
Performance review process report

King's College London, Review period 2018 - 2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the ongoing process to review the performance of King's College London. This report captures the process we have undertaken to date 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 education 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;
- undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed;
- made a recommendation for when the institution should next be reviewed.

The education provider supplied observations which were considered in decision making.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
 - How the education provider have reflected on having more learners than they had originally planned. We focused on how the increase could cause a strain on their resources and ability to effectively deliver the programme. As a result, we explored through quality activity the potential impact this increase may have had with regards to an increase in staffing and resources.
 - The quality activity gave the education provider the opportunity to demonstrate how they were meeting the staff / learner ratios set out by their professional bodies.
 - We also identified the ongoing challenge the education provider is facing in terms of placement capacity in the London region. Both in their reflections and based on external intelligence, we are aware the London region is experiencing issues with limited placement capacity. These challenges could have an impact on profession areas for which the education provider delivers programmes. We noted this could further impact the education provider's plans to increase their learner numbers.
 - The following areas should be referred to another HCPC process for assessment:
 - We noted the education provider had processes in place with regards to service user and carer involvement in their programmes. Several plans were in development at the time of their submission aimed at further
-

embedding their involvement in the future. We have made a referral for the outcome and impact of these plans to be reported within their next performance review submission.

- The education provider should next engage with monitoring in four years, the 2026-27 academic year, because:
 - We agreed they are performing well in the management and delivery of their programmes and to have openly and honestly engaged in this process. We have no concerns and have not identified any risks that would threaten the continued approval / delivery of their programmes.
 - We are recommending a four-year ongoing monitoring period to recognise how well the education provider is performing. The ongoing placement capacity issues in the London region combined with the planned increase in learner numbers is an area of risk. Therefore, we want to review their performance earlier than the standard five year period.
 - The education provider has plans to implement significant changes to their service user and carer policies soon. The plans were being developed at the time of their submission. As a result, we are referring this area to be reviewed as part of their next performance review. The education provider should reflect and report on the outcome on these changes within the portfolio submission.

Previous consideration This is the education provider's first engagement with the performance review process. The outcome of this process will determine their future ongoing monitoring period.

Decision The Education and Training Committee (the Panel) is asked to decide:

- when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be; and
- whether issues identified for referral through this review should be reviewed further, and if so how.

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

- subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2026-27 academic year;
- this recommendation is partly based on ongoing placement challenges education providers are experiencing in London. We recommend the education provider reflects on this and continues to develop their placement capacity. We recommend this is highlighted as an area for review at their next Performance review.

Included within this report

| | |
|--|----|
| Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:..... | 2 |
| Section 1: About this assessment | 4 |
| About us | 4 |
| Our standards..... | 4 |
| Our regulatory approach..... | 4 |
| The performance review process..... | 4 |
| Thematic areas reviewed..... | 5 |
| How we make our decisions | 5 |
| The assessment panel for this review..... | 5 |
| Section 2: About the education provider..... | 6 |
| The education provider context | 6 |
| Practice areas delivered by the education provider | 6 |
| Institution performance data | 7 |
| Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes | 10 |
| Portfolio submission..... | 10 |
| Quality themes identified for further exploration | 10 |
| Quality theme 1 – Additional learners leading to additionally staffing or resources | 10 |
| Section 4: Findings..... | 11 |
| Overall findings on performance | 11 |
| Quality theme: Institution self-reflection | 11 |
| Quality theme: Thematic reflection..... | 16 |
| Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection | 18 |
| Quality theme: Profession specific reflection..... | 20 |
| Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions | 22 |
| Data and reflections | 23 |
| Section 5: Issues identified for further review..... | 25 |
| Referrals to next scheduled performance review..... | 25 |
| Ongoing development of policies relating to service user and carer involvement | 25 |
| Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes..... | 26 |
| Assessment panel recommendation..... | 26 |
| Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution | 28 |

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:

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Carol Rowe | Lead visitor, Physiotherapist |
| Duane Mellor | Lead visitor, dietitian |
| Prisha Shah | Service User Expert Advisor |
| Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh | Education Quality Officer |

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. In this assessment, we considered we did not require

professional expertise across all the professional areas delivered by the education provider.

We were content with this set of visitors because the performance review process does not require a level of programme scrutiny that would require us to have a subject matter expert in the assessment panel. Rather, the process looks at how the education provider has performed at institution level around a number of themes as detailed in Section 4 below.

In addition, we had the option to bring on board a support visitor if the lead visitors felt they needed to, if they identified anything that needed exploring outside of their scope of practice. Such need was not identified for this review.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 6 HCPC-approved programmes across 3 professions. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1991.

The last annual monitoring in the legacy model of quality assurance was 2018-19. They engaged in the record change process in 2022 in the current model of quality assurance, but withdrew the change, and kept the Pg Dip Dietetics programme open.

In the legacy model of quality assurance 2020 they engaged in the major change process twice. They reported they updated both Physiotherapy programmes following a curriculum development process. The programme delivery would incorporate further blended-learning approaches with a greater proportion of online and self-directed learning, as well as lectures. The change reported for the clinical psychology programme related to an increase in cohort size as a result of an increase in Health Education England (HEE) commissioned places for their Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPSy) programme.

The changes reported in 2021 for the Dietetics programmes were the Postgraduate Diploma and BSc were closed to new applicants. The decision for the changes for the MSc Dietetics was it was most appropriate for the changes to be assessed through the programme's next annual monitoring audit.

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 |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------|
| | Dietitian | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2002 |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|------|
| Pre-registration | Physiotherapist | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 1991 |
| | Practitioner psychologist | <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 1992 |

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

| Data Point | Benchmark | Value | Date | Commentary |
|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|---------|--|
| Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers | 197 | N/A (later PR return suggests 454) | 2022 | <p>The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission.</p> <p>The education provider is recruiting learners above the benchmark.</p> <p>Visitors were made aware of this ahead of their review</p> |
| Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing | 3% | 7% | 2020-21 | <p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from data delivery.</p> <p>This means the data is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data delivery – a bespoke HESA data return, filtered based on HCPC-related subjects |

| | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|----------------|--|
| | | | | <p>The data point is above 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 been maintained.</p> <p>This still means that 93% of their learners do follow to completion, but this figure is above the benchmark and was highlighted to the visitors before their review. We explored this by reviewing their submission and reflections. From these we know what measures and mechanisms are being put in place to address this. This includes additional support being put in place for learners.</p> |
| <p>Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study</p> | <p>94%</p> | <p>92%</p> | <p>2019-20</p> | <p>This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is:</p> <p>Data delivery –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 below 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 reviewing their reflections and actions related to this area. We note that the provider is putting an</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|------|--|
| | | | | <p>increased focus on careers into the curriculum for learners. They are also running sessions for learners to think about their career post-studying and working with their Careers and Employability' service to support learners' professional development.</p> |
| Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award | N/A | Silver | 2017 | <p>The definition of a Silver TEF award is Silver: "Provision is of high quality, and significantly and consistently exceeds the baseline quality threshold expected of UK Higher Education."</p> <p>We explored this by reviewing the provider approach to this area, noting that they intend to partake in the future TEF review.</p> |
| National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27) | 74.7% | 71.1% | 2022 | <p>This NSS data was sourced at the summary. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 4.1%.</p> <p>We explored this by examining the providers reflections on this area. We note they are working to improve this score and they state they are gradually returning to their pre-pandemic score. Two years ago, they scored 66% and 71.1% is an improvement on this</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 – impact of the increase in learner numbers on placement capacity and resources required to deliver programmes.

Area for further exploration: From the portfolio submission, we noted the education provider have increased their learner numbers through commissioning by Higher Education England (HEE). They reported on how the increase in recruitment had contributed to the increase in financial income during the review period. While we noted the increase in learner numbers is an indicator of sustainability, we did not receive reflections on the impact this would have on resources, especially staffing. We also noted the education provider had not sufficiently reflected on how they would ensure there would be sufficient placements for all learners. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how the education provider have effectively planned to resource programmes and ensure placement capacity in response to the increase in learner numbers.

The visitors sought further information from the education provider to demonstrate how programmes would be sufficiently resourced especially with regards to staffing. They also explored the education provider's plans to ensure there will be sufficient placement capacity to accommodate the increase in learner numbers. It is important for them to reflect on and address the impact this change would have on the delivery and sustainability of their programmes.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this further with the education provider and chose to email the areas we sought further information. We determined that this is a question they could respond to in writing /

email as it was a single area of clarification. Their response would help clarify our understanding of their management of increased learners.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider responded via email and documentary evidence explaining their approach to managing increased learners at programme level. They confirmed they were in the process of recruiting additional internal staff to support the increased learners on the programmes. They stated these new staff members would be in posts place by October 2023. This should ensure they continue to meet the staff / learner ratio required by partner organisations such as the British Psychological Society. Their Physiotherapy and Dietetics programmes were recently reviewed through the education provider's last internal annual review.

Staffing, learner numbers and the staff / learner ratio were reviewed as part of this process. Our findings confirmed their programmes were currently meeting the guidelines set out by their related professional bodies for these areas. The education provider stated they shall continue to monitor this going forward and no further increases are planned for their Dietetic programmes. The visitors are satisfied the education provider had demonstrated how they meet the staff-learner ratio as stipulated by their regulators / professional bodies is being met.

The visitors explored the additional information the education provider presented in relation to how they will ensure sufficient placement capacity. They noted how the education provider have developed innovative placements methods to increase capacity. Examples of these include simulation based learning weeks in placements, and in house placements at their onsite gym. Their reflections show how they have considered the concern relating to limited placements capacity and how they plan to address this in the future. They stated they recognised the need for a coordinated approach across practice placement partners to ensure all professions are accommodated. They are aligned with the NHS Long-term plan which has resulted in learners on the DCLinPsy have access to other placements in specialist areas.

The visitors agreed the education provider have provided appropriate response and addressed the areas they explored through quality activity. The additional information submitted shows the increases in learner numbers has been adequately resourced and they have plans in place to ensure there are sufficient placements for learners. As a result of the significant change in learner numbers and capacity issues across London, we will be referring this to their next performance review.

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 have reflected on the challenges they have faced in terms of their finances and the impact of Covid-19. They have referred to their strong performance in terms of increased learner recruitment and financial management throughout the review period. This has resulted in a 20.8% increase of income from learners' fees year on year. They have also reflected on how the growth in learner numbers had not been evenly distributed across the institution and had an unsustainable impact on staff. This led to an increase in staff numbers to better match their learner numbers and funds have been made available to support this.
- The visitors noted the education provider reported a surplus for the 2021-22 financial year which indicated a robust process for resource management. They noted how the increase in learners' numbers contributed to increased revenue. The impact of this increase on resources was explored further through quality activity [one](#). The education provider demonstrated how they were maintaining the required staff-learner ratio. More staff were being recruited to support increased learner numbers and the education provider continues to follow regulator / professional body guidance.
- The visitors agreed the education provider has robust policies in place to manage the increase in learners. They have and continue to recruit staff accordingly to support the increase in learners. They are also working with placement partners to continue to ensure they have sufficient placement places. The visitors found the provider to be performing well in this area but have also recommended this area to the education providers next performance review.
- The visitors recognised the ongoing challenge in placement capacity in London which affects the professional areas of the education provider's programmes. The risk identified by this performance review relates to ensuring that there will be sufficient placements places for all learners their programmes. We have no concerns about the placement capacity for the current cohort of learners. The potential areas of risk relate to the impact the planned increase in learner numbers would have soon. We are factoring in this challenge to the ongoing monitoring period and highlighting this as an area for review at their next performance review.

• **Partnerships with other organisations –**

- The education provider have reflected on how they are a large, multi-faculty institution with several health-care programmes. These are supported well by their partners across London and Southeast England. They explained how they have been able to adopt a service delivery approach alongside teaching as a response to Covid. The education provider also worked with HEE and the London & South-east Placement partnership group (LSEAPP) to ensure placement capacity. They have established a formal mechanism for the working relationship with HEE. This is aimed at achieving a nationally consistent and equitable approach for contracting and funding for education and training.

- The visitors agreed the education provider has robust mechanisms in place for engagement with employers, placement providers and other Higher Education Institutions via stakeholder forums. This is in addition to their practice education teams who hold discipline / institution specific meetings. The information reviewed showed how the education provider maintained relationships with practice providers during the pandemic and how this was successfully managed through online stakeholder forums.
- We agreed the education provider is performing well in this area. They have plans to utilise increased simulation and to work with partners and learners. They have demonstrated there are plans in place to implement and manage this.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - The education provider reflected on the challenges they faced with ensuring placement quality during the pandemic. Other challenges included ensuring a rapid and agile response to learner feedback and the addition of new education providers in the region. To mitigate these challenges, they moved academic work online and supported simulated learning and HEE supported placements where possible.
 - Regular additional on-line drop-in support sessions were held separately for practice educators and learners during this period and feedback from both groups was positive.
 - They reviewed and introduced a new curriculum for their Dietetics and Physiotherapy programmes. They have also completed an annual internal review of academic and placement quality for their psychology programmes. Their internal reviews reflected on the shift to online and hybrid working and processes available to support learners and staff.
 - The visitors agreed there were robust annual internal and external quality assurance processes for academic and practice education. They were satisfied there are a range of appropriate quality assurance methods in place. These have effectively ensured academic and placement quality remains high and is monitored regularly.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The education provider reflected on how interprofessional education (IPE) was focused on the combined, collaborative, delivery of workshops for each learner. These workshops allowed learners to learn from each other and patients with a focus on transferrable and professional skills. They developed plans to enhance resourcing based on the recognition of these sessions as clinical teaching, with proportionate funding contributions. They identified timetabling and resources as a challenge for all their programmes. They successfully addressed this challenge by scheduling IPE sessions in prior to programme timetabling.
 - We noted from the education provider's reflections on how interprofessional learning opportunities were being expanded and the increase in trainee / learner reporting. Interprofessional learning on placements are recorded by trainees and their interprofessional learning competences are rated by supervisors. Joint sessions have been held with their 'family therapy' learners who come from diverse professional backgrounds, such as social workers and nurses. In 2019,

they employed a Lead Systemic therapy tutor who introduced additional teaching sessions on Systemic therapies to clinical psychology learners. The education provider also reflected on how they were able to introduce other new IPE activities during the review period. This included Collaborative Teamwork in Mental Health and a recently piloted simulation using the centre's home environment setting.

- The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's approach to IPE. They found it to have a strong position in the education provider's portfolio and was being managed and developed well. They agreed the information suggests IPE was effectively embedded in the curricula and clearly demonstrated inter-professionalism.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider reflected on their commitment to service user and carer (SU&C) involvement in their processes. This included curriculum development, ongoing stakeholder meetings, learner recruitment, practice education and research activities.
 - They have worked to ensure a broad representation from all communities and a diverse range of perspectives and experiences are effectively represented throughout the curriculum. Service-users from the local 'Trust Involvement Register' are integrated into their committee structures and play an important role in the development of their programmes. This ensures the perspectives of a diverse range of people with lived experience of local services. This included those who may face barriers to inclusion are fairly represented.
 - The visitors noted there was an extensive range of policies which had been coproduced with SU&C's, and agreed this area was well managed. The education provider acknowledged the challenges of ensuring consistent compliance across the programmes and reflected on how there were being addressed. There are a range of mechanisms to monitor feedback and outcomes and many areas are performing very well.
 - We noted how the education provider had multiple plans in development and implementation stage such as their SU&C mentoring scheme. As a result of still being at the early stages, feedback, and reflections on how these were implemented, how success is measured, and how these improved their programmes are not yet available.
 - We therefore proposed to factor this development into the ongoing recommendation and refer this to their next Performance review. The education provider should continue to explore future strategy or implementation plans to address issues of diversity and inclusion within SU involvement. We are referring this to their next Performance review and recommend the education provider to reflect on this then.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The reflections suggest equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) is very important to the education provider. They have governing bodies (EDI Committee and EDI Forum) who are responsible for steering and progressing EDI. Their Student Success department lead work on addressing differential learner outcomes. The 'Athena Swan Delivery Team' (ASDT) are responsible for the education provider's sex and

gender equality work. Findings are reviewed and areas for improvement identified as part of their annual EDI report.

- EDI is central to their 'King 2026' strategy which renews focus on the importance of a positive and inclusive culture. It aims to ensure staff are supported to develop their careers and fulfil their potential. They confirmed inclusion and support for disabled staff and those with long-term conditions as a priority. They aim to build on support for parents and carers and continue ambitious plans for gender and race equality. The 2026 strategy also aims to close attainment gaps for black and ethnic minority learners and those with disabilities.
- The visitors noted good examples of outcomes from EDI monitoring being used to drive improvements. They agreed the education provider have appropriate measures in place to appropriately support all learners and strive to continually improve their approach to EDI.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider launched their Vision 2029 project in 2017 with the aim to make 'the world' a better place through excellence in teaching, research, and a service to society. Five interlinked priorities were identified:
 - i) Educate to inspire & improve
 - ii) Research to inform & innovate
 - iii) Serve to shape & transform
 - iv) A civic university at the heart of London
 - v) An international community that serves the world.
 - They have made progress towards these goals by diversifying their student body by 30%, increasing widening participation curriculum enrolments since 2018-19.
 - They conducted a curriculum review to avoid duplication and create space for future developments. They also made developments in learner mental health and wellbeing and addressed attainment gaps.
 - The increase in learner numbers was managed by appointing new research staff, clinical and academic staff to ensure effective programme delivery. They are also developing new placements and have processes in place to ensure that this development work will continue. For example, the DClinPsy has expanded the number of physical health placements to support the greater integration of mental and physical health.
 - In January 2023, the education provider launched a new learner App which improved communication between staff and learners. Significant investment was made to the 'King's Academy' to ensure there was appropriate expertise and capacity to support Programme Leads. The introduction of a new Curriculum Management System aims help ensure they collect and store all curriculum data to provide comprehensive information.
 - The visitors agreed the education provider has clear plans to build on successes and continue to deliver the ambitions of Vision 2029 over the next four years. Clear goals have been identified, and areas of focus moving forwards to secure and advance their portfolios. They recognised the changing health professions educational landscape and

have plans to develop and adapt for the future. The visitors were satisfied with the education providers approach to this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: We are making a recommendation for the education provider to continue to develop and expand their Service User and Carer (SU&C) policies. The aim of this is to broaden diversity and inclusion in their SU&C policies.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
 - The education provider stated they were confident they were successfully addressing most of the standards in the revised HCPC SOPs. For example, the updated faculty professionalism policies require active demonstration of behaviours and are explicitly linked to programme expectations. They are planning for the SOPs to be fully implemented for September 2023 by updating teaching and resources to ensure learners have a full understanding of revised standards.
 - They reflected on how learning about promoting health and preventing ill health was already taking place across their curricula and on placements. Clinical Health Psychology teaching helps learners understand the role that Clinical Psychologists have in health promotion.
 - The education provider explained how their Physiotherapy and Dietetics programmes have made significant progress in embedding public health in academic and practice placement aspects of their programmes. For both professions, public health is included in programme aims and have dedicated modules on contemporary public health issues and the professions' role in this area of practice. Teaching includes how to support individuals / populations to access and sustain activity for primary and secondary prevention.
 - The visitors agreed the education provider has begun the process of embedding the new standards. This active implementation of the standards are already in place for most of the areas. The visitors found the education provider to have appropriate plans in place to implement the new standards implementation.

- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - The education provider moved learning and assessment online in March 2020. In the 2020 / 21 academic year. The challenge involved managing the changing government guidance when multiple programmes returned to on-campus delivery and then required to move back online. Those programmes with essential clinical teaching were able to deliver this on campus in a Covid-compliant environment. The education provider worked at a programme level with support provided centrally for developing and delivering online teaching.

- Research was impacted by restrictions on face-to-face meetings for data collection, and delays in governance approvals for projects. Challenges were largely addressed by prompt and frequent communication and meetings.
- A “Safety Net policy” was introduced in 2020, expanded in 2020/21 to a Fair Assessment Policy. This included a revised process for mitigating circumstances, changes to regulations relating to progression, and a checking process to ensure programme outcomes were not detrimentally affected by the pandemic. The pandemic provided the opportunity to pilot aspects of blended delivery from 2021/22 through to 2023/24 academic years. Including telerehabilitation, interprofessional education, self-directed “flipped classroom” and remote assessments. Engagement was promoted through academic tutor facilitated activities linked to on-line practice experience. Placements were supported by learners being provided laptops, mobile phones, and Virtual Private Networks by their host trust. The education provider was able to offer a placement to every trainee throughout the pandemic, demonstrating the success of the adaptation work across the programme.
- The visitors found the education provider to have openly reflected on their approach and what they have learnt from the pandemic. They found a clear description of how learning has been adapted and how this continues to be developed to enhance learning. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider’s response to the pandemic and the measures they put in place to support learners.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The pandemic highlighted the importance of new ways of working. This included hybrid working, and digital engagement with stakeholders, as well as on content and approach to learning and teaching. The education provider found new technology supported meetings with multiple stakeholders, supports practice educator training and meetings. It also enabled drop-in sessions for learners otherwise conducted in person. Learner skill development was promoted using authentic assessment methods. This included infographics or podcasts where learners undertook formative opportunities for skill development.
 - Programmes utilise technology via mobile applications for assessment, monitoring or prescription, electronic patient records, e-health modules for mandatory training, virtual reality, and high-fidelity simulations. The academic staff at the education provider were able to move their committee and subcommittee meetings online and adapted to move their new supervisor and advanced supervisor training online too.
 - Face-to-face learning has returned as standard for all programmes, but committee meetings and supervisor training remained online. This led to increased attendance and positive feedback. The continued use of NHS e-Portfolio to record competency development monitors learners progress and share this to supervisors. Since the pandemic, when it was not possible to offer teaching on campus (e.g., during strikes and severe weather conditions) they were able to switch to teaching online without difficulty. They now offer learners supplementary recorded resources on statistical methods by KCL Biostatistics Department.

- The visitors found an increasing importance of e-health, digital skills and new technologies being embraced in the curricula across all programmes. The pace of development was accelerated due to the pandemic. There are good descriptions across programmes of how technology was being used both to support learners and as part of their learning. The visitors were satisfied with the education providers approach to developing technology across the programmes and agreed they have adapted to learner needs well.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - There are currently no plans to deliver apprenticeships for Physiotherapy and Dietetics programmes. The education provider is aware this need is increasingly being met by other providers both locally and nationally. However, this does impact their capacity for practice education placements in the London and South-East. The increase in competition for placement places has affected their psychology programmes. The education provider worked with management in placements providing organisations to ensure that the demand for supervisors and placements was managed fairly.
 - The visitors noted the education provider has no active plans to deliver apprenticeships but are aware that this need is increasingly being met by other education providers in their region. Visitors agreed there are plans to review the potential for apprenticeships and the education provider is working with providers to explore how this may change in future. They have no concerns or recommendations for this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
 - The education provider's process for programme approval, modification, and review, has always considered the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, along with the associated advice and guidance documents. The education provider also plans to utilise the code to put in processes that monitor learner outcomes and meet OfS (Office for Students) expectations. They have a plan in place to review their processes against the guidance provided by the code and the Quality Assurance Agency. These were completed in 2021 / 22 and 2022 /23.
 - The visitors found the education provider to have submitted a clear reflection with respect to challenges, developments, and successes. They are satisfied the education provider is following new guidance and remaining compliant with the code and had no concerns going forward.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - The education provider's programmes are subject to regular reviews by professional bodies as part of the programme validation process. They

also utilise HEE as an external body to assess their practise programmes. Placement sites are also regularly inspected by the Care Quality Commission (CQC). The education provider ensures their staff are kept up to date with the results of assessments by external bodies like CQC. They also utilise the feedback gained from the annual National Education and Training Survey (NETS). This mechanism allows learners to raise concerns and independently provide feedback on their programmes.

- The visitors noted that the education provider have used the results of reviews conducted by CQC and Ofsted of placement providers. None of these received poor results which would mean a withdrawal of learners was required. They found clear reflections on the NETS and CQC data. Visitors agreed they are remaining compliant with regulatory body requirements where relevant.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**

The education provider acknowledged they have historically received poor results in the NSS, such as score of 42% in 2020. However, they have consistently performed better than this in subsequent and proceeding years. They remain above 60% and most recently scored 67%. Whilst they reflect that this remains below the benchmark, it is a return to the scores they received before a dip they attribute to the pandemic. Several measures were put in place to support learners during the pandemic. These included support from link tutors and gradual return to on-campus and in-person learning where possible. In addition, online drop-in sessions were added to supplement support and mandatory cohort post-placement debriefs continued.
- The education provider has also noted satisfaction is also rising on the Postgraduate taught experience survey (PTES) scores after a dip. There were also high scores in engagement (80%) and Skill development (71%) suggesting learners found the programme stimulating and to support their professional development.
- The visitors noted the education provider's overall satisfaction score is below the benchmark. But they also noted areas where some improvements have made been and ongoing actions are in place to address remaining weaker area. Additionally, they noted several post-graduate programmes but found only a limited reflection with respect to PTES data. The data presented and the education providers reflections on this area will be factored into the ongoing monitoring recommendation.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - The education provider's reflection shows they are confident they are meeting the revised standards and have worked to integrate these to their internal policies. They undertook this mapping exercise following the introduction of the revised the OfS' new standard, 'B Ongoing Conditions of Registration', which was introduced in May 2022. This exercise was reported to their Education Committee in the July of 2022. The OfS have not raised any concern regarding their programmes not meeting the revised standards.
 - The visitors noted the results of the mapping exercise of practices against the revised ongoing conditions of registration. The education

provider clearly described how information was provided as part of OfS requirements. The visitors are satisfied with the providers reflections here.

- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider identified several professional bodies with whom their programmes have accreditation or reviews. These include:
 - Health Education England
 - The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP)
 - The British Dietetic Association
 - The British Psychological Society (BPS).
 - All three professional bodies implemented new curricula in 2022. Updates were made to their Dietetics programmes following the release of the new curriculum framework in 2021 / 22 academic year. BPS conducted a re-accreditation of their psychology programmes in March 2021 and the programme remains accredited.
 - The education provider also received confirmation of Foundation Level accreditation with the Association for Family Therapy & Systemic Practice (AFT). They have also applied for level 1 and 2 accreditations with the British Association for Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapies (BABCP). The latter was linked to requirements from DClinPsy commissioners (Health Education England).
 - The visitors agreed the education provider has provided clear reflection's with respect to professional bodies. They noted engagement with quality review monitoring and the submission and approvals of new curricula with relevant professional body across all programmes. The visitors are satisfied with the education provider reflections and found them to be performing 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 has reflected on the plans for curriculum development they have in line with professional body guidance. These developments came from the directives of the different bodies they interact with. They reflected on their plans to integrate guidance they have received from HEE, British Association for Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapies (BABCP), the Association of Family Therapy and Systemic Practice (AFT) and the British Dietetic Association.
 - They conducted an internal curriculum review in response to the release of the new SOPs. They aim to future proof graduates by supporting the further development of skills for lifelong learning in an increasingly digital world and changing healthcare environment. The next periodic review will take place in 2023.

- The visitors noted from the submission the education provider has robust policies in place to develop their curriculum in-line with guidance from other bodies. This included factoring in the updated SOPs, guidance from HEE and each programme's relevant professional body. The visitors found a clear description of how stakeholders for each discipline were engaged and how guidance / feedback was used to develop the curricula. They were satisfied with the education providers approach to this area and had no concerns going forward.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider have implemented the updated learning and development principles from the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP) after these were changed in 2020. The CSP also introduced the new national Clinical Placement Assessment Form (CPAF) for use from 2021 / 22. They are successfully using this for all cohorts aside from the final year BSc learners. The British Dietetic Association Curriculum Framework was updated in 2020 and the Dietetic programmes underwent full accreditation against the revised expectations in 2022.
 - The education provider reflected on their plan to secure accreditation from the British Association of Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapists (BABCP) and the Association of Family Therapy and Systemic Practice (AFT). This was part of the recommissioning process by HEE that the education provider is engaging with. They therefore must consider and follow the additional guidance from additional bodies and AFT held their first accreditation visit in 2022. Further visits are planned in 2023 and in the future with all bodies and the education provider is working to new guidance into their teaching from the 2023 intake.
 - The visitors found the education provider's reflection shows an awareness of changes in professional body requirements and guidance. Details of changes made were provided as well as reflections on how programmes have been developed linked to professional body requirements. The visitors were satisfied with the education providers approach to this area and had no concerns going forward.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider reflected on how practice-based learning capacity is managed at the programme level, but also that all programmes have had similar challenges relating to the pandemic. They have worked collaboratively with the London & South-east Placement partnership (LSEAPP) and with HEE to secure sufficient capacity for learner. The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP) developed a national common placement assessment form (CPAF) that King's introduced in 2021-22. The placement assessment form is intended to reduce the barriers to providers offering placements to learners from different HEIs.
 - They have also reflected on the challenges experienced when introducing the new Dietetics programmes which required practice based learning. This meant more learners sought placements in the same placement environments. The education provider was able to

secure placements for all their learners and remain open to collaborating and communicating with other HEI's offering Dietetics programmes.

- The visitors noted capacity challenges and steps to manage fair share allocations across all programmes. They also noted the number of innovative placements developed, contributing to increased capacity and breadth of experience. This included hybrid leadership and education placements, research placements and simulation-based learning weeks. The visitors also found a good description of how placements have been developed to help translate into practice and were satisfied with the education providers approach to 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 reflected on the multiple opportunities for learners to feedback into the programme with formal and informal methods. These included staff learner liaison meetings, feedback via national and internal learner surveys (like NSS), programme representatives or tutorial meetings. The education provider recognised there was an inconsistent approach to managing learner feedback. In response, they introduced standardised formats for both assessment briefing resources and for providing feedback for coursework and examination. It included essential feedforward information on how learners may improve their performance.
- They also recognised a reduction in the satisfaction for student voice in the NSS. They continue to use staff learner liaison meetings and a 'you said, we did' approach to show evidence of actions taken. They have continued to work with learner representative's concerns raised to fully explore any issues and to develop solutions.
- The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflections on their responses to learner feedback and concerns. They have explained how there are avenues for learners to provide feedback including via surveys, staff-student liaison meetings and their 'You said, we did' mechanism. The visitors agreed the education provider is performing well in this area by giving multiple opportunities for learner feedback and clear evidence of addressing this across all programmes.

- **Practice placement educators –**

- The education provider's reflection showed the outcome of their collaboration with practice placement educators. One of the key areas of success included the various mechanisms they have in place to gain feedback. These included curriculum development meetings, stakeholder meetings, departmental stakeholder meetings and through link tutor meetings that occurred mid-way during each placement. In

addition, practice educators provided feedback to individual learners as part of the clinical placement assessment and support.

- They also reflected on challenges which included balancing high-quality practice learning and learner support while navigating service challenges due to the ongoing impact of the pandemic. Practice educators also identified increased pressures experienced by learners resulting in increased levels of stress and anxiety. They have also received overwhelmingly positive feedback for their practice education training sessions and weekly on-line practice educator drop-ins. These were designed in response to educator feedback.
- The visitors noted there were many opportunities for providing and collecting feedback. These included scheduled curriculum development groups and stakeholder meetings as well as an individuals' feedback. The visitors agreed placement educators were involved in the programme's development, can provide feedback through regular meetings.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they valued the input from external examiners. Their role as a "critical friend" to enabled them to reflect effectively on their assessment of programmes and feedback. The external examiners have reported programmes to be of excellent standards when considered against relevant benchmarks. They have noted continual improvement, an appropriate range of teaching methods and assessments and a tailored approach to learner support. The education provider reflected on changes they made to the exam format based on the feedback they received regarding timed online assessments.
 - The visitors agreed the education have presented good reflections on their engagement with external examiners. Their reflections show how external examiners feedback have contributed to improvements in the development of programmes.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Non-continuation rates:**
 - The education provider is performing below the benchmark at 7% and they have chosen to reflect from the programme level. For the Physiotherapy programmes, attrition remains low, this occurred between years one and two of the programme. They attributed this largely to the pandemic as this cohort had high levels of disruption during their final school years. The education providers attrition rates for their Dietetics programmes are higher than the benchmark. However, they also noted that Dietetic cohorts are small and the loss of one learner is a considerable factor in percentage terms. Their Psychology programmes has not experienced the same level of

learners not continuing. They have recognised learners have additional needs such as mental health problems, long-term conditions or learning differences that could affect continuation rates. They are putting in more support processes for these trainees to help them complete.

- The visitors found clear reflections from the education provider on the different factors that have impacted continuation rates. This included the covid-19 pandemic, learners personal challenges and transfers to alternative allied degrees. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area, finding them to have appropriate mechanisms in place to monitor / address challenges.
- **Graduate outcomes:**
 - The education provider is performing slightly under the benchmark (90% against a benchmark of 93%) but is still a strong score. They stated there was an increased focus within the curriculum on careers and employability across their programmes to aid graduate outcomes. In their Physiotherapy programmes, they work closely with their colleagues in the 'Careers and Employability' service to support learners to consider their professional development and future careers. For the Dietetics programmes, they run sessions on careers, particularly with those in the latter stages of the programmes as learners begin applying for jobs, which are very well received.
 - The scope of careers available to graduates is highlighted through events run by the faculty careers service and by dietitians who contribute to teaching on the module. The education provider contacts psychology graduates who have not found employment three months after completing the programme. They then look to collect further data later in their careers and information on their career journey to help future learners. The visitors were satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Teaching quality:**
 - In 2017, the education provider achieved TEF silver, indicating that they deliver high quality teaching, learning and outcomes for its learners, and consistently exceeds rigorous national quality requirements for UK higher education. They noted that this score was influenced by their NSS scoring at the time. Whilst the challenges have changed, they expect their new NSS scoring to be factored in to future TEF reviews. They plan to be involved with the future TEF system with their review expected in 2024.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - The education provider has scored slightly below the benchmark, scoring 71.1% against a benchmark of 74.7%. This is up from last years' data of 66.3% against a benchmark of 74.7%. The education provider has acknowledged their previously low data. They reflected that their previously scored lower for their Physiotherapy programmes in years 2020 and 2021 but have risen closer to benchmark in 2022. Overall satisfaction on PTES for MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) was 67% in 2021 / 22 which represents an increase and return to higher scores following a dip in satisfaction during the Covid pandemic.
- **Programme level data:**

- The education provider has reflected on their programme level data and have provided their current learner numbers and how this translates into staff / learner ratios. This stands as 1:9.8 for their Dietetics programmes, 1:16.6 for their Physiotherapy programmes and 1:9.64 for their Psychology programmes. They have reflected that their programmes have experienced increases in learner numbers across the review period. This was partly due to increases in HEE's commissioned places. But their reflections show the level of staffing remains manageable and they have worked to ensure all learners are supported.
- The education provider was able to secure additional funding to secure sufficient placement and research supervisors, but also reflect that their workloads remain high. Their Dietetics programmes has also appointed an additional staff member to support the department. They also recognise the increase in Dietetic learners is temporary as the two programmes become one. The Physiotherapy also has an additional member of teaching staff to support delivery of the programme. Upon reviewing their reflections, we have no concerns and find the education provider to be performing well in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Outstanding issues for follow up: None

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval or focused review process).

Referrals to next scheduled performance review

Ongoing development of policies relating to service user and carer involvement

Summary of issue: The education provider have reflected on their current approach to service user and carer involvement across their programmes. We noted from their submission, several plans remain in development, and they plan to enhance service user involvement in their processes. We are therefore recommending this development continues as planned and this is reviewed at their next Performance review.

Ongoing challenges relating to practise-based learning placement capacity in London

Summary of issue: We noted several profession areas the education provider deliver programmes in continue to have placement capacity issues across London. We also note that the education provider had increases to their learner numbers and worked to accommodate these learners with placements. The education provider also reflected on these challenges and are working to ensure they have placement places for all learners. We are therefore recommending this is reviewed at their next performance review in four years. This is sufficient time for the provider to continue

to work on this area and reflect on how they have continued to manage this challenge and ensure placements are available for all learners.

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 2026-27 academic year
- The issues identified for referral through this review should be carried out in accordance with the details contained in section 5 of this report. This will be reviewed at their next Performance review.

Reason for next engagement recommendation

- Internal stakeholder engagement
 - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with several professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their programmes
 - The education provider engaged with other relevant professional or system regulator(s) (e.g., Nursing and Midwifery council, OfS). They considered the findings of these regulators in improving their programmes
 - 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 4-year monitoring period is:
 - The visitors were satisfied the education provider is performing well in most areas. They suggested a four-year monitoring period because they agreed this was an appropriate length of time, relative to performance and risk. This will give the education provider adequate time to implement action plans and evaluate the results of changes to reflect upon in their next performance review.
 - This is also a reflection of the general shortages of placements experienced by certain professions in London. The visitors found that a

shorter review period factoring in the available data, allows us to appropriately monitor the situation.

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 2026-27 academic year

Reason for this decision: The Panel have reviewed and considered the observations submitted by King's College London with regards to the four-year review period recommended by the Visitors. They noted the observations focused on placement capacity in the London region. The Panel also noted that in addition to concerns about placement capacity, the visitors' also recommendation for a four-year period due to the planned increase in learner numbers and plans to implement significant changes to their service user and carer policies. As a result, the Panel have agreed to approve the four-year review period recommended by the Visitors.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

| Name | Mode of study | Profession | Modality | Annotation | First intake date |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics | FT (Full time) | Dietitian | | | 01/09/2002 |
| MSc Dietetics | FT (Full time) | Dietitian | | | 01/09/2003 |
| Pg Dip Dietetics | FT (Full time) | Dietitian | | | 01/09/2003 |
| BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy | FT (Full time) | Physiotherapist | | | 01/09/1991 |
| MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) | FT (Full time) | Physiotherapist | | | 01/09/2002 |
| Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPSy) | FT (Full time) | Practitioner psychologist | Clinical psychologist | | 01/09/1992 |