

11 November 2021

Education quality assurance model planning - performance review scale up options

Executive Summary

The Education function plans to review all existing providers via the performance review process. There are approximately 130 education providers to consider through this process, and a finite amount of Departmental resource.

Through this paper, the Executive has presented options for how we undertake this programme reviews, and has presented the prioritisation exercise to arrive at which providers should be considered first.

This paper is presented to follow discussions at the September 2021 meeting of the Committee, where the Executive noted that an options paper would be presented to discuss how soon the Committee wished all programmes to cycle through the new model.

Previous consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ETC decision that the model is implemented from September 2021
Decision	The Committee is asked to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• discuss the options presented, with considerations or benefits, risks / issues• come to a preferred option, considering quality and impact on resources
Next steps	The executive will take the Committee's view into consideration when planning for resourcing over the next 2-3 years, and in the next budget planning exercise.
Strategic priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strategic priority 3 – Develop insight and exert influence• Strategic priority 5 – Build a resilient, healthy, capable and sustainable organisation
Financial and resource implications	Financial and resource implications for each option, to be worked into future Departmental budgets
Author	Jamie Hunt, Education Manager Jamie.Hunt@hcpc-uk.org

1. Aims

1.1. The Education function plans to review all existing providers via the performance review process in either two or three years. This will allow us to:

- Assess all providers under the requirements of the new model, and understand performance related to these requirements
- Decide when next the provider will need to engage with the performance review process, based on risks, issues, and good performance identified
- Set requirements for under-performing providers, leading to withdrawal of approval if issues persist

2. Context

2.1. Education providers were required to engage with the HCPC as follows in recent academic years:

- 2018-19 – annual monitoring – group A¹ audits, group B declarations
- 2019-20 – annual monitoring – group B audits, group A declarations
- 2020-21 - annual monitoring – all providers declarations, some providers performance review via the pilot exercise

2.2. This means that some providers have not been audited since the 2018-19 academic year

2.3. As part of the decision to pilot the new education quality assurance model in the summer of 2020, the Committee agreed to not undertake annual monitoring audits in the 2020-21 academic year. This was so the pilot activity could be resourced within the existing Departmental budget. Risks associated with this approach were discussed, with mitigations provided and accepted at the time².

2.4. Future academic years will function as follows:

- 2021-22 – year 1 of performance review
- 2022-23 – year 2 of performance review
- 2023-24 – year 3 of performance review (potential)

3. How we will prioritise provider engagement with the new model

3.1. Prioritisation of engagement of providers will be based on a number of factors:

¹ In the previous model, education providers were split into two groups which we engaged on a two year rolling cycle (alternating audit and declaration) to manage resource

² ETC paper 8 July 2020 – [Risk assessment: Pausing annual monitoring in 2020-21 academic year](#)

Metric / indicator	Reason metric / indicator used	Application
Total number of learners	Higher number of learners means more service user contact through training, and throughput of registrants. If there is a small risk of service user harm whilst in training, or of registrants not meeting SOPs, then this risk is magnified by more individuals progressing through programmes.	Providers with the most overall learners (the top third)
When the last HCPC annual monitoring audit was undertaken	A longer period since active engagement with the HCPC was required means a greater risk that issues were not picked up or reported through the old model	Providers most recently assessed in the 2018-19 academic year
The number of available data points through HCPC's performance scoring model ³	Fewer available data points mean less data to understand provider performance and the risks and issues associated with each area. Able to work with providers at an earlier stage to fill those gaps.	Where less than three out of five data points for the HCPC's performance scoring model are available
HCPC performance score	Lower scores in key external metrics show potential for poorer provider performance overall	Using live data, and considering lack of some data points, the bottom third of 'performance scores'

3.2. We have also discounted a small number of providers due to:

- Engagement with pilot activity through the performance review process
- Where significant change programmes are being undertaken at institution level (for example, assessments via the approval process), which will be best reflected on in a future academic year (rather than part way through changes)
- Where HCPC-approved programmes have only recently started (in this or the last academic year), and therefore no meaningful information can be provided about the ongoing quality of the provision

³ Information about our performance scoring model can be found on our website <https://www.hcpc-uk.org/education/quality-assurance-principles/using-data-and-intelligence/>

3.3. We plan to prioritise providers where at least two of the four metrics / indicators apply. At this time, this means around 60 providers will be taken through a review in this academic year.

3.4. We will monitor allocations in future years and bring forward on the basis of risks presented by:

- Changes to key performance data points
- Intelligence or information resulting in a referral through the focused review process

4. Options for scale up

4.1. We have presented two options for scaling up performance review

Option 1 – Completing the performance review process for existing providers in two years

Benefits

- Quicker assessments of the performance of all providers under new model requirements – this ensures all providers have been assessed against the baselines required by the model at the earliest date possible
- Earlier identification, and if needed withdrawal of approval, of providers and programmes that no longer meet standards
- The ability to accurately forecast future performance reviews at the end of the 2022-23 academic year, as we will understand the monitoring period for all providers at this point

Risks / issues

- Analysis of pilot activity shows that each Education Officer can undertake between 9-12 performance review cases per year. Therefore, there will likely be additional Departmental resource required in the short term to operate the model as intended, with required resource dropping from the 2023-24 academic year.
- Over-burden of executive / partner visitors, with poorer quality assessments as a result

Option 2 – Completing the performance review process for existing providers in three years

Benefits

- Easier to resource within existing Departmental resource envelope
- More balanced executive workload across years within the existing resource envelope
- Allows for more reprioritisation

Risks / issues

- Slower assessments of the performance of all providers under new model requirements – maximum gap from one assessment (annual monitoring in the

old model) to another (first performance review) is 5 years (although this could be reduced to 4 years by front loading those assessed via annual monitoring in 2018-19 in years 1 and 2)

- Potential later identification, and if needed withdrawal of approval, of providers and programmes that no longer meet standards – although the providers this is most likely to apply to would be assessed earlier in the cycle due to the prioritisation exercise
- Ability to accurately forecast future performance reviews a year later when compared to option 1

5. Numbers to illustrate

Financial year	Two year scale up			Three year scale up		
	First review	Second review ⁴	Per executive	First review	Second review	Per executive
2021-22 (remainder Q4)	12	0	2	12	0	2
2022-23	72	0	14	48	0	10
2023-24	43	3 ⁵	9	48	3	10
2024-25	0	20	4	19 ⁶	20	8
Total	127	23	29	127	23	30 ⁷

6. Discussion

6.1. The Committee is asked to discuss the options noted in section 4, including:

- The benefits, risks and issues presented
- Resourcing considerations
- The Committee's preferred option

⁴ Estimated based on numbers of pilot cases and their outcomes, and the types of provider assessed so far

⁵ For both first and second review, assessments completed in Q1 and Q2 of 2023-24 FY to allow assessments to be wrapped up in the 2022-23 academic year

⁶ For both first and second review, assessments completed in Q1 and Q2 of 2024-25 FY to allow assessments to be wrapped up in the 2023-24 academic year

⁷ Difference to two year total due to rounding error