

---

## Use of external data sources by the HCPC Education function

This document explains how we source external data used through our quality assurance work, and how data points and benchmarks are arrived at.

### **How we use data**

Using data and intelligence as a key part of our quality assurance model allows us to be:

- Proactive – where data and intelligence identifies risks, we can trigger some form of engagement with providers
- Risk-based – have an evidence-based understand of risks for providers
- Proportionate – use risk profiling to undertake bespoke and right touch regulatory interventions

We do not make regulatory decisions using solely data we produce or receive. Data and intelligence is used to form part of a quality picture of education providers / programmes.

When supplying data to providers, we ask them to consider and reflect on the data. This might include noting how they have used a disappointing data point as catalyst for change, or challenging us if they are unclear how data points were arrived at, and / or if data points are out of date.

### **Values used**

We started using external data in our processes from the 2021-22 academic year. When integrating data into our model, we accepted that some data is better than no data, and worked with the bodies which would give us most coverage across providers. We have therefore used some data delivered through a direct supply, and some which is publicly available.

### **Benchmarks**

Benchmarking allows significant differences in performance to be highlighted, whilst considering that certain learner characteristics can impact on data points. We use benchmarking from relevant organisations as a comparison point when considering data.

## Data points explained

Data point	Source	How provider level values are arrived at	How benchmarks are arrived at	Recognised limitations of the data	Future development
<a href="#">Percentage not continuing</a> <a href="#">Percentage in employment / further study</a>	<a href="#">Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA)</a> data, via Jisc data consultancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student level data aggregated at the provider level</li> <li>• Students included where the <a href="#">HESA 'course title' field</a> contains or references HCPC professional titles / parts of the Register (eg 'Hearing Aid Audiology', 'Paramedic', 'Podiatry')</li> <li>• This data is suppressed (ie not provided) when a percentage cannot be derived due to <a href="#">HESA's rounding and suppression strategy</a></li> </ul>	Unweighted mean of the education provider level data points provided through the supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The supply relies on programme title, which may include non-HCPC-approved provision / exclude HCPC-approved provision</li> <li>• Data is provided to Odp due to HESA restrictions on supply</li> <li>• The benchmark used is sector-wide (based on HCPC professions), so does not take provider learner profile into account</li> <li>• Percentage in employment / further study is no longer publicly produced at a provider level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish direct data supply from Jisc as a 'public purpose customer'</li> <li>• We will be able to inform the quality of the data, particularly to ensure programmes are correctly tagged with HCPC as a regulatory body</li> </ul>

National Student Survey (NSS)	Office for Students (OfS) – public data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall results for each of the seven themes<sup>1</sup>, using only HCPC-related subjects (using the <a href="#">Common Aggregation Hierarchy (CAH)</a> level 3) aggregated at the provider level</li> <li>• Subject areas used are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Biomedical sciences (non-specific) (CAH02-05-03)</li> <li>○ Counselling, psychotherapy and occupational therapy (CAH02-06-07)</li> <li>○ Healthcare science (non-specific) (CAH02-05-02)</li> <li>○ Medical sciences (non-specific) (CAH01-01-01)</li> <li>○ Nutrition and dietetics (CAH02-06-02)</li> <li>○ Physiotherapy (CAH02-06-05)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Values from each subject weighted to the number of responses to give an overall value for subjects related to HCPC professions</li> <li>• Where no subject level data is available, the <a href="#">provider level data</a> for taught programmes is used</li> </ul>	Weighted mean of the education provider level data points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NSS only applies to undergraduate provision at higher education institutions</li> <li>• Not all programmes within the subject areas will be HCPC-approved</li> <li>• Some HCPC-approved programmes will be outside of the subject areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim to include data from the <a href="#">Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)</a></li> </ul>
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

---

<sup>1</sup> 1. The teaching on my course, 2. Learning opportunities, 3. Assessment and feedback, 4. Academic support, 5. Organisation and management, 6. Learning resources, 7. Student voice

<a href="#">Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award</a>	Office for Students (OfS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The most recent provider-level TEF award</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only mandatory for English institutions where <a href="#">condition B6</a> of the regulatory framework applies<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Some non-English providers engaged with legacy TEF, but Northern Irish, Scottish and Welsh providers have not engaged with the most recent exercise (2023)</li> </ul>	
---	---------------------------	--	-----	--	--

---

<sup>2</sup> We are clear that we do not disadvantage providers who are not mandated to have a TEF award – see our [position statement](#) for further information

## Our use of teaching quality data

This position statement notes how we focus on teaching quality data and information. It notes how slightly different considerations are needed in the four UK nations, and for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) / non-HEI education providers.

### Institution performance

	English HEI	Northern Irish / Scottish / Welsh HEI	Non-HEI
<b>Performance review approach</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require providers to demonstrate good teaching quality, through information and evidence, including any data points available</li> <li>Ask providers to reflect on the quality of their teaching, including how they use data</li> <li>Make a teaching quality judgement which informs our risk-based decision making</li> </ul>		
<b>Use of TEF award, and equivalent data available</b>	Use legacy TEF awards until 2023 TEF awards are available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not engaging with TEF 2023</li> <li>No equivalent high-level data point in any of the three countries</li> </ul>	Available for teaching institutions should they wish to engage

### Ongoing risk profiling (outside of active reviews with providers)

- To remain confident with provider performance, we rely on regular supply of data and intelligence to help us understand provider performance outside of the periods where we directly engage with them
- We previously established data supplies for several areas, including teaching quality
- Where one or more data points are not available for specific providers, we ask them to consider providing alternative data, and consider it a risk indicator if they are not able to (or choose not to) do so. Establishing supplies enables providers to move beyond a 2-year monitoring period
- TEF awards do not regularly change (beyond established award cycles) so there is no need to 'replace' or 'substitute' from a regular supply / consideration of data perspective
- This means that the lack of a TEF award will not be seen as a risk indicator