

---

## Performance review process report

University of Chichester, Review Period 2018-2023

---

### Executive summary

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

We have:

- Reviewed the institution’s portfolio submission against quality themes and found that we did not need to undertake further exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed
  
- The education provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2028-29 academic year, because:
  - 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 and practice educators.
  - The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
  - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
  - 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.
  - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes.

---

<b>Previous consideration</b>	N / A as this case did not arise from a previous case.
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

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

<b>Next steps</b>	Subject to the Panel’s decision, the provider’s next performance review will be in the 2028-29 academic year.
-------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---



## Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment.....	4
About us .....	4
Our standards .....	4
Our regulatory approach.....	4
The performance review process.....	4
Thematic areas reviewed .....	5
How we make our decisions.....	5
The assessment panel for this review.....	5
Section 2: About the education provider.....	6
The education provider context.....	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider.....	6
Institution performance data.....	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes .....	8
Portfolio submission.....	8
Quality themes identified for further exploration .....	8
Overall findings on performance .....	9
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	9
Quality theme: Thematic reflection .....	12
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection.....	13
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection .....	14
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions.....	15
Section 5: Issues identified for further review.....	16
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes .....	16
Assessment panel recommendation .....	16
<b>Education and Training Committee decision</b> .....	17
Appendix 1 – summary report.....	18
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution.....	20

## 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:

Fleur Kitsell	Lead visitor, Physiotherapist
Joanna Finney	Lead visitor, Operating Department Practitioner
Ian Hughes	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer
Carol Rowe	Advisory visitor, Physiotherapist

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, as the education provider only has two HCPC-approved programmes, we considered we had sufficient expertise in the two Lead visitors, because they were from the relevant professions.

## Section 2: About the education provider

### The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers two HCPC-approved programmes across one profession. It is a Higher Education Provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2020.

### 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	Physiotherapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	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<sup>1</sup>.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	60	68	29 February 2024	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

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

				<p>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>We explored this by considering how well the education provider manages learner numbers. Our conclusion was that they do so effectively and no concerns were highlighted.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	0%	2020-21	<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 8%.</p> <p>We considered that this was strong evidence of the education provider's ability to support learners to completion.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	96%	2020-21	<p>This HESA data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</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 been maintained.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider supported learners into next steps.</p>
Learner satisfaction	76.3%	78.6%	2022	<p>This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score 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 the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider gathered and acted upon feedback from learners.</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.

Although we asked for clarification in certain areas, we did not consider quality activity necessary due to the thoroughness and relevance of the education provider's portfolio.



## 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 presented reflections on the actions taken to address the issues around the impact of the integration of their provision into a new School of Nursing and Allied Health. They noted that new clinical facilities have been developed for interprofessional learning for all learners.
  - The education provider have a strong business model across relevant departments. This strengthened the breadth areas of which will enable a constant focus of strategic importance. They placed particular emphasis on making significant investments in staffing and infrastructure related to the allied health provision. A key objective is to increase the numbers of teachers and allied health professionals and they are in a strong position to support the current regional and national workforce.
  - From the reflections, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They were clearly able to reflect appropriately on the future strength of their provision.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
  - The education provider noted the main challenge concerned placement capacity for learners and the appropriate supervision resources in practice. They engage with NHS partners, the private sector and NHS England (previously Health Education England) to expand placement capacity across all programmes. Their positive engagement with employers ensured the required placement capacity for learners was maintained.
  - The education provider reflected on how they have established a wide range of external partnerships with multiple stakeholders to support the delivery of HCPC curricula. They have established processes to continue to develop and foster new partnerships across regions. This provides a strong foundation for each programme to support a wide range of learning experiences for learners.
  - From the reflections, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They agreed the education provider have strong links with partnership organisations, and the ability to reflect on their partnerships.
- **Academic quality –**

- The education provider reflected on the importance of the mechanism they use to collect regular feedback and conduct evaluations of their programmes. They outlined how some the biggest challenges they faced was to ensure there were correct processes to support learners in practice placements. They used online assessments to help ensure clear learning objectives are identified and measured by practice partners when learners are on practice placements. Practice placement evaluations from learners are collated at the end of each term.
- The development of their processes allowed for real time evaluations and comments from both practice educators and learners in placement. The ability to raise concerns quickly and directly with a nominated member of staff has enabled more efficient resolution of issues and improved support for learners.
- From the reflections, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They agreed the education provider have provided good examples of how feedback is collected and how they respond to issues.
- **Placement quality –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they monitor and maintain placement quality through co-operation with NHS Trusts. This co-operation takes place because all learners are placed with NHS Trusts.
  - Clinical learning audits are used to ensure that learners continuously meet key competencies. The education provider reflected on how they had previously gained feedback from learners and practice educators. This had been used to initiate improvements at programme meetings, and to amend training of practice educators.
  - The education provider reflected on whether changes in leadership at NHS Trusts are likely to have an impact on their programmes. They concluded from this that such changes were unlikely to impact the programme because there would be continuity of policy and approach from the new leaders as regards prescribing.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had reflected appropriately on their approach and what changes or challenges might experience in the future.
- **Interprofessional education –**
  - The education provider submitted detailed reflection on their approach to implementing interprofessional learning across their programmes. Learners undertake interprofessional learning (IPL) with other learners from other disciplines such as learner midwives, learner nurses, and learner social workers. They noted how the diversity in the learner groups enable engagement with peers from different clinical and professional background. This provides learners with the opportunity to share experiences, knowledge, and ideas, discuss theories and challenge current practice.
  - They explained how they work with different stakeholders to broaden the opportunities for learners to work alongside and learn from a wide multi-professional team. As part of this, they will continue to source new opportunities at local and levels.
  - They reflected on how one of the key challenges they experienced related to applicants limited understanding of the importance of IPL

while in placements. As a result, the opportunities of working within a multi-disciplinary team is not always fulfilled. In response to this challenge, learners are provided with multiple opportunities to reflect on feedback they receive from other professionals while in placements. In addition to this, learners are given clear guidance and objectives for IPL placement experiences.

- From the reflections, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They noted the education provider had submitted good reflections with regards to how interprofessional working practice.
- **Service users and carers –**
  - The education provider outlined how they have a robust policy and strategy in place which ensures the governance of their service user group. Both groups have representatives across academic health, social care staff and service users and carers. Their reflections show how they worked to develop new ways of working as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.
  - The education provider reflected on the positive impact this has had on learners because their engagement with service users and carers made them feel more prepared to go into practice placements.
  - They described how they collect and use feedback about service users and carers. They noted how most of the feedback is positive with learners reporting their engagement with service made them think differently and link practice and theory better. Service users discuss the value of their input during their weekly drop-in sessions, and they feel like they are making a positive contribution to tomorrow's health and social care professionals.
  - From the reflections, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area. They agreed there are appropriate policies in place to manage service users and carers.
- **Equality and diversity –**
  - The education provider reflected in detail on its mechanisms for monitoring equality and diversity on the HCPC programme, and the issues identified. There is a university-level policy concerning access and diversity, and every programme is required to make annual reports detailing their progress against defined targets related to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI). The most important target for the HCPC-approved programmes was broadening the ethnic diversity of their recruitment, as black and minority ethnic (BAME) people remain under-represented in physiotherapy.. To do this, they planned to make the programmes as accessible as possible to a wide range of learners, and to review their curriculum to ensure that it was accessible and relevant to all sections of society.
  - We considered the education is performing well in the area. The education provider was clearly engaged with the need to continuously monitor and improve its approach to equality and diversity issues and had specific plans in place to address problems.
- **Horizon scanning –**
  - The portfolio contained substantial reflection on how to ensure strong performance in the future. Horizon scanning is embedded in the programmes It is a standing item at programme meetings. Some of the

key challenges identified during the review period include the launch of the University of Chichester Health Awareness and Maintenance Programme (UCHAMP), and the ongoing need to expand placement capacity. UCHAMP is a scheme to support learner and staff mental health and wellbeing, and requires commitment from all programmes. The development of new capacity in practice-based learning is to accommodate anticipated growth in future cohort sizes, and to ensure appropriate experience for learners to prepare them for professional practice.

- Additionally, staff have regular time away from their routine work to discuss upcoming issues, and to review developments in the professional or regulatory environment. This was done recently for the changes in HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) and to the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy.
- We considered that performance in this area was good. This was because for every part of their HCPC provision, the education provider was considering relevant changes and developments and making specific plans.

**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 submitted extensive reflections on how they had considered the revised SOPs, and whether changes needed to be made to their provision to incorporate the revised SOPs. The main areas where they considered that they needed to make changes were around leadership, equality and diversity, and further centring the service user.
  - For example, they have adapted the Evaluation of Clinical Competence form to ensure that learners with additional needs or from disadvantaged backgrounds can ask for further support or reasonable adjustments. The same form has also been adapted to further emphasise to learners the need to centre the service user in their practice. Additionally, all practice educators will receive further EDI training. Practice educators will also receive additional training in developing leadership skills in learners. The existing Leadership and Influencing Competence Framework has been updated to reflect the specific requirements of the revised SOPs.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had clearly reflected thoroughly on the revised SOPs and considered what changes they might need to make.
- **Learning and developments from the COVID-19 pandemic –**
  - The education provider had undertaken detailed reflection on their response to the pandemic, including a consideration of which mitigations could continue to be adopted. For example, they noted that improvements in communication, and a much greater use of various virtual learning tools, would be part of their provision in the future. They

also stated that assessment regulations and tools had been adapted to ensure that learners were not unfairly disadvantaged.

- We considered that performance in this area was good, since impacts of COVID-19 had been appropriately handled. We considered that a range of appropriate strategies had been implemented. We noted too the education provider's ability to use learners in service delivery where appropriate and clinically necessary.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
  - The key theme of reflection in this area was the education provider's use of technology to overcome the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. As well as the increased use of virtual learning noted above, the education provider also outlined their strategies for maintaining cohort identity and maintaining learner's morale, at a time when some learners were physically isolated. There was also some reflection on how confidence in using technology had been developed among both staff and learners. The portfolio noted also that the education provider was engaged in continuous review of technology use and was aware of the need to balance in-person and virtual learning.
  - We considered that performance in this area was good. The education provider had a proactive attitude to developments in this area and had reflected transparently.
- **Apprenticeships in England –**
  - The education provider does not have any apprenticeships and is not currently planning to introduce any.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
  - The education provider noted that they had not been reviewed according to the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (QCHE) during the review period. However, they stated that a QCHE review did take place in the review period and that the recommendations had been incorporated into relevant action plans.
  - We considered that this was a reasonable response and did not consider there was any need for further exploration.
- **Office for Students (OfS) –**
  - The education provider's reflection noted that they had not had direct monitoring during the review period. However, they have considered the Office for Students' (OfS) revised quality and standards conditions of registration in their own internal quality standards. They noted the specific amendments in the portfolio, including updates to grade descriptors and re-organisation of committee structures.

- We considered that performance in this area was good. We saw evidence of clear engagement with the OFS, and a constructive response to OFS updates.
- **Performance of newly commissioned Allied Health Professional (AHP) provision in Wales –**
  - N / A as this is an English institution.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they had worked with professional bodies and other regulators to ensure ongoing programme suitability. For example, they noted how the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP) had fed into changes to their Practice Educator Handbook. The CSP was also going to be invited to endorse the provision during the next two years.
  - We considered that performance in this area was good. We were satisfied that the education provider was closely in touch with professional and regulatory requirements and had clear mechanisms for taking relevant action.

**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 portfolio contained substantial reflection on the mechanisms for continuing curriculum development. One of these was feedback from learners. External examiners are also invited to give their views on what developments might be necessary / appropriate, and regular reviews are used to thoroughly review programmes. Detailed examples were given of how specific programmes have changed in response to various forms of development impetus. Most of these are related to changes to the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs).
  - We considered that performance in this area was good because we have seen clear evidence of reflection on curriculum development.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
  - The education provider reflected on changes made during the review period. For example, the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy's initiative to create a plan for improved access to physiotherapy for disadvantaged groups resulted in a new module. The education provider submitted evidence of long-term co-operation with the CSP to deliver these improvements.
  - We agreed the education is performing well in the area. We saw clear evidence of the education provider reflecting on relevant changes and implementing them in a timely fashion.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**
  - The portfolio contained substantial reflection on the challenges and opportunities in this area. The education provider also reflected on their ongoing attempts to expand non-traditional placements for learners. They had taken a lot of steps in this area. They had reached out to local

partners with appropriate settings and to contacts in primary health and similar areas.

- We considered that the education provider was mostly performing well in this area. It was clear that they were closely monitoring placement availability and had mechanisms available to develop more capacity where necessary.

**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 how they had responded to learner feedback. They gave examples, including the learners' request for more teaching on interprofessional education.
  - The visitors considered that the portfolio had provided some good reflection. However, they did not see evidence regarding whether and how the education provider had reflected on learner complaints involving external bodies. In discussion with the education provider, the visitors were informed that no such complaints had been received regarding their HCPC-approved provision during the review period.
  - Considering this clarification, we considered that performance was good. This was because there was strong and consistent reflection for the whole provision, with clear mechanisms to identify issues and potential issues.
- **Practice placement educators –**
  - The portfolio contained substantial reflection on how practice placement educators were enabled to feed back to the programme. For example, feedback mechanisms had revealed some communication difficulties between learners, practice educators and the education provider. These were being addressed. Input from practice educators had also been used to review arrangements for termly liaison between learners, practice educators and programme staff elsewhere in the provision. Potential improvements had been identified for communication with practice educators.
  - We considered that performance in this area was good. This was because the education provider was proactively engaged with seeking the views of practice educators and had clear mechanisms for putting feedback into action where appropriate.
- **External examiners –**
  - The reflections in this area were relatively brief but the education provider offered a summary of feedback received from external examiners across the HCPC-approved provision. This was broadly positive. Assessment, programme structure, learner support and links with placement providers were praised by external examiners. More granular information was also provided about how individual programmes had changed in response to external examiner feedback.
  - We considered that this reflection was useful, but we also considered that it would be useful to get a clearer understanding of the general themes

emerging in external examiner reports. In response to a request for clarification the education provider submitted external examiner reports. Although these are not strictly necessary in performance review, they did enable us to be satisfied that the portfolio gave an accurate and comprehensive view. We were therefore satisfied that performance was good.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

**Findings of the assessment panel:** We considered the data available about the education provider and concluded that the data indicated good performance across various areas.

- **Learner non continuation:**
  - The learner non-continuation rate is zero and we considered that this reflected good performance from the education provider in supporting learners to complete the programmes.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - The education provider is performing above benchmark in this area. The visitors were satisfied that there were no concerns about the education provider's ability to help learners move on to the next stage of their academic or professional careers.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - The visitors considered that support for learners was strong, and that they were provided with a good experience by the education provider. The data confirmed that the education provider scored well in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
  - The programme level data did not raise any concerns for the visitors.

**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 2028-29 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, the senior team, external examiners, practice educators and service users.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
  - The education provider engaged with the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists, the International Society for Prosthetics and Orthotics, and the British Association of Prosthetics and Orthotist
  - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
  - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period
- What the data is telling us:
  - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider [considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.

### **Education and Training Committee decision**

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year.

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

## Appendix 1 – 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 Chichester	CAS-01390-Y5Z5J7	Fleur Kitsell  Joanna Finney	Five years	<p>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 and practice educators.</p> <p>The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.</p> <p>The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.</p> <p>Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable</p>	N / A

				<p>us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.</p> <p>From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

<b>Name</b>	<b>Mode of study</b>	<b>Profession</b>	<b>Modality</b>	<b>Annotation</b>	<b>First intake date</b>
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2020
MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2020