

---

## Performance review process report

University of Aberdeen, Review Period 2018 - 2023

---

### Executive summary

This is a report of the ongoing process to review the performance of the University of Aberdeen. 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 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 need to be explored through quality activities.
- Undertaken quality activity to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
  - How the education provider ensures that appropriate feedback is gathered from internal stakeholders and implemented. We explored through quality activity how the education provider ensured that they gained appropriate feedback, and how this was used to drive programme improvements. The visitors considered that there had been appropriate and useful mechanisms for the education provider to take action on such feedback during the review period.
- The education provider must next engage with monitoring in 5 years, the 2028-29 academic year, because they are performing well across all portfolio area. They also engaged well with the process. Both their initial portfolio submission, and their responses to the quality activity and requests for clarification, were full and frank. The information we reviewed shows there has been effective strategic oversight of the programme. There are no ongoing issues or processes which pose risks that we will need to review specifically before 2028-29.

---

Previous consideration	N / A because this process did not arise from a previous process.
------------------------	---

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

---

---

Next steps

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
Section 4: Findings .....	10
<b>Overall findings on performance</b> .....	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection .....	13
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection.....	14
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection .....	15
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions.....	16
Data and reflections .....	17
Section 5: Issues identified for further review.....	17
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes .....	18
Assessment panel recommendation .....	18
Appendix 1 – summary report.....	19
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:

Nicholas Haddington	Lead visitor, Independent Prescribing
Jane Day	Lead visitor, Radiographer, Therapeutic Radiographer
Sheba Joseph	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer
David Rovardi	Advisory visitor, Independent Prescribing

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the

assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we did not require professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because there was only one programme at the education provider.

## Section 2: About the education provider

### The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers one HCPC-approved programme for Independent and Supplementary Prescribing. 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
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing		2020

### Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes<sup>1</sup>.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	40	11 learners started on the program	2023	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through

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

		me in the most recent cohort.		<p>initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments.</p> <p>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 below the benchmark, meaning we should explore the potential impact on the sustainability of the provision. However, there are two cohorts per year making up the benchmark of 40, so the discrepancy is not as large as it appears.</p>
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	3%	2020-21	<p>This 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 equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider’s performance in this area is in line with sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has dropped by 3%.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the education provider stated in the portfolio that no learners from HCPC-approved</p>

				professions are failing to complete the programme.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	93%	93%	2020-21	<p>This data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</p> <p>The data point is equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider’s performance in this area is in line with sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has dropped by 1%. However, this is not relevant to the education provider’s prescribing programme.</p>
National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score (Q27)	78.0%	86.8%	2023	<p>This data was sourced from the summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has improved by 1%.</p>

### Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

#### Portfolio submission

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

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



## Quality themes identified for further exploration

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

### Quality theme 1 – explanation about the methods/processes/approach used to collect and implement learner feedback

**Area for further exploration:** In their portfolio, the education provider gave some examples of how they gathered feedback from learners. They noted that they had various mechanisms for gathering such feedback and for considering the findings. The visitors found this helpful as a starting point for their understanding of performance. However, there was a limited reflections about how feedback from learners and service users would be used to prompt the education provider's reflection on how to develop and improve the programme. There was insufficient information about the mechanisms used to translate feedback into action. The visitors also noted that the portfolio contained comments on the low response rates to learner satisfaction surveys. The education provider did not explain the impact of this or if they had put any actions into place to improve/increase the learner response rates.

The visitors therefore asked to explore these areas in more detail, in order to gain a clear understanding of how the education provider would reflect on feedback from learners. This would enable them to make an informed determination of the education provider's performance in using feedback for programme development.

**Quality activities agreed to explore theme further:** We explored this through email clarification and additional evidence as we considered this the most appropriate and proportionate way to address the issue.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The education provider submitted a detailed explanation of how they implemented feedback from learners. They noted that twice a year, there was a review of feedback from learners, service users and employer representatives. This includes a document prepared for learners providing a "you said, we did" outline of what had been done in response to particular concerns. The education provider also noted that programme staff meet with practice educators at least during the programme to explore issues arising, and to provide accountability for taking feedback forward.

Additionally, the education provider noted that all feedback received each year is included in an Annual Course Review (ACR) form. This form is required by the senior leadership, to set out detail of feedback received and a structured account of whether, and how, the feedback has been implemented. In the next ACR form the senior team ask for evidence of how that implementation has proceeded. Senior staff involved in this include the School Director of Education and members of the School Teaching and Learning Committee.

In relation to the concern about low completion rates for learner satisfaction surveys, the education provider noted that they had reflected on how to improve learner

responsiveness. The measures adopted included an “open door” policy for learners access and engage programme staff, and making the learner feedback form more learner-centred by clarifying for learners the “you said, we did” aspect of the process. They also sent out more reminders through the virtual learning environment, and used induction sessions to stress the importance of learner feedback.

The visitors considered that this was an appropriate response overall, which enabled them to gain a full understanding of how the education provider processed feedback from learners. The education provider had clearly reflected on the best ways to implement suggestions and feedback from learners, and to ensure that as many learners as possible submitted their views.

## 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 reflected on some of the challenges they have experienced in this area. These included the impact of Brexit, the Covid-19 pandemic, rising wage and utility costs, and fluctuations in learner numbers. They worked with their placement partner, NHS Grampian (NHSG), to ensure the prescribing programmes continued to be sustainable.
  - The education provider reviewed their approach to recruitment of learners, and investment to ensure that resources were being efficiently allocated during a period of significant pressure on resources. This included increasing the programme team, to support their aim of growing learner numbers and to continue sustain their financial stability. They also noted ongoing institutional support for the programme.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. This was because the education provider had engaged in transparent and thorough reflection on their resource and financial position. They took appropriate steps to mitigate any risks and challenges identified.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
  - The education provider reflected on their collaboration with NHSG, one of Scotland’s 14 regional health boards, for their prescribing programme. The relationship is governed by a long-term memorandum of understanding (MoU). The education provider reflected on how they used this partnership to support their prescribing programme.
  - They also reflected on how their staff were members of “relevant NHS committees”, for example the NHSG Non-medical prescribing Group.

NHS staff were similarly involved in their operational groups to provide additional guidance and oversight. These operational groups directed the work of prescribers. This group, chaired by a Nurse Consultant for Advanced Practice, provides expertise and oversight for independent prescribers from all professions. The education provider noted that there were multiple routes for regular communication and engagement between themselves and NHSG. For example, regular formal and informal meetings between programme staff and clinical staff.

- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. The education provider had engaged in thorough reflection on how they used partnerships to deliver their programme effectively.
- **Academic quality –**
  - The education provider reflected on developing their academic quality approach based on the outcome of their HCPC and the Nursing and Midwifery Council programme approval process. They noted that the programme has not changed since they gained approval in 2020. They also reflected on whether their approach to academic quality was still meeting programme needs. Their conclusion, based on feedback they received from learners and external stakeholders, was that it was still fit for purpose. This approach includes an annual programme review by a Quality Assurance Committee and reviews by external examiners.
  - They noted that generally feedback from learners and the external examiner had been positive, showing that they had reflected on learner and external examiner input. They have made some small changes to the competencies based on Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPharm) guidance. They increased the support provided to learners in the numeracy assessments giving more flexibility for when the assessment can be taken.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. The education provider had clearly reflected on how they effectively monitored academic quality. They had systems in place to ensure the programmes continued to improve and develop.
- **Placement quality –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they monitor and maintain placement quality through co-operation with NHSG. This co-operation takes place because all learners are NHSG clinical staff. Practice educators must complete the Designated Prescribing Framework (DPF) for approval by the Non-Medical Prescribing Lead before learners can be accepted onto the programme. The education provider enabled the virtual completion of the PDF after reflecting on the advantages of flexibility.
  - Clinical learning audits are used to ensure that learners continuously meet key competencies. The education provider has collaborated with the Scottish Government Health Directorate to achieve appropriate monitoring in this area. They noted that Healthcare Improvement Scotland's Quality Assurance Framework (2022) had contributed to them ensuring suitable programme content.
  - The education provider reflected on whether changes in leadership at NHSG are likely to have an impact on their programme. 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 reflected on how they had designed interprofessional education (IPE) to ensure that all learners were prepared for the kind of multi-disciplinary working that they were likely to encounter in future. They considered the nature of the programme was likely to bring together different professionals, especially in clinical settings. However, they also reflected on how their specific defined pathways for IPE were working. This included having a strong multi-professional staff team, and a strong emphasis on learners using clinical hours to seek IPE opportunities.
  - The education provider's reflections noted that their approach appeared to be effective in delivering IPE. Despite this, they have plans in place to ensure they continue to maintain a high level of quality in this area. For example, they have systems in place to ensure learner use clinical practice time efficiently.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. The education provider had provided strong reflection on their approach to IPE and shown that they were able to consider new approaches as necessary.
- **Service users and carers –**
  - The education provider reflected on how service users and carers contribute to delivery and evaluation of the programme and the development of learners' clinical skills. They take part in teaching sessions and give feedback on the learners' clinical and interpersonal skills. They also reflected on how the Covid-19 pandemic forced them to move to a more virtual model of delivery. The impact of this was a significant reduction in the number of service users and carers.
  - The education provider have reflected on how the best approach to effectively re-establish service user involvement to pre-pandemic levels. They noted for example that they are returning to more face-to-face sessions, and reaching out to lapsed service users to re-establish their involvement. Their intention was that this would enable them to identify appropriate people to be brought back into the service user involvement.
  - Overall the visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had clearly reflected on how best to use service users moving forward.
- **Equality and diversity –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they maintain the programme's compliance with relevant institutional policies. These are embedded in a strategic plan, and reviewed regularly. NHSG has its own equality and diversity policies and procedures, which the education provider took into account in its reflection because the learners on the programme work in NHSG settings.

- The education provider have gathered data on differential attainment in order to inform their delivery of the programme. This enabled them to identify gaps where further actions might be needed. An example of this was providing additional support to those learners who need it with essay-writing.
- One area the education provider identified as possibly needing some development related to learners who are returning to study after a long break. They noted the actions they were taking to meet the needs of these learners, for example by providing extra academic skills support and the option of close supervision.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had provided evidence of reflection on gaps and future needs. However, they also sought clarification on whether specific actions had been taken during the review period as a result of EDI monitoring. The education provider stated that they had taken such actions and gave some particular examples.
- **Horizon scanning –**
  - The education provider reflected on upcoming challenges, and had identified a number of specific issues. These included:
    - The need to significantly increase learner recruitment to grow the programme, based on future workforce demands, with a relatively limited pool from which to choose;
    - the need to build working relationships with partners other than NHSG, as more health boards seek to upskill existing HCPC-registered staff to prescribing level;
    - extensive changes to the technology used in prescribing at the national level;
  - The education provider reflected on each of these possible areas of future challenge in turn, describing what might need to happen and what steps would need to be taken to address them. Not all of these concerns were relevant to the HCPC but the visitors considered that performance was good in this area because there was clear evidence of sustained and detailed consideration of the potential challenges arising in the education provider's provision.

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

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

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** None.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learning and developments from the COVID-19 pandemic –**
  - The education provider's key reflection in this area concerned the return to normal since the end of the pandemic. They described how they had moved to fully virtual delivery during the lockdowns, and their gradual return to a more blended approach in the subsequent years. Their reflection concluded that the post-COVID "new normal" was more

flexible and responsive, providing learners with more options to progress through the program..

- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. This was because the education provider had given a clear outline of their decision-making around what post-COVID changes to retain.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
  - The education provider reflected on their approach to deliver continuous improvement through their use of technology. Their use of virtual learning environments (VLEs) had increased during the pandemic and they have decided to retain much of the resulting flexibility and responsiveness to individual learners needs. However, the response to the pandemic was not the only technological issue on which they had reflected. They had also considered the need for better use on the programme of simulation, including highly realistic manikins and clinical simulators which provide immersive experience. They mentioned in addition the rising issues associated with the use of artificial intelligence, both in medicine and by learners. They are still considering the best methods for managing and adapting to the prominence of these technologies.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. Strong reflection had been provided showing a willingness and ability to engage with changing technological tools.

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

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

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** 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 in the portfolio that during the review period they completed the Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) process operated by Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (QAAS). This approach is now being phased out and replaced with the Tertiary Quality Enhancement Framework (TQEF), which the education provider will engage with as necessary from the 2024-25 academic year. In the interim, the education provider underwent Quality Enhancement and Standards Review (QESR). This involved a wide-ranging external quality review.
  - The education provider have reflected on the areas of good practice identified through this process, and the two recommendations for action that they were given. These were to ensure that learners had access to external examiner reports and to develop the system of personal tutoring. The education provider stated that they are confident that their programme can meet the requirements set out in the recommendations.

- The visitors consider that performance in this area was good during the review period, because the education provider has shown appropriate and affective engagement with relevant quality frameworks.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
  - The education provider's reflection in this area was brief, because they have only one prescribing programme, which means have limited interaction with professional bodies. They noted in their portfolio that after gaining approval from the NMC in 2019, no further changes to the programme have been required by the NMC. Additionally the Royal Pharmaceutical Society's amended competencies were incorporated into the programme in 2022. This required some limited changes to the module descriptors and curriculum content.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had given an appropriate account of relevant interactions.

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

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

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** None.

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Curriculum development –**
  - The education provider did not provide any reflection in this area because they only have the one programme, prescribing, and there are no relevant changes.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
  - The education provider noted that they had not made any programme amendments to reflect changes in professional body guidance. However, they had reflected on whether they needed to so the visitors considered that performance in this area was appropriate.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**
  - The education provider do not have to monitor capacity for their HCPC-related provision per se, because they only have the one programme. , . All the HCPC-registered learners on the programme are existing clinical professionals who are encouraged and facilitated to complete the programme by their employer, NHS Grampian (NHSG). The education provider's approach to maintaining their relationships with NHSG has been described in earlier sectionsThe education provider does reflect earlier in the portfolio on how they maintain their relationship with NHSG.
  - The visitors considered that the education provider were performing well in this area, as their arrangements met that NHSG ensured capacity in practice-based learning for all learners.

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

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

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** None.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learners –**
  - The education provider's reflection outlined the mechanisms by which learners can provide feedback about the programme. These include informal methods during the normal activities of the programme, as well as an elected class representative, as an intermediary between staff and learners. They also attend the twice-termly meetings of the Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) to provide learner perspective. Individual modules also have evaluation points.
  - The education provider noted that there is a poor response rate for course evaluations. They had clearly considered how to improve this but there was limited information about steps that had been taken to do so. There was also little information in the portfolio about how the education provider acted on feedback from learners, so they decided to [explore this area through quality activity](#).
- **Practice placement educators –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they might improve their formal individual feedback from practice educators. They recognised in the portfolio that while they have clear guidelines for practice educators and there are lots of opportunities for informal feedback, there is no formal pathway.
  - The visitors considered that this was a useful and effective piece of reflection. However, they also considered that to gain a clear understanding of how exactly the education provider was planning to use their reflection to improve feedback from practice educators, they wished to explore this area further through quality activity.
- **External examiners –**
  - The external examiner submit reports on the programme at the end of every academic year. The education provider has reflected on the external examiner feedback from the review period, noting that the feedback is broadly positive. They state that in 2022-23, they responded to external examiner feedback about the balance of assessment by reviewing the weighting of assessments. Although no changes were made, they were responding appropriately to the feedback and showing that they could reflect on the information received. The education provider also mentioned feedback about the transition to virtual learning during the pandemic. The external examiner considered that this had been successfully managed.
  - The education provider are planning to recruit a new external examiner for the programme later in 2024.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because there was evidence of the education provider using the external examiner's reports to inform programme development.

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



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

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** None.

### Data and reflections

**Findings of the assessment panel:** The visitors considered that the institutional data indicated good performance. The points considered through the assessment suggested that the programme was performing well and there were no gaps or concerns.

- **Learner non continuation:**
  - The data suggests that there is a non-continuation rate of around 3%, which is the benchmark figure. We considered that this was reasonable and not a cause for concern. This is particularly evident because the education provider clarified through the portfolio that all learners from HCPC-approved programme in the last cohort successfully completed the programme.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - The education provider is performing overall at benchmark, and the score has dropped slightly. However, given the nature of the single prescribing programme, where all learners are already employed in NHS clinical settings, this data point was not the impetus for any further investigation.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - Learner satisfaction is above benchmark, and has improved on the previous year. The visitors considered that the data here did not warrant any further investigation or exploration, although they did use quality activity to better understand how the learner feedback loop is closed.
- **Programme level data:**
  - The programme is not currently recruiting to the level at which it is approved to do so. However, the portfolio does set out plans to expand learner numbers, and the visitors considered that the programme was sustainable based on all the information considered.

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

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

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** 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, service users and employer partners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engaged with all the professional bodies relevant to learners on their prescribing programme. They [considered professional body findings in improving their provision
  - The education provider engaged with the NMC. They considered the findings of the NMC in improving their provision
  - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
  - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
- What the data is telling us:
  - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes.

### 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 Aberdeen	CAS-01377-Y7Y8H1	Jane Day  Nicholas Haddington	2028-29	The education provider engaged well with the process. Both their initial portfolio submission, and their responses to the quality activity and requests for clarification, were full and frank. There is good strategic oversight of the programme. There are no ongoing issues or processes which pose risks that we will need to review specifically before 2028-29.	N / A

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>
Independent Non-Medical Prescriber	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2020