
Performance review process report

University of Surrey, 2018-2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of the University of Surrey. 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.
- Undertook quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- There are appropriate mechanisms to maintain and monitor the quality of the programmes and external examiners are involved with this process. External examiners review and provide feedback on all modules apart from the placement modules. There was evidence of the education provider actioning feedback received from the external examiner.
- Learner response rates to feedback were low despite the education provider having a range of methods learners could use to feedback. To increase this response rate, they focussed on encouraging learners to complete the module evaluation questionnaire (MEQ), which provided module leads with appropriate feedback that could be shared with Programme Directors and discussed at the Board of Studies.
- The provider must next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2027-28 academic year, because:
 - Visitors are satisfied with the submission and confirmed the professions and programmes regulated by the HCPC were performing well. There are no risks or issues identified that have been referred to another process. Visitors have therefore recommended a five year performance review monitoring period for the education provider.

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: <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 provider:

- 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	9
Portfolio submission.....	9
Quality themes identified for further exploration	9
Quality theme 1 – Maintaining and monitoring quality of programmes	9
Quality theme 2 – Increasing and monitoring learner feedback.....	10
Section 4: Summary of findings	11
Overall findings on performance	11
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	11
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	15
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection.....	16
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	17
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions.....	18
Data and reflections	19
Section 5: Issues identified for further review.....	21
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	21
Assessment panel recommendation	21
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution.....	23

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:

Sarah Illingworth	Lead visitor, Dietitian
Keren Cohen	Lead visitor, Practitioner Psychologist, Counselling Psychologist
Sarah Hamilton	Service User Expert Advisor
Saranjit Binning	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 Prescribing programmes. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1994.

This is the first time the education provider has engaged with the current quality assurance model; however, they have previously completed annual monitoring in 2018-19.

They have engaged with the legacy model of quality assurance and have reported major changes. For the dietetics programme there was one change, paramedic science had three changes and the practitioner psychologist programme had one change during this review period.

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	Dietitian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1997
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2016
	Practitioner psychologist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1994
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2020

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
Number of learners	175	175	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%	1%	2019-2020	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 2%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how the education provider supported learners. We considered the education provider was performing well in this area.</p>

Outcomes of those who complete programmes	94%	97%	2019-2020	<p>This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 3%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering the employability opportunities available to learners. We considered the education provider was performing well in this area.</p>
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Gold	June 2017	<p>The definition of a Gold TEF award is "provision is consistently outstanding and of the highest quality found in the UK Higher Education sector."</p> <p>We explored this by reviewing how the education provider plans to maintain this high-quality teaching. They have monitored their teaching quality throughout the review period and demonstrated it has remained at an appropriate level. We considered the education provider was performing well in this area.</p>
Learner satisfaction	75.7%	83.3%	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 above the benchmark, which suggests</p>

				<p>the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 7.6%.</p> <p>We explored this by reviewing the reflection provided in the portfolio. We considered the education provider was performing well in this area.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the [thematic areas reviewed](#) section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their portfolio. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider was performing well against our standards.

Quality theme 1 – Maintaining and monitoring quality of programmes

Area for further exploration: Visitors noted the education provider had robust processes to monitor the quality of academic delivery and placements. A detailed reflection was provided where they explained the regulatory frameworks and guidelines, they use to monitor the quality and performance of their programmes. However, we did not receive any reflections on how quality was monitored at programme level and what actions they took to improve performance. Further reflections were therefore sought from the education provider on how they considered external examiner feedback and responded to it. Clarification was also sought in relation to the placement modules and if the quality of these modules was considered and reviewed by the external examiners.

Visitors recognised there was a clear placement audit process, however they were unable to determine how the outcomes of this process were considered. Further information was sought on how the data collected through this process was monitored and actioned. In addition to this, we also requested information on how learners raise concerns about their placements. To support this request, we requested to see the placement audit report.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email clarification and documentary evidence from the education provider. We considered this would be the most effective method for the education provider to provide this information.

Outcomes of exploration: In their response, the education provider has provided a programme level summary of how external examiner feedback is considered, which demonstrates they respond to feedback and take the necessary action to make improvements. In relation to the placement modules, they have confirmed these are not reviewed by the external examiners but are reviewed by the British Dietetic Association (BDA) and are discussed at the Board of Studies. They are currently in the process of making the placement portfolios available online, which will allow the external examiners to review them. The aim is to have this ready for September 2023.

With regards to learners providing feedback and raising concerns in relation to their placements, they explained how the feedback gathered through this process enabled them to identify issues and respond to them. For example, they have been able to improve lines of communication for learners and signpost them appropriately, improve the structure of placements and offer consistent supervision.

To support these reflections, a report dated July 2021-2022 was supplied and the education provider explained how a report for 2022 was not available, as the issues impacting learners had not changed and they were still recovering from the pandemic. However, in future they will complete audit reports every two years, as this will allow them to review and reflect on the impact of the recommendations and improvements that have been made.

Visitors were satisfied with the information provided and acknowledged their reflections in this area. There was clear evidence of the measures they took to ensure quality assurance of the modules and placements and the benefits of this.

Quality theme 2 – Increasing and monitoring learner feedback

Area for further exploration: From the portfolio, the visitors recognised there were a range of methods being used to gather feedback from learners. They noted there was a lack of engagement through some of these methods, and no reflections were provided on how the education provider would engage with learners to increase the level of feedback they receive. Further information was therefore sought on how the education provider increased the learner response rate to feedback and how this was managed and monitored.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email clarification from the education provider. The visitors

considered the email clarification would be the most effective method for the provider to respond to the queries they had.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained how they have encouraged learners to complete the Module Evaluation Questionnaire (MEQ) this year to increase response rates to feedback. This has involved the Pro Vice Chancellor for Education producing a presentation for learners, and teams producing short videos emphasising the importance of the MEQs. Some teams have also timetabled the completion of the MEQs into the programmes to ensure they obtain the feedback. This approach appears to have worked well and has resulted in module leads receiving positive module feedback from learners. These questionnaires have also enabled module leads to produce module evaluation summaries for the Board of Studies.

Visitors were satisfied with the explanation provided and acknowledged the education provider were taking necessary action to increase learner response rates.

Section 4: Summary of findings

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

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
 - Despite the challenges of the pandemic during this period and a 5% drop in income, the education provider reflected on how they have remained financially stable.
 - In 2021, they updated their University Strategy, which enabled them to manage costs and generate additional income. This update included the development of the hybrid education model, which resulted in the education provider making improvements to the infrastructure costing them £19 million. These improvements included increasing the wellbeing facilities for learners, creating more spaces for learners and introducing new technology that offers learners a modern virtual learning environment.
 - The education provider used the resource-based planning model for the last three years to manage staffing levels and to ensure the staff:student ratio was appropriate. Improvements have been made to the model during this period to ensure it serves its purpose and is regularly reviewed by the Strategic Planning and Finance functions they have in place.
 - Visitors acknowledged the education provider's reflections on the challenges experienced during the pandemic and how they have remained financially stable. They were satisfied with the information

provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

- **Partnerships with other organisations –**

- The education provider demonstrated they had strong partnerships with a range of stakeholders, which includes Surrey County Council, Sussex NHS Foundation Trust and Alzheimer Society. These partnerships are managed by the Faculty's Executive and professional services management team and in some cases the programme teams. Recently, they have appointed a Head of Health and Medical Partnerships who is based in the Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences and is responsible for managing partnerships at a strategic level.
- Reflections were provided on how challenging it had been to increase placement capacity since the removal of the healthcare commissioning structure in 2016. In addition to this, staff shortages within the NHS also impacted the availability of placements. To address these challenges, bi-annual meetings were arranged with NHS England to discuss priorities and difficulties. Placement providers also signed the new NHS Education Contract, which provided more structure to the agreements. The increase in learner numbers from other areas also allowed the education provider to expand their placements with providers, such as the London Ambulance Service and Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust.
- Visitors acknowledged there was clear evidence of good partnerships and new partnerships developing. They noted the use of the NHS Education Contract and the work they were undertaking with NHS England to address some of the issues experienced with placement capacity. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

- **Academic and placement quality –**

- The education provider demonstrated a commitment to quality assurance through the Quality Assurance Framework. This framework ensured the quality of the provision is maintained and delivered at a high standard and provides learners with a good learning experience. The University Education Committee is responsible for quality assurance and implements policies and strategies to improve the quality of the provision. The Committee ensures all Faculties are engaging with the quality assurance framework and the Board of Studies and Board of Examiners meetings take place as required.
- With the use of the NHS Education Contract, Placement Agreements and audits the education provider were able to ensure the quality of placements was at a high standard. These agreements outlined roles and responsibilities of all parties including the level of support learners required during their placements and therefore supported the quality of the placement and the learner experience. They recognised the challenges experienced with placement capacity and acknowledged how competitive the environment was within which they were operating to secure placements. To reduce the risk in this area, they developed a Health Placement Business Continuity Plan and Business Impact Assessment.

- There were robust processes to monitor the quality of academic delivery and placements and feedback was gathered through various mechanisms such as the MEQs. All feedback received from learners, external examiners and facilitators was reviewed and actioned, with some variations across programmes. Visitors explored this further through [Quality theme 1](#) where further details were provided on how feedback was considered and actioned to maintain and improve the quality of the programmes.
- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section and acknowledged appropriate measures were in place to address the area explored through the quality activity, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The education provider invested in enhancing the facilities and opened the Kate Granger Building in 2020 to expand the space for learners to allow for more interprofessional learning and collaboration. Despite this, they recognise there are still some barriers to overcome and will continue to focus on developing and sharing interprofessional learning opportunities across schools.
 - They recognise there is a preference from learners for profession specific teaching and therefore trying to engage them with interprofessional learning can be challenging. However, staff have embraced this and have increased their engagement with learners and changed their approach with how interprofessional learning is presented to some professions. For example, in paramedic science they have linked interprofessional learning to employability and have engaged with the learners to explore current changes within the profession and supported them with understanding the various skills required that could be applied in other settings, such as GP practices.
 - All programmes have embedded interprofessional learning into their programmes but have used different methods. For example, with the dietetics programme learners can collaborate with learners on the Nursing, Psychology and Food Science programmes through workshops, whereas the V300 course has a module dedicated to interprofessional learning. These differences are noted and there is clear evidence of the education providers commitment to enhancing interprofessional learning.
 - Clarification was provided on how interprofessional education was monitored across the different professions, which varied for the different programmes. The various methods used for monitoring this included learners completing questionnaires about their learning experiences, meetings with personal tutors for learners to reflect on their learning and the completion of MEQs. Reflections were also provided on how programmes overlapped with different professions.
 - They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The School of Health Sciences and Psychology has a Service User and Carer Group, which serves all the programmes within the School. Service users and carers were involved with these programmes, however there were some variations with level of involvement due to

the nature of the programmes. For example, challenges were experienced with involving them with the Paramedic Science programme, whereas with the Dietetic programme they were involved with interviews, assessments and teaching. The involvement of service users and carers was impacted by the pandemic and the format of some activities had to be changed, such as the stakeholder meetings.

- Clarification was provided on how feedback was gathered and actioned in relation to service user and carer involvement. The education provider explained how learners provided feedback through the MEQs, which was shared with service users and carers, and in the service user and carer group meetings. This feedback was reviewed through module reports and annual audit reports and enabled the education provider to assess the level of service user engagement with the programmes. They confirmed the level of engagement was appropriate during this period and that service users and carers were involved with the majority of activities within the school.
- They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider has a clear commitment in this area and the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Strategy is used to support schools with this. The strategy ensured learners had access to all support available and monitors the diverse groups of learners. The support available ranges from the Disability and Neurodiversity Department, who provided learners with support on medical conditions and specific learning difficulties to Student Services.
 - A gap with progression was identified within paramedic science with regards to learners from Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds being at risk of not progressing. To address this, the team are providing learners with additional support to return to their studies. The Student Success teams are also being used by the Faculty to increase the support offered to learners from BAME backgrounds to improve retention rates.
 - There is an emphasis on ensuring all professions are recruiting learners from diverse backgrounds. To manage this, staff can access these statistics via the Power BI dashboards, which enables them to identify trends that they can respond to, such as attainment gaps. For example, this intelligence enabled the dietetics programme to improve the gender split and increase the number of learners from BAME backgrounds.
 - They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider reflected on the challenges experienced with ensuring there is sufficient placement capacity and outlined some of the processes they developed to overcome these challenges. For example, the dietetics programme was developing links with charities and private dietetic companies to expand their portfolio of practice placements.
 - There has been extensive investment in new facilities, with the Kate Granger Building being the most recent which opened in 2020. There

are currently plans to build a Food Innovation Centre commencing in 2023/24. With this level of investment, the education provider aims to enhance the learning experience for learners and provide them with more space to collaborate.

- Visitors noted the reflections provided on the challenges experienced with practice learning and the plans to increase placement capacity. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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 demonstrated how the revised SOPs would be delivered from September 2023 across all programmes and reflected on how some elements of it were already embedded in some of the programmes. For example, the promoting public health and preventing ill-health SOP has already been implemented in the Paramedic Science programme across the three years. All learners are provided with opportunities to work with service users through taught sessions and during placement and assessed thereafter.
 - The revised SOPs have already been discussed with learners, however sessions and workshops have been arranged to take place at the start of the next academic year. This will ensure they are aware of the changes. The education provider will also update all documentation to reflect the revised SOPs, which includes handbooks and placement related documents.
 - Learners have access to a wide range of opportunities where leadership is promoted, such as the Student Ambassador programme and Surrey Peer Support. These opportunities allow learners to develop their leadership skills and they are also encouraged to apply these in their placements.
 - Visitors acknowledged the reflections provided. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - Placement provision was impacted significantly during the pandemic due to the social distancing guidelines that had been introduced by the government. Some placements were therefore suspended or withdrawn, as the environments were not considered safe for learners. Where possible, programme teams developed alternative assessments and virtual and remote working placements, which enabled learners to progress with their learning and complete their studies.
 - During this period alongside the placements, all teaching was moved online, which was challenging for the education provider. Despite these challenges, they reflected on some of the benefits of the pandemic and how they had permanently implemented some of the adjustments that

were made during this period. This included, the adjustments made to the placements in paramedic science, which resulted in increasing placement capacity.

- Visitors acknowledged the reflections provided and how the government guidelines impacted the provision. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The education providers priorities in relation to information technology were outlined in the Education Strategy. The Digital Learning Team support staff to develop and enhance the learning experience with the introduction of new technology. All new technology was evaluated, and learning analytics were used to monitor outcomes, such as how much the SurreyLearn resource was accessed by learners.
 - There were a range of ways technology was used across the programmes, for example online tools such as Microsoft Teams and Zoom were used to support the delivery of lectures and SurreyLearn, which is the virtual learning environment, were used by all learners to access resources. In addition to this, through the Surrey Clinical Simulation Centre learners were able to access new technology, such as the immersive learning rooms to enhance their learning.
 - Visitors noted how technology enabled the education provider to adopt a blended approach to learning and teaching and commented on the variations with how technology was used across the programmes. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - The education provider currently does not offer apprenticeships and are not an approved provider. However, they are considering developing apprenticeships for the dietetic programme, due to interest expressed by the NHS partners. Discussions are therefore ongoing on how apprenticeships could be supported and developed further.
 - Visitors noted the discussions to develop apprenticeships and confirmed they had no concerns 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 –**
 - Programmes are mapped against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education to ensure standards and quality are maintained.
 - Visitors acknowledged this and were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**

- The education provider has a specialist professional services team who are responsible for actioning any feedback received from external bodies in relation to placement providers. If concerns were raised about a specific placement provider, the education provider investigates this and consider withdrawing learners.
- Care Quality Commission (CQC) reports were also considered by the education provider. They reflected on how three of the NHS Trusts they place learners with have been rated good.
- Visitors acknowledged the reflections provided. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - Reflections were provided on how the education provider had responded to the revised conditions of registration. They outlined the existing processes used to ensure quality is maintained and how they provide a high-quality academic experience. To enhance quality further across the programmes, they have developed a Curriculum Design Review (CDR) process, which will be ready in 2024.
 - Visitors acknowledged the education providers approach to ensuring there were appropriate processes to ensure they were monitoring and meeting the Office for Students conditions of registration. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider reflected on the audits they had completed with the British Dietetic Association and the British Psychological Society (BPS). They commented on how the BPS specifically recognised their involvement with services users and carers and the development of the specialist CBT pathway through this audit. In 2019, they also engaged with the BPS to re-accredit the PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 training.
 - To ensure effective engagement with professional regulators and bodies, there were various senior managers involved to manage this who were responsible for responding to and implementing any regulatory changes.
 - Visitors acknowledged there was extensive engagement with regulatory bodies. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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 –**
 - Challenges were identified and reflected on across the programmes. Paramedic Science reflected on the challenges they experienced with learners not participating and their lack of confidence in speaking.

Whereas with PsychD, the challenge was to incorporate the trainee competencies, that were published in 2019, into the programme.

- In 2022, the British Dietetic Association re-accredited the Nutrition and Dietetic programme and provided the education provider with some feedback. As a result of this feedback, they have introduced modules and activities to focus on skills training to prepare learners for professional practice.
- A mapping exercise was completed to ensure the curriculum aligns with the updated Royal Pharmaceutical Society's Competency Framework for Prescribers.
- Visitors acknowledged how responsive the education provider were to changes and making the necessary adjustments to the curriculum. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider demonstrated their engagement with professional bodies and reflected on the different requirements for the individual programmes. For example, they mapped the standards of proficiency for paramedics to align with the new curriculum.
 - Digital competencies have also been developed on the PsychD programme in response to the BPS and HCPC SOPs requirements.
 - Visitors noted the education providers engagement with changes to regulations. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
 - Increasing placement capacity has been challenging for the education provider, however they have reflected on the challenges. For example, new roles within the mental health sector have increased, which has impacted the amount of supervision offered to learners in placement. To address this issue the education provider considered alternative options to ensure minimum requirements were met.
 - There is evidence of the education provider working collaboratively with existing placement providers such as the NHS Trusts to increase placement capacity in areas, such as the forensic services. One of these collaborations was a project to develop placements in the third sector with homeless organisations. It was clear they were exploring ways in which placement capacity could be developed and enhanced further and they were considering options outside of the traditional model of placements, such as care homes and charities.
 - Visitors acknowledged the education providers reflections and their awareness of the challenges with increasing placement capacity and noted they were taking appropriate action to address this. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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 demonstrated a commitment to receiving and responding to feedback. There were various mechanisms used to receive feedback from learners, such as the module evaluation questionnaires, learner representatives, the National Student Survey (NSS) and Hearing the Learner Voice (HLV) survey. In addition to this learners were also able to provide feedback via UNITU, which is a platform specifically created for education providers to use to collect and analyse feedback. This platform could also be used by learners to raise concerns. Reflections were provided on how the education provider responded to learner feedback and what action they took.
 - Visitors acknowledged how positively the education provider engages and responds to learner feedback. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - There were various methods practice placement educators used to provide feedback, which varied across the programmes. Some of these methods included mid-placement meetings, the placement audit form, and the placement visit. In addition to this practice placement educators can also provide feedback or share any concerns directly with the tutor. All these methods work effectively to gather feedback and the education provider has reflected on how the feedback has been responded to.
 - As a result of the feedback received, mainly through the stakeholder meetings, the education provider increased the number of training sessions they offered to practice placement educators. This increased the level of support provided to practice placement educators.
 - Visitors noted there were appropriate methods to collect feedback. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider outlined some of the positive feedback they had received from the external examiners in relation to maintaining academic standards in line with other education providers and obtaining a high standard of feedback. There was also evidence of the education provider maintaining good relationships with the external examiners and responding to their feedback appropriately.
 - Visitors noted how effectively the education provider engaged with the external examiners and responded to their feedback. They were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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:**
 - The education provider recognises there is a higher risk of learners from BAME backgrounds not progressing and therefore have various strategies they use to support these learners, which includes the Student Success Team.
 - They have outlined a range of processes to identify learners where there maybe a cause for concern or they are at risk of not progressing due to a failed assessment. The personal tutor is important in this process and provides pastoral support and identifies any support the learner could benefit from.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided and confirmed they had no concerns.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - Positive reflections have been provided on the high employment rates for learners when they graduate. The education provider has commented on how much of this is due to the nature of the provision and the fact that there is a demand for the NHS workforce to grow.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided and confirmed they had no concerns.
- **Teaching quality:**
 - In June 2017, the education provider achieved a Gold Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award. This award recognised their excellent work with supporting learners and the research expertise of staff. It also commended them on embedding employability throughout the curriculum. In January 2023, a new TEF submission was submitted, which the education provider is awaiting the outcome of.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided and confirmed they had no concerns.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - The education provider reflected positively on the high National Student Survey (NSS) scores they have received over the last five years. The high scores demonstrated a clear commitment to enhancing the learner experience and addressing issues.
 - Due to the NSS only applying to undergraduate programmes, the education provider used the Participant in Research Experience Survey (PRES) to gather feedback for the postgraduate programmes. This survey was completed by the postgraduate learners and the satisfaction rate was 82.8% in 2022, which demonstrated satisfaction rates amongst the postgraduate learners were in line with the undergraduate learners.
 - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided and confirmed they had no concerns.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The education provider outlined how they ensured the staff:student ratio was appropriate and how the workload planning model was used to calculate this. They recognised this data was only available at school level and reflected on how useful this data would be at programme level and explained how they would coordinate with the Strategic Planning team to make this data available in future.

- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided and confirmed they had no concerns.

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 and external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with several professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - The education provider engaged with the BPS, BDA, NMC and the OfS. They considered the findings of other regulators in improving their provision.
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
 - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
- What the data is telling us:
 - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.
- In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a five year monitoring period is:

- Visitors are satisfied with the submission and confirmed the professions and courses regulated by the HCPC were performing well. There are no risks or issues identified that have been referred to another process. Visitors have therefore recommended a five year performance review monitoring period for the education provider.

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) Nutrition/Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/08/1997
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2016
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (PsychD)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/1995
PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 Training	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Health psychologist		01/10/2015
PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 Training	PT (Part time)	Practitioner psychologist	Health psychologist		01/10/2015
Practitioner Doctorate in Psychotherapeutic and Counselling Psychology (PsychD)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Counselling psychologist		01/01/1994
V300 Non-Medical Independent and Supplementary Prescribing	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/01/2020
V300 Non-Medical Supplementary Prescribing	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/01/2020

Appendix 2 – summary report

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

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
University of Surrey	CAS-01267-X7S7X8	Sarah Illingworth Keren Cohen	5 years	Visitors are satisfied with the submission and confirmed the professions and programmes regulated by the HCPC were performing well. There are no risks or issues identified that have been referred to another process. Visitors have therefore recommended a five year performance review monitoring period for the education provider.	There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.