
Performance review process report

University of Dundee, Review Period 2018-2023

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of University of Dundee. 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 needed to undertake further exploration of key themes through quality activities
- Undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
 - Quality activity 1: The visitors were unclear about the detail of the audit procedure for new practice-based learning settings. They explored this with the education provider and the education provider clarified that their agreements with practice partners set out in writing the required approach to monitoring and assurance of practice-based learning.
 - The provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2028-29 academic year, because:
 - The visitors considered that the education provider was performing well across all portfolio areas. They had engaged well with the performance process.
 - 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, clinical educators, service users and programme staff.
 - The education provider engaged with other regulators on a regular and appropriate basis.
 - 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 and acts on data to inform positive change.
-

Previous consideration N / A as this case 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
Quality themes identified for further exploration	9
Quality theme 1 – Uncertainty about audit of new clinical placements	9
Section 4: Findings	10
Overall findings on performance	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	13
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection.....	14
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	14
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	17
Assessment panel recommendation	17
Education and Training Committee decision	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
Duane Mellor	Lead visitor, Dietitian
Jenny McKibben	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer
Nicola Carey	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 required professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers four HCPC-approved Independent Prescribing programmes. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2007.

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 2](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level	Approved since
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing		2007

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 programmes¹.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	300	192	January 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 assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was

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

				<p>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.</p> <p>We explored this by considering whether the programme was sustainable and the visitors concluded that there were no concerns in this area. The education provider had reflected on staffing, future planning and institutional support for the programme.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	0%	2020-2021	<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 been maintained.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how the education provider was supporting learners to continue with the programme, and concluded that they were performing well in this area.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	96%	2020-2021	<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 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 supports its learners to move into their next steps, professionally and academically. We found that their performance in this area was good.</p>
Learner satisfaction	74.9%	77.1%	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 monitored and responded to learner concerns. We considered that they were managing this well.</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 – Uncertainty about audit of new clinical placements

Area for further exploration: The education provider submitted reflections on how they monitored existing placement quality and maintained relationships with clinical partners. They also noted that they had been expanding into new practice-based learning settings. The visitors considered this was useful information but there was no reflection in the portfolio about how the education provider had ensured that new placements were appropriately audited before learners went into them. All HCPC-registered learners on the programmes are already employed by NHS organisations, meaning they bring their placements with them. The visitors understood that if learners from clinical settings which had not previously participated in the programme joined, a new audit would be required. However, they were unsure about the process for this.

Without this information the visitors could not fully determine how well the education provider was performing in this area, or how they had reflected on the new placements. They explored this area through quality activity.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme and to seek clarification of our understanding on the above query.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider noted in their response that “in Scotland the Quality Management of the Practice Learning Environment (QMPLE) IT system is used for all old and new NHS placements and is audited by the School of Health Sciences.”

They clarified that their audit process is a collaboration between themselves and NHS Education Scotland (NES), using an NES system. Placements are rated under a “traffic light” system, with red, green and amber ratings. The education provider’s service level agreement (SLA) with NES requires NES to monitor the quality of all placements, including new ones, and report any concerns to the education provider. It was apparent to the visitors that the SLA ensured that it was not possible for a new placement to be used on the programme without being appropriately audited.

The visitors considered that this was a good response as it made clear how the education provider ensures the quality of new placements. In light of the additional information, they considered performance was satisfactory.

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 the size of their provision and the number of learners. They noted that they had made specific efforts to increase the number of learners on the programme, in line with growing national demand for prescribers in Scotland. They note through the reflection that they have taken specific actions during the review period to ensure sustainability, including investment in additional staff with varying expertise.
 - The visitors considered that the education provider was performing well in this area, because the education provider was clearly willing and able to reflect closely on their ability to keep the programme viable. They knew this because the education provider submitted information about how they monitored learner numbers and staff ratios on an ongoing basis, and the actions they took in response to the insights gained through that monitoring.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The education provider reflected on how well they had been managing and developing relevant partnerships. Their key strategic partners are NHS Boards, who provide their learners and deploy those learners once they have become practising prescribers.
 - The education provider continued to develop the Module Lead position which is the key point of contact with the NHS Boards. This Module Lead works with local prescribers and represents the education provider at quarterly meetings of the NHS Boards.
 - Examples of their reflection include the way in which they managed the COVID-19 pandemic, by liaising with partners to ensure online delivery was as effective as possible. They also developed a plan to deliver online assessment appropriately, and ensured that all Trusts were ready and able to support learners appropriately despite the challenges of the pandemic.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider has shown that they liaise regularly and closely with stakeholders to deliver effective partnership working.
- **Academic quality –**
 - The education provider had reflected on their quality assurance processes. They noted that they have ongoing review of all modules, and that they use external examiner reports as a basis for module leader reflection. Areas that have been changed as a result include assessment, teaching activities, and programme content.

- Additionally the education provider has a process by which programme staff undertake peer review of each other's teaching, and give constructive feedback. Changes made to the programme are communicated to learners on a "You Said, We Did" basis, providing a layer of accountability to learners which helps the education provider reflect. They reflect on these changes to the external examiners. They also ensure they follow closely the requirements of organisations such as the Quality Assurance Agency (AQA).
- They note through their reflection that they have received good feedback from external examiners on their ability to adapt to feedback.
- The visitors considered that performance was good because the education provider had a clear pathway for reflecting on the feedback gathered about academic quality.
- **Placement quality –**
 - The education provider's reflection in this area focused on both NHS and non-NHS placements. The non-NHS placements were not applicable to HCPC learners. For the NHS placements, they had reflected on the findings of their audit process, using their Quality Management of the Practice Learning Environment (QMPLE) tool. The education provider considered that this was delivering appropriate information about placement quality, and noted that they were working with NHS Education Scotland to refine their audit process and ensure excellent quality. For example, QMPLE had indicated that some learners felt they needed additional contextualisation of their clinical knowledge through the academic components of the programme.
 - The visitors considered that performance was good in this area because the education provider was clearly able to monitor the quality of NHS placements and was engaged in an ongoing process of improvement.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The education provider's reflection noted that they use a blended curriculum approach which encourages learners to mix with other professions, to share experiences and expertise between the professionals. Their consideration of the best way to deliver interprofessional education (IPE) has involved professionals and clinical practitioners, who feed in suggestions for improvements and development.
 - The education provider also reflected on their use of outside experts to support their learners integrating the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS) framework into their own particular professional practice. One way in which this work has evolved is the introduction of additional recording procedures for IPE. This will enable the IPE to be more appropriately quantified. Additionally the education provider have initiated a scheme encouraging learners to develop interprofessional networks prior to registration.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had clearly considered how their IPE was performing and how it could be improved.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider's reflection noted that they have increased their service user involvement over recent years, and improved their

recording and monitoring of this involvement. Service users are now asked to record their own reflections and to contribute to planning future engagement. Since the COVID-19 pandemic the education provider has returned to face-to-face use of service users after the disruption of the pandemic.

- Recently a service user co-ordinator post has been created and filled, after the education saw a gap in their provision, and this person has developed a strategy for the programmes to follow.
- As a result of education provider reflection, contingency planning is in place to mitigate the risk of individual service users not being able to participate as planned.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had a clear mechanism for reflecting on and developing service user involvement.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider reflections are in the context of the university-level strategy on equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI). There are regular surveys of learners and staff to gauge their opinions and experiences linked to EDI issues. These surveys are the basis of improvements and developments taken by the education provider.
 - Using this information the education provider has incorporated EDI into all aspects of the learner pathway through the programmes. Individual staff members are also asked to reflect on EDI in their module, assessment and teaching design. The education provider's high-level EDI committee is convened by a designated senior staff member. The prescribing programmes have used outcomes from these meetings to drive programme developments, for example around increasing accessibility of programmes to learners from a diverse range of backgrounds.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider have continuously looked for opportunities to improve.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The delivery of the prescribing programmes is under continuous review. The education provider demonstrated this by reflecting on how well their programmes meet emerging needs and the changing landscape within prescribing. They also have ongoing discussions with relevant health authorities to ensure that they are fit for purpose in the future.
 - A key future development issue identified by the education provider is growing demand for non-medical prescribing. To meet this growth, the education provider have increased staff numbers, have grown the expertise on their team and reviewed their interprofessional education. They have also added a mental health specialist to their team to reflect the growing importance of this area of healthcare, and the need to integrate it into other areas of care. In terms of future plans, the education provider intends to expand its marketing and its networking within Scotland and the wider profession to maintain the clinical relevance of the programme.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good as they had seen clear evidence that the education provider was looking

forward and anticipating likely changes and developments in the sector.

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) –**
 - Not applicable as the education provider only has prescribing programmes.
- **Learning and developments from the COVID-19 pandemic –**
 - The key reflection in this area concerned how the education provider had handled the return to normal after the pandemic while also determining what changes to retain. They decided to retain much of the online delivery that had been adopted during the pandemic, because they found that this had improved the flexibility of the programme and the possibilities of online collaboration between widely dispersed learners, programme staff and practice educators.
 - After the pandemic the education provider reflected on learner feedback and returned to a blended learning approach, mixing online and in-person learning and teaching. They retained, for example, programme content being easily sharable online as learners reported this helped them review and revise.
 - The visitors considered that this was effective reflection because it showed the education provider had considered what was valuable in the changes forced by the pandemic, and which could be rejected after COVID-19 was no longer an issue.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The education provider noted that they had technological issues with their TurnItIn virtual learning environment (VLE). They addressed this by providing additional support to learners, and established a regular session to which learners can bring their technological issues for resolution and skill-building.
 - The blended learning delivery continues to be developed and refined, for example by encouraging and supporting innovation from staff in how they can better use the Blackboard VLE. Additionally, their bespoke MyDundee software, used for communication and assessment, has been continuously developed in response to feedback received. This is an ongoing process.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had clearly shown their responsiveness to changes and developments.
- **Apprenticeships in England –** Not applicable as this is a Scottish institution.

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 reflected on how they ensure ongoing compliance with the standards for non-medical prescribing programmes set by relevant bodies. They do this through the University Quality Framework (UQF), which sets a requirement that all programmes meet relevant quality standards.
 - One outcome of their reflection has been their involvement with the Scottish Prescribing Programmes Leads Network (SSPLeN). This was developed to support the strategic direction of Scottish higher education institutions (HEIs) providing prescribing programmes.
 - The education provider also underwent an independent review by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA)m which expressed confidence in their ability to deliver high quality prescribing education.
 - In the future, involvement with SSPLeN requires ongoing improvement and sharing expertise, so the visitors considered performance in this area was good. In particular the education provider is developing resources in conjunction with SSPLeN to support non-NHS placement audit.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider reflected on recent discussions with the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), intended to ensure that clinical supervision continues to be effective and appropriate. The outcome of these discussions was that they would continue to collaborate with the NMC to ensure alignment with professional changes.
 - Additionally the NMC discussions were used to expand understanding of the different prescribing roles that learners, not just nurses, might undertake in the future, and how the role of clinical supervisor might need to adapt.
 - The visitors considered that performance was good because the education provider had demonstrated a strong working relationship with a key stakeholder, the NMC, and the willingness and ability to consider matters raised.

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 –**
 - Through their portfolio the education provider noted how their reflection on new guidance had led to changes in several areas during the review period. For example, they had updated their programme to meet new non-medical prescribing requirements from both the HCPC and the

NMC. The updated Royal Pharmaceutical Society Framework (2021) was also incorporated into their provision, by updating teaching materials, module guidance and learning sessions.

- Following the COVID-19 pandemic the education provider retained several aspects of the changes forced by the pandemic. These are discussed in more detail above.
- In the documentation you note that you admit registrants to train in the area of beauty/aesthetics. Could you clarify how you ensure that any HCPC learners on this pathway are adequately enabled to meet the relevant (RPS) competencies, as these are based on practitioners working in a healthcare setting? (Some HCPC registrants may have a scope of practice that explicitly excludes aesthetics.)
- The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had clear mechanisms for developing the curriculum as necessary, and had demonstrated this.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - In line with their reflection on the updated Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS) Framework for all Prescribers (2021), the education provider undertook changes to their teaching materials and their assessment approach. Similarly, the NMC's updated prescribing standards were incorporated into the programme – the main effect was a reduction in simulation for clinical skills learning, which had increased in prominence on the programme during COVID-19.
 - The education provider worked with their practice partners to ensure that clinical supervision reflected the new guidance.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had demonstrated their ability to adapt and develop in light of changing professional expectations.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**
 - Capacity of practice-based learning is a less significant concern for this education provider because the prescribing learners are already registered practitioners with existing roles, supported by employers. However, the education provider did reflect on whether their learners might experience time pressure due to the competing requirements of work and study. They noted they had increased the support available to learners to mitigate the risks in this area. They had also provided more support for Designated Prescribing Practitioners (DPPs), who are providing clinical supervision for the learners. This includes additional workshops and more regular communication.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had a clear mechanism for ensuring that pressure on learners could be handled and managed.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: Concerning curriculum development, the visitors wanted to highlight one particular issue, around the education provider's approach to registrants training in beauty and aesthetics. The visitors understood that the education provider did offer such training, but wanted to note for future reference that HCPC learners on the beauty / aesthetics pathway might have a specific scope of practice that may limit their clinical practice in beauty / aesthetics. They suggest that

the education provider review this aspect to ensure that HCPC learners are appropriately prepared for practice.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learners –**
 - The education provider gave some examples of learner feedback on which they had reflected, and on which they had taken action. For example, learners reported difficulties with the delivery of pharmacology content, so the education provider broke the learning up into more manageable sections. Learners also reported inconsistencies in assessment early in the review period, which was addressed through closer moderation of assessment and an attempt to align different assessor's approaches more closely.
 - The visitors did request some clarification and expansion of the education provider's approach to implementing learner feedback. The education provider submitted some additional information, noting that module leads are responsible for convening meetings at the end of modules to discuss, and take action on, learner feedback. This action is part of their role description.
 - In light of this clarification, the visitors considered that performance in this area was good, as the education provider had demonstrated that they could both gather, and take action on, learner feedback.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The reflection in this area was focused on communication between the education provider and their clinical partners, to ensure that the relationship was delivering effectively. For example, during the review period the education provider initiated annual NHS / University of Dundee Education events to support Continuous Professional development (CPD) of Prescribing Practice with NHS Stakeholders. These were designed to develop and implement new Prescribing Policy.
 - Additionally the education provider is developing a national framework for gaining national-level feedback, to incorporate into the programmes. They noted also that their regular module review procedure includes review of the contributions by clinical educators.
 - We requested some additional reflection about how feedback from practice educators is used in programme improvement and development. The education provider stated that all practice educators were given a specific contact on the programme team, and that feedback from practice educators was frequently reviewed at programme staff meetings, and in module reviews.
 - Following the clarification, the visitors considered the education provider was performing well in this area, because they had given examples of how they gathered, used and improved the feedback from practice placement educators.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider submitted reports from their external examiner. These demonstrated that the external examiner considered the programmes were working well. She had no concerns about how the programme was delivering the curriculum, or the learners' ability to give

feedback. The education provider noted that they reflected closely on external examiners' input.

- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had clear engagement with the external examiner.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learner non continuation:**
 - We explored this by considering how the education provider was supporting learners to continue with the programme, and concluded that they were performing well in this area. Effective feedback was gathered from learners through defined mechanisms, and learners' positivity scores were above the benchmark.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - We explored this by considering how well the education provider supports its learners to move into their next steps, professionally and academically. We found that their performance in this area was good.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - We explored this by considering how well the education provider monitored and responded to learner concerns. We considered that they were managing this well.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The programme level data indicated that the education programme was performing well. The visitors did not see anything which raised issues with their performance.

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, clinical educators, service users and programme staff.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with two professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - The education provider engaged with the NMC. They considered the findings of the NMC and the Royal Pharmaceutical Society 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 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 Dundee	CAS-01369-R9Y8G0	Nicholas Haddington Duane Mellor	Five years	The visitors considered that the education provider had reflected appropriately. They agreed they are performing well across all portfolio area. They also engaged well with the performance process. Both their initial portfolio submission, and their responses to the quality activity and requests for clarification, were comprehensive and reflective. 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.	N/A

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11)	PT (Part time)	N/A	N/A	Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/02/2014
Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11)	PT (Part time)	N/A	N/A	Supplementary prescribing	01/09/2007
Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9)	PT (Part time)	N/A	N/A	Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/02/2014
Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9)	PT (Part time)	N/A	N/A	Supplementary prescribing	01/09/2007