

---

## Performance review process report

University of the Highlands and Islands, 2018-2022

---

### Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of the University of the Highlands and Islands. 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 our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Undertook 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 that the following areas needed to be explored through quality activity.

- The areas we explored focused on:
  - Use of learner feedback to drive continuous improvement. We asked the education provider to expand on how they had used data from learners to improve their programmes during the review period. They expanded in detail on the different ways in which they did this, providing practical examples.

The education provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2027-28 academic year, because:

- The visitors were satisfied with the ongoing performance of the education provider. Data points showed they are performing as expected with regards to learner's professional advancement, continuation, and outcomes. They have demonstrated they can appropriately respond to challenges and shown insightful reflections regarding their performance during the review period. The visitors agreed there is a low risk to their performance moving forward and therefore recommend the maximum review period.

---

Previous consideration	Not applicable because 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 2027-28 academic year.

---

## Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment.....	4
About us .....	4
Our standards .....	4
Our regulatory approach.....	4
The performance review process.....	4
Thematic areas reviewed .....	5
How we make our decisions.....	5
The assessment panel for this review.....	5
Section 2: About the education provider.....	6
The education provider context.....	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider.....	6
Institution performance data.....	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes .....	8
Portfolio submission.....	8
Quality themes identified for further exploration .....	8
Quality theme 1 – use of learner feedback to drive continuous improvement. ....	8
Section 4: Summary of findings .....	9
Overall findings on performance .....	9
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	9
Quality theme: Thematic reflection .....	12
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.....	18
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes .....	18
Assessment panel recommendation .....	18
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution.....	21

## 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:

Jim Pickard	Lead visitor, Chiropodist / Podiatrist, Supplementary prescribing, Independent prescribing, POM – Administration, POM – Sale/Supply (CH), Podiatric Surgery
Beverley Cherie Millar	Lead visitor, Clinical Scientist
Mohammed Jeewa	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

## 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 2018.

The university have not engaged in any processes in both the current and legacy model of quality assurance since the programme approval in 2018.

### 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		2018

### Institution performance data

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

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	60	60	April 2023	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission.

				<p>The education provider is recruiting learners at the benchmark.</p> <p>We explored this by considering the levels of sustainability of the programme.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	2%	2019-2020	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 1%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well learners are supported to continue on the programme.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	96%	2019-2020	<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 improved by 2%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider prepares learners for their new</p>

				professional responsibilities as qualified prescribers.
Learner satisfaction	81.4%	90.9%	2023	<p>This NSS 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 improved by 9%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well learners on the programme were supported and encouraged to contribute.</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 – use of learner feedback to drive continuous improvement.



**Area for further exploration:** The education provider submitted information detailing the pathways and mechanisms used to gather feedback from learners. These included informal methods like emails from learners, alongside formal methods like module evaluations and the National Student Survey (NSS). The visitors considered that this was useful for enabling them to understand the education provider's approach.

However, the portfolio did not contain sufficient reflection on how this data had been used to make improvements to the programme during the review period. It was therefore the visitors were not able to make a determination about performance, without additional information. They decided further explore how the education provider used its processes to ensure that feedback from learners was used to improve the programme.

**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 narrative response supported by evidence in the form of sample records of action taken in response to learner feedback. They gave examples of how feedback loops had been closed. One such example was that an additional pharmacology session was added to the timetable to aid learners' revision for an assessment. There is a learner representative on the Non-Medical Prescribing Management Group (NMPMG), and action on feedback is a standing item on the agenda for meetings of the NMPMG.

The education provider also uses Self-Evaluation Documents (SEDs) completed by learners to feed into regular programme reviews, which generate actions that must be taken by programmes under institutional policies.

The visitors considered this was an appropriate response. This was because it demonstrated that during the review period, the education provider had been able to consistently use feedback received from learners to ensure that programme quality was maintained and developed as necessary. They considered therefore that performance was good.

## Section 4: Summary of 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 three key areas of challenge. They reflected on their financial position, which had been uncertain during the review period due to inflation and the COVID-19 pandemic. They explained how they took specific actions such as simplifying governance and making existing structures more integrated which helped to address these challenges.
- Additionally, there had been some difficulties around staff retention and recruitment. They noted they struggled to replace staff who had resigned for while but that they entered a period of stability following a review of the skills needed for the programme staff.
- The education provider also reflected on the programme's move to dual campus operation. Previously, the programme had been concentrated on a single site but the increased use of online learning and hybrid working had enabled them to work across both campuses. They stated this has enhanced the learner experience and resulted in better use of staff resources.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was satisfactory because they had seen clear evidence of the education provider reflecting on how best to meet the challenges. The visitors noted that the education provider is currently looking to the strengthen AHP input into programme management, including additional HCPC registrants and a podiatrist will be joining the group for the next academic year. They suggested that this innovation should be considered in the next performance review.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they maintained and managed important partnerships for their unusual working model. This model has brought together institutions across a sparsely populated and remote area.
  - They worked with organisations such the Scottish Government, the Scottish School of Primary Care, and NHS Education Scotland (NES). These relationships were maintained at both the strategic and operational level which enabled them to continue to deliver their provision effectively.
  - There were some additional reflections on the education provider's plans to develop and expand the range of health professionals who accessed the prescribing programme. These reflections included consideration of whether there were sufficient existing AHPs in the west of Scotland who wanted to achieve prescribing annotation.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was satisfactory. This was because the education provider had clearly worked closely with relevant partners during the review period and was able to reflect on successes and challenges in this working.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
  - The education provider set out the mechanisms that they have used to reflect on academic and placement quality during the review period. These included a web resource known as the Quality Management of the Practice Learning Environment (QMPLE), as well as the Non-Medical Prescribing (NMP) Management Group.
  - Several specific examples were given of areas where these mechanisms had resulted in particular improvements. These included

the production of a practice learning handbook aimed specifically at supporting Practice Assessors and Practice Educators in their role. All practice educators attend an introductory meeting to provide information regarding the programme delivery and how we can support them in their roles.

- Another example was the education provider's amendments to the online delivery structure in response to learner feedback. They used insight from past learners to ensure that the programme continued to reflect contemporary best practice. They also invited learners to use the Virtual Learning Environment to give feedback. The education provider also identified development of the Self Evaluation Document (SED) as a priority for future work.
- Given the above evidence of the education provider's reflection on their approach in this area, the visitors considered that performance was good.
- **Interprofessional education –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they used the prescribing programme's inherently interprofessional nature to ensure that interprofessional education was delivered.
  - They noted how this had been challenging due to the different roles that these professionals adopt. They stated that the Department of Nursing & Midwifery, in which the programme sits, is "trying to meet the needs of all within the scope of safe and effective prescribing without being too generic." However, reflected on how different professions have had opportunities to contribute and that these contributions have been well-received overall. Discussions is a key part of these exercises and the education provider noted that reflection was encouraged through channels such as in-person group work and online messaging.
  - The visitors considered that this was good reflection from the education provider and that performance was satisfactory. This was because the portfolio had a clear and open description of how the education provider had considered the best way to deliver effective IPE using the resources available during the review period.
- **Service users and carers –**
  - The education provider reflected on the challenges they had faced during the review period in maintaining service user involvement. The fact that they serve a large area, with a scattered population and difficult transport, meant that they had not always found it straightforward to gain input from service users.
  - However, they did demonstrate some reflection on the best way to overcome these challenges. For example, they have been filming some service user interaction for multiple uses, rather than relying on face-to-face sessions. They have also developed written resources with service user input that do not rely on a service user being physically present with learners.
  - Service user feedback on the programme has also fed into curriculum development, for both the general structure of the programme and individual components.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because they had seen reflections of innovative approaches being

used to overcome the unique problems faced by the education provider.

- **Equality and diversity –**
  - The education provider reflected on the different ways in which they sought to maintain and expand the inclusiveness of the programme.
  - They noted their membership of the Athena Swan scheme, which is designed to promote women's leadership, alongside a suite of internal policies which all programmes must follow. They also noted the varied entry points for their programmes, and their work on developing Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), have ensured that individuals from a variety of backgrounds are able to access their programmes.
  - Specifically, for the HCPC-approved programme, the education provider noted that they had reflected on the detailed equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) data for the programme. They discovered it did not highlight any particular issues given the overall make-up of the professions served in non-medical prescribing (NMP).
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly reflected on the best approach to ensuring a fair and inclusive programme.
- **Horizon scanning –**
  - The education provider reflected on their possible future involvement with the Scottish Government's plans to expand allied health profession (AHP) training. A particular focus of the Scottish Government's approach related to how to increase the skills of existing health professionals. The education provider noted that they may in future become involved in apprenticeship-type delivery.
  - Another possible issue for the future identified by the education provider's reflection was the relatively low numbers of allied health professionals (AHPs) accessing the programme compared to nurses. They suggested that the work by the Scottish Government noted above might help to expand the AHP numbers.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had realistically considered possible future challenges.

**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:**

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
  - The education provider only runs a single prescribing programme, so the revised SOPs are not directly relevant. However, the visitors did ask for clarification around how the education provider would ensure that they delivered any revised SOPs which were relevant to prescribing.

- The education provider stated that they ran a module for learners from different professions. In this module learners were required to consider how the SOPs from their particular profession were relevant to practising as a member of that profession with a prescribing annotation.
- The visitors considered that this was a satisfactory answer. They therefore considered that performance in this area was good. They did note however that visitors in the next review ought to look at specific examples of course areas/case studies where the new/modified standards have been implemented.
- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
  - The education provider noted in their reflection that they had managed the challenges of the pandemic effectively by moving the entire programme online.
  - Since the pandemic, the education provider has adopted a “blended learning approach” which is kept under ongoing review to ensure that it continues to be fit for purpose. They also reflected on how they had used technology to maintain partnership working with relevant organisations. They noted that the pandemic had also made it harder for some of the learners to complete clinical components of their programme. This was managed through increasing staff availability for support and increased flexibility around assessment deadlines.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because there was evidence of the education provider adapting well to the pandemic. The education provider had also demonstrated that they had adapted to post-pandemic expectations by incorporating hybrid approaches.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
  - The education provider submitted some reflection on how their Educational Development Unit (EDU) keeps the provision under ongoing review in order to ensure that programmes are using technology as appropriately as possible.
  - The portfolio also sets out how the education provider used technology to mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, and noted that they had used internal forums to determine which mitigations would be used.
  - The visitors considered that performance was good because they had seen evidence that the education provider had reflected on how best to use technology to serve their programme.
- **Apprenticeships –**
  - This is not applicable to the education provider because they do not have any apprenticeship programmes and do not have any concrete plans to introduce any programmes in the near future. However, the [‘Horizon scanning’ section above](#) notes the future possibility of apprenticeship-type programmes.

**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 reflected in some depth on their recent interaction with the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), in the form of an Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) in 2021.
  - This ELIR made recommendations about governance, curriculum development and quality monitoring and improvement. Although these were mostly focused on the non-HCPC provision at the education provider, the education provider reflected on how improved mechanisms for curriculum review and strategic oversight should be beneficial for all their provision.
  - From the ELIR, the education provider had developed a new Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy (LTES), published in 2022. From the reflections reviewed, this was borne out of careful reflection on the findings of the ELIR. The LTES is designed to ensure that all programmes have regular formal quality enhancement mechanisms.
  - Based on the findings in this area, above, the visitors considered that performance was good. The prescribing programme was covered by the overall effective institutional reflection on the QAA's input.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
  - The education provider reflected on the oversight exercised by NHS Education Scotland (NES). NES is responsible for annual reviews of their nursing curriculum, and develop enhancement plans.
  - With specific regard to the HCPC-regulated provision, the main external body identified for this section was Health Care Improvement Scotland (HCIS). This organisation has responsibility for monitoring and maintaining quality in healthcare settings in Scotland.
  - No specific concerns have been raised by HCIS about placements used by the education provider during the review period. However, there is an established mechanism for taking action on such concerns at the education provider, the Practice Learning Committee.
  - Given the above, the visitors considered that performance was good. This was because there were clear established pathways by which external organisations' findings could be fed into the education provider's processes.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
  - The NSS does not gather data from learners on prescribing programmes. The education provider has supplied comparable data which indicates a high level of learner satisfaction with the programme – the overall satisfaction rate was 95%.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because of the robust data which had been supplied regarding overall learner satisfaction.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
  - Not relevant because the education provider is a Scottish institution and is outside the remit of the OFS.

- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
  - The education provider reflected on their work with the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC). For example, they engaged with the NMC to have the programme re-approved according to the NMC's new prescribing standards introduced in May 2020. No conditions were set which demonstrated that the education provider had reflected appropriately on how to align themselves with the new requirements from the NMC.
  - The education provider also reflected on the emergence of the DPP (Designated Prescribing Practitioner) role, which was developed by the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPharm) and their Competency Framework. This enabled them to expand the pool of people who were available to be practice educators, and to have learners supervised by people with more comparable professional experience.
  - The education provider's reflection on RPharm's updated Competency Framework was evidenced by their updating of their programme in time for the NMC re-approval noted above.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly engaged with relevant external bodies in a consistent and appropriate way.

**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 –**
  - During the review period, the education provider reflected on how to integrate the new competency standards from the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPharm) into their programme. This integration was successfully achieved. This included updates to module descriptors and the practice assessment document.
  - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. This was because the education provider had developed the programme curriculum in a timely and appropriate way, and had explained how they were considering the best way to do this.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
  - The education provider did not note any changes to the programme in the review period that came from a result of changes in professional body guidance. However, this is because there is not a single professional body for prescribing programmes, and so this area is best covered by the information in 'Curriculum development' above.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they organise and monitor practice-based learning. This works in a different way on the programme because of its nature as a prescribing programme. Normally, learners access clinical learning in their own workplace

settings with occasional visits to other settings as required. The education provider's role is to consider the appropriateness of such settings through a defined audit process.

- However, the education provider did include some reflection on how the introduction of the Designated Prescribing Practitioner (DPP) role had expanded the pool of suitable individuals for practice educators. They noted that this will have a significant positive impact on the effectiveness of the programme. They also included some reflections on what management support would be required to ensure that the new practice educators filling the DPP role can function effectively.
- The final area of reflection involved the education provider's use of technology to maximise existing clinical capacity. This was especially important as the learners are widely dispersed in areas with limited support.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. This was because the education provider was clearly reflecting on the specific requirements of securing, expanding and maintaining clinical placement 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 presented information about how they gather feedback from learners. This is done through the National Student Survey (NSS), the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), and internal methods such as online discussion boards and email.
  - The visitors agreed that this was useful information and that it indicated a clear commitment from the education provider to gather feedback from learners from different channels.
  - However, the visitors also considered that there was insufficient reflection on how learner feedback was turned into specific action. They therefore decided to explore the closing of the feedback loop through quality activity.
  - This was explored through [quality activity 1 above](#). The education provider supplied reflection on how they used feedback from learners to drive continuous improvement. After the quality activity, the visitors considered that performance was good. This was because there was clear evidence of reflection based on learner feedback.
- **Practice placement educators –**
  - The portfolio noted that feedback had not been received by practice educators during the review period. However, there was insufficient reflection on how practice educators' continuing suitability was monitored, and how their feedback was used to drive improvement.



The visitors therefore requested additional clarity on these questions, and the education provider was able to supply this.

- The education provider noted that the training status of practice educators was maintained through liaison with relevant Health Boards, They confirmed this was a long-established process that had been reflected on before and considered effective. The education provider also undertakes its own checks on practice educators.
- Regarding feedback, the education provider reflected on the pathways involved. These included a specific request for feedback in the practice handbook, as well as an opportunity for feedback during live virtual sessions with programme staff. Informal feedback was considered at meetings or during clinical sessions. A key area of additional reflection regarding this kind of informal feedback was that there was not a clear pathway for recording it, so the education provider created a form to do so. This form would be accessible to management committees and programme staff.
- The visitors considered that this clarification and additional reflection was helpful to their understanding, and therefore considered performance was good. They did note that the education provider had created a template to capture informal feedback so that an audit trail existed for both feedback and action taken. This feedback template will inform the self-evaluation document as well as feed into governance committees. The visitors noted that this would be a good area for a future review to consider.
- **External examiners –**
  - The education provider's reflection on their relationship with their external examiner set out how the relationship was managed and how they considered and address feedback. There are both informal and formal means by which this can happen. The education provider has clearly considered the best ways to make sure that they have an effective relationship with the external examiner. The external examiner can have regular contact with learners enabling them to gain a clear understanding of all aspects of the programme.
  - Given the above, the visitors considered that performance in this area was good because they had seen evidence of regular reflection on the external examiner relationship in the review period.

**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 reviewed the data provided as part of their consideration of the portfolio. Their review did not highlight any issues needing further exploration.

- **Learner non continuation:**

- The learner non-continuation rate is below the benchmark level of 3%. Our review of the portfolio, and the quality activity, found learners on the HCPC provision were being well-supported to continue the programme. Learners' specific feedback around support and engagement was good.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - The education provider was performing above average in programme completion rates. This suggests that learners in the HCPC programme were being well-prepared for professional practice and that the education provider had reflected on how best to support learners.
- **Teaching quality:**
  - The education provider does not participate in the Teaching Excellence Framework, but they supplied information about how they monitor teaching quality through the portfolio. The visitors considered that teaching quality was of a high standard and that the education provider was able to reflect appropriately on quality.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - The education provider scored well above benchmark in the National Student Survey overall satisfaction section. Based on our review of the portfolio, and the quality activity focused on mechanisms for ensuring good learner feedback and consultation, we concluded learners had good support available and opportunities to offer suggestions for improvements and development.
- **Programme level data:**
  - We did not consider that there were any specific issues around this area. We did not see any programme-level data through the portfolio that raised concerns around any issues.

**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 2027-28 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, practice educators, partner organisations, and external examiners. We note the mechanisms in place that allows for these stakeholders to feedback to the education provider and how this is utilised.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engaged with three professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
  - The education provider engaged with bodies such as the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), the Quality assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) and NHS Education Scotland. They considered the findings of named regulators 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.
- In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a five year monitoring period is:
  - The visitors were satisfied with the ongoing performance of the education provider. Data points show they are performing as expected with regards to learner satisfaction, continuation, and outcomes. They have demonstrated they can appropriately respond to challenges and shown insightful reflections regarding their performance during the review period. The visitors agreed there is a low risk to their performance moving forward and therefore recommend the maximum review period.

### **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 2027-28 academic year.

**Reason for this decision:** The education provider submitted a strong portfolio with sustained in-depth reflection across all areas. There were no issues with the sustainability of any of their HCPC-approved provision. There are no large-scale ongoing projects or changes to the provision of which we need to monitor the

outcome. Across the board the education provider was performing well, and they have co-operated closely and appropriately with the performance review process.

Appendix 1 – 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>
V300 – Nurse Independent/Supplementary Prescriber	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2018

Appendix 2 – 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 the Highlands and Islands	CAS-01263-V8G6C4	Jim Pickard Beverley Cherie Millar	Five years	The visitors were satisfied with the ongoing performance of the education provider. Data points show they are performing as expected with regards to learner satisfaction, continuation, and outcomes. They have demonstrated they can appropriately respond to challenges and shown insightful reflections regarding their performance during the review period. The visitors agreed there is a low risk to their performance moving forward and therefore recommend the maximum review period.	None