learners from 12 (in 2018) to 18 (in 2022). One of the ways they intend to manage the challenge was to increase the length of placements from five to eight months. This meant learners would have four rather than the current six placements.
- Further information received provided further reassurance of how the education provider would ensure practice-based learning capacity given the increased learner numbers across their provision. We understood the availability of placements is factored into the recruitment process which ensures learner numbers are matched to placement availability. For ClinPsy, we were made aware the education provider is working with their existing placement providers to maximise capacity and they are developing new placements in the voluntary sector, university counselling service, public health etc. DEdCPsy maintains a close liaison with placement providers as required by the Department for Education. The education provider noted this meant they can be confident in providing high quality placements for their learners.
- The visitors saw sufficient information both in the portfolio and through quality activity to reassure them that the education provider is capable of managing the availability of practice-based learning. The reflections also showed how the different innovations have contributed to capacity of practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learners –**
 - The education provider uses an institutional platform known as Tell to collect learner feedback on modules and programmes. This is done via end of module and end of programme surveys. Departments and teaching can reflect on learner feedback, by:
 - providing quantitative and qualitative reports, and data analysis;

- reporting mechanisms for, module leads, Directors of Education and Faculty Directors of Education to reflect on modules and programmes;
- using it as an opportunity for all staff to reflect on their own teaching practice.
- Within the Clinical Psychology programme, the education provider reflected on how they met with learners to discuss and agree on how to run the regular yearly meetings they hold with each cohort and their clinical and academic tutor. Based on feedback from learners, the agreed decision was to run these in smaller groups with a member of staff in each group and then feedback to the larger group. This has enabled learners to get to know staff and each other and has enabled much richer feedback and discussion between staff and learners.
- In Educational Psychology, the education provider reflected on the change that was made to the small group research project in year 1. We understood the working time available was changed following feedback from year 1 learners that highlighted the need for more time to be given for the completion of the work in term 1 of year 1.
- Through [quality theme 3](#), we noted how the education provider responded to the feedback from learners in their new graduate survey 2021.
- The visitors were satisfied with how the education provider engaged with learners, including feedback on teaching and modules and taking part in learning and teaching committees. It was also clear that actions were being taken following learner feedback. Therefore, the visitors considered the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - We noted the education provider continued to meet with their University of Sheffield Practice Educators (USPE) biannually. For their Speech and Language Therapy provision, the education provider reflected on the struggle of practice educator coordinators to offer placements due to staffing issues caused by illness, vacant posts, impact of Covid on service provision and changes to work environments (for example limited space for learners). We understood practice educators are feeling the impact of placement requests coming (or due to come) from new HEIs in the region. The education provider described their work with NHS England and other providers to manage the reduced placement capacity. They noted they now have a placement management system “In Place”. This should improve efficiency, reduce administrative demands and improve communication enabling both HCS staff and practice educator time to focus on placement expansion. The education provider also described how they have been supporting practice educators, through their practice educator training as well as their USPE meetings, to design innovative placement models that increase capacity and have reciprocal benefits for learner, clients and service users.
 - In Clinical and Educational Psychology, supervisors provided feedback informally to clinical tutors, through an annual feedback questionnaire and through the programme’s committee structure. Successes have

included setting up supervisor peer discussion groups during the pandemic that have continued since because of positive feedback from supervisors.

- The visitors considered the education provider's reflection showed practice educators are able to feed into provision, including regular meetings and consultations. Therefore, they are satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider reflected on external examiners' feedback on their new BMedSci and MMedSci programmes. They noted specifically the systematic review style final year dissertations, the application of clinical data in the linguistics and phonetics teaching amongst other areas.
 - We noted that in response to external examiners' areas for development, staff continued to adopt the full range of marks (0-100%) when assessing learner work across all modules, in particular defining criteria for the lower end of the range (for fail marks) and how to provide more constructive feedback.
 - In Orthoptics, the external examiner fed back on proposals on how to run and deliver modified written and clinical exams whilst maintaining an appropriate level and standard during the Covid -19 pandemic were sought.
 - As part of the developments, the education provider noted the duration and number of questions in written exams were reduced. Learners could access each exam within a specific time frame. Once they logged into the online exam it automatically ended when the duration for the exam was complete. Where possible the exam questions within an exam were randomised to minimise the use of unfair means. The Psychology programmes also reflected on positive feedback from external examiners.
 - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. This is because they noted clear evidence of responsiveness to external examiners.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel: Learner non continuation:

- Data showed the education provider's learner continuation rate is at benchmark which would imply low attrition rate. The visitors were satisfied with this score and considered the education provider is performing as expected in this area.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - The percentage of learners who complete the programmes who are in employment or further study is much higher than the benchmark. Although the education provider did not provide any detailed reflection

in this area, the visitors were satisfied the scores indicate the education provider is performing well in this area.

- **Teaching quality:**
 - The education provider received a Silver Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award in 2019. They noted they have made a TEF January 2023 submission, in line with the new scheme launched by the OfS and that the outcomes are due in summer 2023.
 - The education provider submitted a breakdown of their scores against TEF dataset. This showed they were performing above benchmark in learner continuation rates, completion rates and progression outcomes.
 - The education provider noted they are committed to creating an inclusive environment, supporting all learners to succeed, and closing the gaps in equality of opportunity. They also noted they continue to strive to enhance their provision in order to offer the highest quality education and learner experience and guide strategic work to drive improvements. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - Although the education provider's National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score is slightly below the benchmark, we note that the scores are comparable to the benchmark. The education provider noted this indicates learners are generally satisfied with their programmes.
 - We understood the education provider has invested in a new system for managing placement activity which is being piloted by the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health with a view to extending its use institution-wide. This is intended to support the management and organisation of placements.
 - The visitors noted sufficient evidence to demonstrate the education provider is performing well in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
 - Current data shows staff / learner ratios are within acceptable ranges across the programmes.
 - We understood adjustments have been made to several programmes that have experienced temporary increased learner numbers as a result of the impact of Covid -19. In particular, the education provider noted this in their undergraduate programmes and its impact on the overall staff to student ratios. The education provider explained they liaised closely with NHS England around workforce development plans / requests. They noted such requests to increase learner numbers to meet workforce plans often do not often come with additional staff / numbers or additional quality placements. However, they reflected that increasing simulated placement and in-house placement provision has helped to maintain placements overall.

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 NHS England, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Sheffield Health and Social Care NHS Foundation Trust.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged a number of professional bodies including RCSLT, BIOS and the BPS. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - The education provider engaged with the Office for Students and the Nursing and Midwifery Council. They considered the findings of these regulators in improving their provision.
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
 - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
- What the data is telling us:
 - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.

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
BMed Sci (Hons) Orthoptics	FT (Full time)	Orthoptist		POM - Sale / Supply (OR)	01/09/2017
BMedSci (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2018
Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Educational psychologist		01/01/2005
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/1990
MMedSci Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2018
MMedSci Vision and Strabismus	DL (Distance learning)			POM - Sale / Supply (OR)	01/09/2018
PG Exemptions Course	DL (Distance learning)			POM - Sale / Supply (OR)	01/09/2018