

## Performance review process report

University of York, Review Period 2018-2023

### Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of the University of York. 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
- Reviewed the institution’s portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored 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
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2028-29 academic year, because:
  - Overall, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider’s reflection across all themes. They were reassured that there continues to be appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure quality. The education provider delivers only prescribing programmes, and the visitors did not identify any risk. There were no issues referred to other processes and the data also supported their overall performance.

<b>Previous consideration</b>	Not applicable. The performance review process was not referred from another process.
<b>Decision</b>	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• when the education provider’s next engagement with the performance review process should be</li> </ul>
<b>Next steps</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject to the Panel’s decision, the provider’s next performance review will be in the 2028-29 academic year</li> </ul>



## 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 .....	9
Section 4: Findings .....	9
Overall findings on performance .....	9
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	9
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 .....	18
Section 5: Issues identified for further review .....	19
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes .....	19
Assessment panel recommendation .....	19
Education and Training Committee decision .....	20
Appendix 1 – summary report .....	21
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution .....	22

## 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
Wendy Smith	Chiropodist/ Podiatrist, POM-Administration
Mohammed Jeewa	Service User Expert Advisor
Temilolu Odunaike	Education Quality Officer

Maddy Nicholson	Advisory visitor, Physiotherapist / Supplementary and 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.

## Section 2: About the education provider

### The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers four HCPC-approved programmes for eligible professions. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2014. These are all post-registration programmes for independent prescribing and supplementary prescribing annotations.

The education provider has not engaged with processes so far in the current model of quality assurance. They last engaged with the annual monitoring assessment process in the legacy model of quality assurance in 2019.

The prescribing programmes sit with the Faculty of Science.

As the education provider's only approved HCPC programmes are prescribing programmes, they have not completed how they embedded the revised standards of proficiency as they are not required to do this.

### 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		2006

### 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	Bench- mark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	160	73	2023/24	<p>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> <p>The education provider is recruiting below the benchmark.</p> <p>We explored this by through the assessment. Although the numbers are much lower than the benchmark, we were reassured that the institution remains financially stable. Each of the programmes is approved for up to 40 learners but have not recruited such numbers. However, the education provider noted consistent application numbers which the visitors found reassuring.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	2%	2019-20	<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 based on HCPC-related subjects.</p>

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

				<p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>We explored this through the assessment and were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	95%	2019-20	<p>This 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 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 through the assessment. We were satisfied with the education provider's reflection that those who complete their programmes there continue to make progress.</p>
Learner satisfaction	79.8%	79.9%	2023	<p>This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the summary. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</p> <p>The data point is broadly equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms.</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.

Following the visitors' initial review, there were areas we needed to seek clarification. These are captured in the Findings section below. There were no quality activities that needed to be recorded separately.

## 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's strategic aims focus on research, empowering education, global commitment, and community building. These ensure sustainability, equality, diversity, internationalism, and collaboration.
  - The Faculty Executive Board (FEB) directs the faculty's strategic direction within the University Strategy 2020 framework, ensuring academic excellence and financial sustainability. The FEB oversees strategic development, planning, performance monitoring, resourcing, and policy matters, with the Faculty Operations Group (FOG) providing operational oversight.
  - NHS-employed learners and apprentices have employer agreements for clinical demand, and programme oversubscription was managed through application windows. Consistent applicant numbers supported staffing and workload planning, with internal reviews ensuring the programmes met prescribing standards.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the education provider's reflection showed there continues to be appropriate staffing and other resources in relation to learner numbers.
  - Therefore, the visitors determined that the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**

- Learners are recruited from a wide geographical area which means each practice partner has their own policy. To ensure the education provider has a good understanding of each practice partner, meetings are organised between the Non-Medical Prescribing leads and their practice partners.
- During the review period the education provider considered how they will develop strategic links with partner organisations to support applications with reference to employer requirements for commencing study. These strategic links have assisted in programme sustainability. This was as a result of the greater understanding between the partnership organisations and the education provider in terms of workforce planning and programme commencement dates to maximise capacity and sustainability.
- The visitors were satisfied that the education provider has continued to perform well in this area.
- **Academic quality –**
  - To ensure academic quality, programmes require a minimum of three meetings between the learner, practice educator, practice supervisor with evaluations submitted to the Board of Examiners and liaison with an External Examiner.
  - The education provider noted that their current external examiner is a registrant and independent prescriber and a programme lead at a HEI. They follow the University policy on assessment, examiners, marking, and feedback. Their suitability was ensured through recruitment processes and annual assessments of their professional development and knowledge.
  - Further clarification was sought to understand the effectiveness of existing academic quality processes. We understood an annual subject expertise and currency audit was conducted through the Peer Observation Process (POP) and shared with the programme lead/team to identify strengths and areas for development. Annual Performance and Development Reviews (PDR) ensured professional registration and development. Programme level development activities were actioned via Programme Level Quality Improvement Plans and the University's overarching Quality Improvement Plan. The External Examiner's (EE) module evaluation comments were addressed at the Board of Examiners, with responses detailing actions and subsequent module development. The Apprenticeship Unit conducted an annual Quality Assurance (QA) cycle. This included analysis of data, observation of teaching, and auditing of planning documentation, benefiting all NMP learners by disseminating good practices across the teaching team.
  - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection on ensuring academic quality. Therefore, they determined the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Placement quality –**
  - The Handbook for Designated Prescribing Practitioners (DPP), Practice Educators and Practice Supervisors Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Non-Medical Prescribers (AHP only)

V300 provides information on how quality is ensured in practice-based learning.

- We understood learners can report issues to the programme team, who will liaise with the practice setting. Self-employed and non-NHS learners needed to demonstrate governance arrangements for the compulsory practice element. Practice-based learning areas were assessed via Practice Assessment Record and Evaluation (PARE) or the Care Quality Commission (CQC). Each learner was assigned an Academic Assessor (AA) and must nominate a Practice Educator and Supervisor, who met Nursing and Midwifery (NMC) standards and were verified by academics. Scheduled meetings between the learner, Practice Educator, and AA were documented in the e-Portfolio, ensuring progress and addressing any issues. The programme used a blended assessment approach to meet NMC requirements, with feedback from learners and DPPs considered for quality enhancement.
- From seeking further clarification, we understood the measures the education provider has in place to ensure the ongoing quality of a practice area including how they gathered and utilised feedback from the learner regarding their practice-based learning experience.
- We understood The Department of Health Sciences Practice Learning Links (PLL) Team audit placement areas worked with practice partners to support learners' practice education activity. The education provider noted that learners were encouraged to give feedback to the programme team and to utilise PARE.
- The education provider noted how the Safe Learning Environment Charter supported quality of practice-based learning. We understood this has helped to ensure the learner's ability to undertake learning within a practice environment with the assurance that governance and resources are met, including protected time for learning.
- The education provider's reflection and subsequent clarity received satisfied the visitors that they have performed well in this area.
- **Interprofessional education (IPE) –**
  - The education provider noted the programme is designed for HCPC and NMC registrants, promoting interprofessional learning by encouraging learners to develop networks. Learners introduced themselves during the introductory lecture and worked in diverse groups throughout the programme. Additionally, they were guided to complete practice hours with other professions as part of Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS) competency 10.
  - We understood learners were sometimes reluctant to engage with other professions during group work. To manage this, members of the programme team were given access to learner information including profession and clinical setting. Learners were encouraged to self-allocate during group work; however, academic staff also could do this if required to help encourage IPE.
  - Learners were encouraged to build networks with other learners on the programme. This has exposed the learners to a broader range of professions and has given them a more holistic view on prescribing practice.

- The visitors considered that the education provider had reflected on the nature of IPE, including challenges they have experienced and the steps they have taken to address them.
- Therefore, the visitors were satisfied the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Service users and carers –**
  - The education provider noted that a member of the programmes sits on their Service User and Carer Involvement (SUCI) Forum. Working groups have been formed to collaborate with SUCI on resource development, including programme design, teaching and assessment, and learner recruitment.
  - Through service user and carer feedback, the skills of a prescriber were established. Teaching materials were co-produced by service users and carers whilst providing adequate support.
  - The education provider's reflection , demonstrated that there continues to be a strategic link between their SUCI Forum and the programmes. It was also clear that service users have directly contributed to programme development and delivery.
  - The visitors were therefore satisfied that the education provider is performing well in this area.
- **Equality and diversity –**
  - The education provider noted they are dedicated to ensuring inclusivity and accessibility in all aspects of university life, fostering a culture where everyone can contribute. Inclusive facilities include all-gender toilets, prayer rooms, a nursery, a family-friendly room in the library, hearing loops, and breastfeeding facilities.
  - In their reflection, the education provider described some of the actions they have taken to remove barriers for learners so that the whole learning experience and means of delivery were accessible. For example, they noted the learning technology Replay (Panopto) enabled learners to work through lecture material at their own pace. Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) Course Tools also now include an Accessibility Report.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the education provider had reflected on a variety of ways in which Equality and Diversity policies were complied with both currently and with a view to the future. They noted the reflection covered a range of elements including curriculum review to prepare learners as culturally competent practitioners and actions to support a range of diverse needs within the learner cohorts.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the education provider has continued to perform well in this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
  - As part of the long-term challenges identified by the education provider, we understood learners had to go through substantial travel due to their vast geographical locations. We noted the impact this has had on their ability to engage with and successfully complete the programme.
  - As a future plan, the education provider is looking to engage with different stakeholders to explore the possibility of using a blended learning approach. This will involve the use of both blended and face-

to-face approaches. Learner feedback will be taken to understand any impact the changes may have on learner demands.

- As part of their successes, the education provider reflected on the delivery of the programmes as an online provision during the Covid-19 pandemic. Their reflection on this has provided the opportunity to explore this different format, whilst continuing to deliver the programmes.
- The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection and considered they have performed well in this area.

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

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

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learning and developments from the COVID-19 pandemic –**
  - The education provider reflected on the nature of the new methods of delivery that were adopted during the pandemic. They explained how useful / positive elements of these approaches are being selectively preserved and incorporated going forward.
  - For example, they reflected on how the programme team worked with the education provider to propose changes to the assessment format and teaching methods to enable the programmes to continue to be delivered. As a result, the programme team was able to develop a virtual learning environment and the use of video conferencing to support learners both academically and pastorally. For example, the introduction of a short meeting on zoom at the start of the teaching day. These timetabled video meetings allowed learners to feel supported and helped with engagement of learning materials.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the education provider recognised alternative methods of delivery that were required as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and how successful aspects of these developments are being incorporated going forward.
  - The visitors therefore determined the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
  - The education provider reflected on the challenges of using an old version of VLE – Blackboard, and how they transitioned into to a newer version – Blackboard Ultra. We understood the old version had reduced functionality and could not be supported beyond December 2023.
  - To develop the new VLE, a VLE transformation project was set up including the roll out of their Turnitin Feedback Studio. Benefits of this for learners included integrated feedback and mark release, and improved visibility of marking progress for the programme team members.

- We sought further clarification on how artificial intelligence (AI) advanced may have impacted on learners. The education provider noted their policy on Acceptable Assistance with Assessments and guidance aligns with Russell Group principles and QAA advice on using generative AI tools in education. It emphasised the importance of recognising limitations, risks, and ethical issues. We noted the education provider supported learners in understanding and applying these tools appropriately, clarifying acceptable use in assessment briefs and guidelines. Programme handbooks warned against academic misconduct and specified that AI should not be used to generate assessment answers unless explicitly permitted. We understood Turnitin was used to ensure proper integration of material and to identify plagiarism and poor academic practices.
- The visitors were satisfied with the information provided and determined the education provider has performed well in this area.
- **Apprenticeships in England –**
  - The education provider noted the programmes were co taught with learners undertaking the programme as a standalone qualification and those undertaking it as part of the Advanced Clinical Practice (ACP) programme. They noted they had to revise some of the learning materials to comply with the apprenticeship standards.
  - From seeking further reflection, we understood the non-medical prescribing programme offers two cohorts per year: one in September for ACP apprentices and standalone learners, and another in February for standalone learners. The programme lead used prior learning information from ACP enrolments to determine how many apprentices needed the programmes in their second year. Over time, fewer ACP apprentices required the programmes as they had completed it previously. The education provider reflected that strong relationships with practice partners and weekly meetings with the programme administrator helped them to manage the programme’s sustainability and future planning.
  - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider’s reflection and determined they are performing well in this area.

**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 –**
  - As part of the further clarification received around this area, the education provider noted the UK Quality Code is used as a key reference point to design, deliver and monitor provision at the institution level.
  - They noted their last inspection by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) was in 2012, which therefore had no impact on this performance review.

- The visitors were satisfied the education provider continues to perform well in this area.
- **Office for Students (OfS) –**
  - We understood, from seeking further information, that the education provider has been investigated by the OfS as there had not been any concerns brought to their attention.
  - The education provider reflected on how they ensure compliance with the B Conditions of registration through annual reviews, policy evaluations, academic committees and the analysis of student satisfaction surveys. The B conditions are conditions of registration for quality and standards set by the OfS which all higher education providers must meet in order to remain registered.
  - We were satisfied the education provider has continued to perform well in this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
  - The education provider reflected on the impact of the change in NMC standards on their Non-Medical Prescribing programmes. We noted the programmes were redesigned and approved for delivery from September 2020 following the changes made by NMC.
  - The education provider noted low learner intake numbers from Pharmacists prior to the change. This led to a withdrawal of accreditation from the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) which meant the NMP programmes are no longer delivered to Pharmacists. We understood the programme team will continue to monitor the situation and may decide to reintroduce the programmes to this professional group in the future if there is sufficient demand.
  - The visitors considered the reflection useful and were satisfied the education provider had performed well in this area.

**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 –**
  - Following the HCPC's adoption of the updated RPS Competency Framework for all Prescribers, effective from September 2022, the education provider noted they have revised materials for their programmes. They added they mapped all documentation, including module descriptors and session outlines to the new framework. In addition, they updated the e-portfolio used for learner assessments to align with the latest framework, starting with the September 2022 cohort.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the education provider is performing well in this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
  - The education provider reflected on how they have revised the curriculum to include a lecture linked to remote consultation as part of

the NHS plans to manage the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. We understood this continued as part of the programme and has helped in highlighting the needs for any health profession programme to remain up to date with current issues.

- Further clarification was sought on the education provider's reflection on The Society of Radiographers Practice Guidance for Radiographer Independent and or Supplementary Prescribers. We understood the change of legalisation, to enable therapeutic radiographers to prescribe a limited formulary of controlled drugs, took effect from 31st December 2023. The education provider has continued to align with the change.
- Learners on the NMP programmes were required to complete a personal formulary and discuss it with their practice educator as part of their e-portfolio assessment. The programmes included various taught sessions within a curriculum mapped to the RPS competency framework, with updates reflecting recent legislative changes. Learners were taught in multi-professional groups and encouraged to consider different prescribing rights and their impact, particularly regarding RPS competency 10 prescribe as part of a team - on team prescribing.
- The visitors were satisfied that the education provider has continued to make changes in line with changes in professional body guidance. Therefore, the visitors determined the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**
  - The education provider reflected that learners on the programme are required to identify their own practice-based learning and this was often within their place of employment. As the nature of practice-based learning and the supervision is set out as part of the application process, we understood this assured capacity.
  - We were satisfied with the education provider's reflection and determined they had performed well in this area.

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

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

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learners –**
  - The education provider reflected on the feedback received from learners on one of their modules (Pharmacology) and the exam. They noted this had been the main aspect of feedback from learners. We understood the required pass mark for the exam was 80% for the pharmacology related to prescribing and 100% for numeracy related to prescribing. Some learners identified concerns around the amount of pre lecture work related to the course. To address the concerns, the education provider made changes to the introductory lecture to now discuss the teaching and assessment strategy used, focusing on the support available to learners.



- As part of the quality assurance (QA) process, learner feedback was documented in the programme QA report and reviewed by the external examiner. The programme lead reported the feedback to the Board of Examiners meeting, where the programme team discussed and decided on any necessary actions.
- Further clarification was sought around the education provider's reflection on the effectiveness of the process to seek, review and act upon feedback from learners. We understood learners provided feedback through module evaluations and were encouraged by reminders on the VLE. The Module Lead reported this feedback in the module QA report, which was published on the VLE, and recorded the number of learner responses for transparency.
- Learner representatives gave feedback informally via the termly Student-Staff forum and formally through the Postgraduate Teaching Committee, Apprenticeship Committee, and Board of Studies. Actions based on feedback were communicated through 'You Said, We Did' notices. For apprenticeship routes, feedback was collected through periodic surveys to inform curriculum design and future developments, and ongoing feedback was encouraged through various means.
- Through the initial reflection and subsequent clarification received, the visitors were satisfied the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Practice placement educators**
  - The education provider reflected on the feedback from practice educators which focused on problems around fitting in their role with other clinical responsibilities. We understood Non-Medical Prescribing forum meetings were held with practice partners providing an opportunity for the programme lead to feedback on each cohort and discuss any feedback.
  - One of the challenges noted was around the use of a secure portal to enable practice educators to update information. The education provider noted they have developed a google site detailing information related to the programme and their role, which practice educators can access. They also developed a handbook for practice educators and practice supervisors, and this is made available before the programme starts. We understood this has helped practice educators to plan their role alongside their clinical responsibilities.
  - From seeking further clarification around the effectiveness of the process to seek, review and act on feedback from practice educators, we understood feedback was gathered through periodic surveys to inform curriculum design and future developments. Partnership meetings provided training, standardisation, and industry updates, with minutes audited to ensure actions were logged. The programme team used relationships with practice partners to gain feedback from stakeholders and update them on minor programme changes. Regular attendance at practice partners' NMP forum meetings and contributions to NMP study days helped maintain these relationships. The development of the DPP supervisor google site aimed to enhance feedback collection, acknowledging the importance of supervisor feedback and the challenges in obtaining it.

- Through the initial reflection and further clarification, the visitors were satisfied the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **External examiners –**
  - In their external examiner feedback, the education provider noted comments were made around the robustness of the plan to support learners.
  - For example, as part of the developments, we understood a formative exam opportunity was scheduled which gave learners the opportunity to experience the exam structure. In addition, learners were given support with exam time management strategies such as signposting them to resources within the education provider. We understood the introduction of these measures have helped to manage assessment stress and prepare learners for the summative exams.
  - The visitors were satisfied that the reflection the education provider is acting on external examiner feedback. They therefore determined the education provider had performed well in this area.

**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:**
  - In their reflection, the education provider noted the low number of HCPC learners undertaking the programmes. We understood there were only six learners on the programmes in the 2022/23 academic year and because of this data can only be analysed at programme level. However, we understood there is a total of 73 learners on the programme including NMC learners. The education provide wishes to maintain the approved numbers and we have been reassured from our assessment that they continue to be financially stable.
  - The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - In their reflection, the education provider noted the low number of HCPC learners undertaking the programmes. We understood there were only six learners on the programmes in the 2022/23 academic year. The visitors noted that the low number of learners has meant full analysis was not possible.
  - They noted a slightly higher number of those completing the programme when compared with the benchmark. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - In their reflection, the education provider noted they have a robust process that ensures learner feedback and overall satisfaction is collected and reported upon.
  - The Data showed learner satisfaction is higher than the benchmark which meant they had performed above sector norms.

- Therefore, the visitors were satisfied the education has continued to perform well in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
  - The education provider noted a breakdown of learners across their Level 6 and level 7 programmes, including staffing rates.
  - Although the visitors identified the low numbers of HCPC learners. From additional information received, we noted the total number of learners on the programmes, including NMC learners was much higher. We were also reassured of sufficient resources for all learners. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education provider's performance in this area.

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

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

## Section 5: Issues identified for further review

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval or focused review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process

## Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

### **Assessment panel recommendation**

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year.

### **Reason for next engagement recommendation**

- Internal stakeholder engagement
  - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, and external examiners. This ensured the education provider's performance had not identified any risks for delivering provision of good quality.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engaged with a number of professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
  - The education provider engaged with the Nursing and Midwifery Council, Office for Students, Royal Pharmaceutical Society and other bodies.

- They considered the findings of other regulators such as the General Pharmaceutical Council and the Quality Assurance Agency in improving their provision.
- The education provider considered 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 considered 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 York	CAS-01410-M3T5M1	Nicholas Haddington  Wendy Smith	Five years	Overall, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection across all themes. They were reassured that there continues to be appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure quality. The education provider only delivers prescribing programmes and the visitors did not identify any risk. There were no issues referred to other processes and the data also supported their overall performance.	None

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 and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 6	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/10/2014
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 7	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/10/2014
Supplementary Prescriber (Level 6)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/10/2014
Supplementary Prescriber (Level 7)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/10/2014