
Performance review process report

University of the West of Scotland, Review Period 2018 - 2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of the University of the West of Scotland. 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 to consider which themes need[ed] 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 used quality activity to explore how the education provider was re-establishing appropriate service user involvement following some challenges identified in their portfolio. In particular, the visitors explored how feedback and other information from service users would drive improvement to programmes and improve learner experience. The education provider submitted a detailed response demonstrating that they were well on their way to restoring service user involvement and that they would be able to use information and input from service users.

Previous consideration	Not applicable 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 2027-28 academic year.
------------	---

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment.....	3
About us	3
Our standards	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The performance review process.....	3
Thematic areas reviewed	4
How we make our decisions.....	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: About the education provider.....	5
The education provider context.....	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider.....	5
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 feedback from service users to drive programme improvement.....	8
Section 4: Findings.....	9
Overall findings on performance	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	12
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection.....	14
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	16
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions.....	17
Data and reflections	18
Section 5: Issues identified for further review.....	19
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	19
Assessment panel recommendation	19
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:

Paul Blakeman	Lead visitor, Chiropodist / podiatrist / POM - Administration
Peter Abel	Lead visitor, Biomedical scientist
Prisha Shah	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors

have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we did not require professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because the lead visitors were satisfied they could assess performance and risk without needing to consider professional areas outside of their own.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 5 HCPC-approved programmes across 3 professions. 2 programmes cover post-registration education for supplementary prescribing; independent prescribing annotations. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2007.

Most of the HCPC-approved provision at the provider is recent, with only the biomedical science programme dating from before 2019. The education provider has been developing its offer over the period covered by this review. Three new programmes have been approved during the review period – undergraduate programmes in paramedicine and operating department practice, and the post-registration prescribing programme. The annual monitoring audit process in the old quality assurance model had already been withdrawn when those programmes were approved so they did not go through it. The biomedical science programme went through annual monitoring audit without significant issues arising. During the review period there have been considerable additions to the HCPC provision as noted above. This is the main area of change identified in the portfolio. As with other institutions the education provider has also had to manage its response to the COVID-19 pandemic and to make decisions about how far to return to the pre-COVID status quo in terms of teaching, assessment, practice-based learning etc.

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
Pre-registration	Biomedical scientist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2007
	Operating Department Practitioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2019

	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2020
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	290	302	26/06/2023	<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 learners broadly at the benchmark</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider supported their learners during the review period.</p>

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

Learner non continuation	3%	1%	2020-21	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced 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 improved by 2%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how the education provider supports learners to complete their programmes.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	94%	2019-20	<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 equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained.</p> <p>We explored this by examining how the education provider has prepared learners for entry to the workforce or further study.</p>
Learner satisfaction	77.9%	84.4%	2022	<p>This NSS data was sourced at [the subject level / the summary]. This means the data is [choose one of the</p>

				<p>following, format as a sentence]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject – for HCPC-related subjects • Summary – the provider-level public data <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 examining how the education provider was able to gather data on learner satisfaction and to implement changes based on that data.</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 feedback from service users to drive programme improvement.

Area for further exploration: The education provider's portfolio contained reflection on some of the difficulties that had arisen for with regards to the use of service users during the review period. As noted below in the ['Service users and carers' below](#), the main problems they faced were the COVID-19 pandemic and some service users' misunderstanding of their role during Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs).

However, they did not submit sufficient information about how they had incorporated service user input in learners' clinical practice. It also wasn't clear how they were planning to redevelop service user and carer involvement after the challenges mentioned above. Without this information, the visitors could not gain a full understanding of the education provider's ability to incorporate feedback during the review period.

They therefore wished to explore how the education provider used information provided by service users to inform learners' clinical skills, and what they were planning to do to address the difficulties that had arisen in their service user involvement.

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 an example of how feedback to and about learners' clinical skills was recorded in practice assessment documentation.

Additionally, they provided reflection for each of the HCPC programmes, setting out how they were planning to develop and restore service user involvement. Some of these mechanisms were still at the developmental stage, for example an initiative involving co-operation with the Scottish Ambulance Service to include service users. However, other mechanisms were in place, notably the use of Macmillan charity volunteers as service users and the involvement of dementia patients and their families.

The response was thorough and transparent. The visitors considered that it met their concerns. This was because it showed that in every curriculum area, the education provider was moving towards regaining an appropriate level and type of service user involvement. In light of this planning, the visitors considered that performance was good.

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 their overall financial position during the review period. As a result of running an operational surplus for three consecutive years, they were able to expand their provision, including their HCPC-approved provision.
 - The School of Health and Life Science was awarded additional funding during the review period to develop its facilities, and particularly its staffing. This was achieved through the Annual Budgeting and Planning process. This increase in staffing for the HCPC-approved provision was a response to a need for more staff identified by both the education provider and learners.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because they had seen reflections on the education provider's ability to use its internal reflection processes to maintain and develop the fitness for purpose of the HCPC provision.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The education provider reflected on how their different programmes interacted with relevant partner organisations, including NHS Health Boards, professional bodies, and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC).
 - They explained how they had used the Partnerships and Collaborations Committee (PCC) to maintain and grow key relationships during the review period. They also reflected on how relationships had delivered effective improvement. For example, they had undertaken a Quality Enhancement and Standards Review with the Scottish Government, which had commended several parts of their provision and also identified areas for improvement.
 - The education provider reflected on their new Principal's attempts to reset and improve relationships with local partners following the disruption caused by COVID-19, and to adapt to changing health and social care expectations and arrangements. COVID-19 had disrupted local arrangements by making it difficult to renew formal partnership arrangements, but this was now being addressed.
 - The visitors considered that the education provider was performing well in this area. This was because they saw a detailed reflection on how the education provider oversaw the relevant partnerships. This information showed that the education provider had reflected on the best way to develop and maintain the necessary relationships.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - The education provider reflected on how it uses three key mechanisms to ensure programme quality. These include: Institution-Led Review (ILR), institutional enhancement and annual monitoring process (IEAM), and External Performance Review processes (EPR).
 - Several developments and improvements in programme quality were delivered through these pathways during the review period. The education provider improved its use of real-time data for monitoring quality. They also introduced digital sign-off for clinical placement, and

a new level of quality reporting to ensure that such reporting was relevant to individual programmes. Additionally, they introduced a more flexible approach to quality reporting so that programmes could choose the most appropriate method.

- The key challenge identified during the review period was the need to make quality monitoring and reporting more streamlined, and more digital-based. The education provider was addressing this by the measures noted above.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly reflected well on the best ways to monitor and develop quality.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The education provider gave a description of the role of interprofessional education (IPE) on their programmes. The main way in which they deliver IPE is through regular cross-disciplinary events, and through modules specifically designed to incorporate IPE.
 - They reflected on some of the developments and challenges in this area during the review period. Developments included a more flexible timetabling system to bring learners together more, and experiments with hybrid learning and other alternative forms of learning. Challenges included the difficulties involved in bringing learners together because of the geographical issues within the region. This has been mitigated by the innovations in delivery noted above.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because they had seen clear reflection on how the education provider was developing its IPE and overcoming challenges.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider reflected on some of the difficulties they had faced in their service user involvement during the review period. Generally service users have been involved in programme design and development and in assessment, especially in Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs).
 - However, the COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted their ability to have face-to-face interaction with service users and they are still recovering from this disruption. Additionally, service user involvement with OSCEs had to be halted because some service users were not participating appropriately.
 - The education provider's portfolio was very transparent about their ongoing need to reinvigorate service user involvement. They noted that it was a priority for them to reintroduce such involvement as soon as possible.
 - The visitors used [quality activity](#) to explore this area further so that they could fully understand performance. After the quality activity, they considered that performance was good. While there were some difficulties in service user involvement, the portfolio and the quality activity, taken together, set out a pathway to overcoming these difficulties.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider included some strong reflection on how they ensure that equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) policies are followed and respected.

- The mechanisms for doing this include a high-level institutional EDI Committee involving senior management, and the appointment of an Associate Dean with special responsibilities in the EDI area. The EDI Committee had a very expansive and appropriate remit, and the new Associate Dean had already started on several projects during the review period.
- Specific measures included Report + Support and Athena Swan membership. The portfolio also reflected on the education provider's identification of "unconscious bias" as an important area for staff and learner development.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good as the education provider was clearly able to reflect appropriately on their approach to EDI issues.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider outlined future challenges that they had identified. These included: issues with funding in the sector, the cost-of-living crisis affecting learners and staff, recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic, and advances in technology (including AI). They also noted that ongoing industrial action by staff would affect their provision.
 - The education provider had established a Focus programme which was intended to deliver solutions in important areas of transformational change – learner experience, digital transformation, and organisational effectiveness.
 - The portfolio identified its "greatest challenge" as admissions and recruitment, and learner progression and retention. Looking forward they were aware that finding appropriate learners might be difficult, and that there was a need to ensure that the learners who had been recruited were appropriately supported. A large institutional project with several separate workstreams was underway to address these difficulties.
 - The visitors considered that this was good evidence that horizon-scanning was taking place, and that the education provider had considered changes that might need to take place.

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 submitted detailed thematic reflection on how they had incorporated the new SOPs across their provision. For example they had reviewed all modules on their programmes to ensure that they emphasised the need for close attention to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) related matters. They had also undertaken a detailed review of all their programmes to ensure that leadership and centring of service users was embedded. The centring of service users

was of particular note to the visitors because of the issues highlighted in [quality activity 1](#) and [institutional findings](#) above.

- The visitors considered that education provider had performed well in this area. This was because there had clearly been a large-scale project to consider the implications of the revised SOPs and to incorporate them as necessary.
- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - The education provider's reflection focused on the move to more virtual teaching technologies, and more virtual assessment required by the pandemic. They had also specifically reflected on whether assessment was affected by the pandemic and concluded that learners' scores had held up well.
 - They also reflected on the specific issues created by difficulties with placements during the pandemic. Their core response to this was to condense online teaching sessions and to record and repeat sessions for learners who had not been able to attend. They also adopted a more flexible approach to learning and teaching activities in general. For example by allowing different start and finish dates for placement than normal.
 - They co-operated with the Scottish Government to ensure learners were not adversely affected by the pandemic changes, wherever possible. They reflected on how they had achieved this, by reporting on how learner completion and achievement did not seem to have been affected.
 - Their reflection on both of these measures indicated that the initiatives had helped to expand access to learners whose learning had been disrupted during the pandemic. A certain amount of learning loss had been unavoidable in the initial stages, but the measures enabled them to help learners catch up in subsequent phases of the programme.
 - The visitors considered that the reflection was evidence that the education provider had managed well during the pandemic. They also considered that the education provider was taking seriously the opportunity to develop their offer in the new post-COVID-19 conditions.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The two key areas of reflection in this area were the growing use of clinical simulation as a routine part of all programmes, and adaptation to the COVID-19 pandemic and its consequences.
 - The education provider stated that simulation is in a process of constant development, with financial aid from the Scottish government. Two immersive suites were built for this purpose. A third is in development. Having a number of these suites is especially important for this education provider because of the wide geographical spread of their learners.
 - The education provider clarified how they would best use simulation to support learners in their programmes. For example, they gave a list of curriculum areas where learners on healthcare programmes were most likely to benefit from integration of simulation and curriculum. It was clear that they had considered which was the best virtual learning environment (VLE) to support their particular learning needs.

- The visitors considered that this reflected an effective and appropriate approach to technology and so they considered that performance was good.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - The education provider does not deliver apprenticeships in HCPC-regulated professions.
 - They do not mention in their portfolio any plans to deliver apprenticeships in HCPC-regulated professions. They did note that one of their programmes, the DipHE Operating Department Practice, had some similarities to the English apprenticeship model.

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 reflection in this area was focused on a Quality Enhancement and Standards Review (QESR), which was a requirement of the Scottish Funding Council (SFC). The QESR is carried out by the Quality Assurance Agency (Scotland). The education provider had clearly engaged thoroughly with this process and its requirements.
 - The education provider, as part of their reflection, noted both the commendations and the suggestions for improvement that had been generated through this process. The improvement suggestions included more training for learner representatives and for staff involved in assessment, a clearer process for change management, and better training for staff in handling data.
 - The visitors considered that performance was good in this area. This was because the education provider had clearly engaged appropriately with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and was being transparent about how to achieve the improvements that had been recommended.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - The education provider's reflection in this area noted that, while they do not directly receive reports on clinical partners, they are confident that their practice education providers are appropriate settings. This is because NHS Health Boards, the Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) and accredited NHS laboratories all have their own mechanisms for quality control. Ensuring that such mechanisms are in place is part of the education provider's process for initial placement approval. This indicates that they have reflected on the best way to ensure the suitability of external placements.
 - The education provider's reflection was also aided by learner feedback on placement. They also encourage learners to understand use the raising concerns procedure if necessary and appropriate.

- The visitors considered that performance was good, because the education provider was clearly able to ensure that the clinical placements used were appropriate. There was a clear pathway for reflecting on how best to ensure good practice education.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
 - The education provider noted that their NSS scores have mostly been strong during the review period. However, they did note some lower scores, and the action taken to address them. For example, in 2019 the score for the Applied Biomedical Science programme was at 65%. The portfolio included a detailed reflection on how the education provider had addressed this low score, through engagement with learners and a review of how the programme was being delivered. They noted that by 2022 the score had increased 11 percentage points, taking it above the benchmark. A similar reflective exercise was undertaken for the operating department practitioner programme.
 - This reflection indicated that the education provider monitored NSS scores closely, and was willing and able to reflect on the most appropriate pathway to address low learner satisfaction.
 - The visitors therefore considered that the education provider was performing well because they were aware of the strengths and weaknesses in learners' experience of their programmes.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - Not applicable for this institution as it is in Scotland and the OfS is an English organisation.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider reflected on their interaction with other regulators and professional bodies, on a programme by programme basis. They noted which programmes come under the remit of which bodies, including the Nursing and Midwifery Council and NHS Education Scotland. This section set out how the education provider synchronised internal and external quality processes. The education provider also noted that they kept in close touch with relevant professional bodies and regulators to ensure their programmes remained as up-to-date as possible.
 - The education provider showed that they had reflected on information received from relevant bodies by noting, for every programme, whether or not they had made any changes during the review period. They noted, for example, that their annual audits by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) had not resulted in any requirements from the IBMS that they make changes.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, as the education provider had clearly remained in close touch with regulators and professional bodies, and had reflected on actions arising from these relationships.

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 –**
 - In their reflection the education provider reflected in detail on improvements and developments to each of their programmes during the review period. All programmes have been through their regular annual internal review, and in addition all programmes were reviewed as part of the process to embed the new standards of proficiency.
 - In particular the education provider reflected on the significant changes to the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science. These included greater use of simulation on a new campus, as well as new clinical skills sessions made possible by new labs. In addition there was more focus on digital skills and the learner-tutor relationship.
 - Similarly, the paramedic and prescribing programmes both went through remapping exercises and changes to programme structure to improve learner retention.
 - The visitors were confident, based on the information received, that the education provider had multiple effective mechanisms for reflecting on necessary changes to the curriculum. The visitors therefore concluded that performance in this area was good.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider reflected in the portfolio how the new guidance from organisations like the Institute for Biomedical Science (IBMS) and Forum for Higher Education in Paramedic Science (FHEPS) has been incorporated into their programmes. This had involved changes in emphasis on the curriculum, including expansion into new areas such as public health. It has also meant a stronger community medicine focus.
 - The education provider noted that they would be seeking accreditation from the College of Paramedics (COP) for their updated and amended paramedic programme. There was a good reason why they had not done so yet, namely the upcoming revised guidance from the COP. They also reflected on why a proposed change to the biomedical science curriculum had been turned down by the IBMS. They noted that this was a reasonable decision.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly reflected effectively on relevant professional body guidance during the review period.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider submitted reflection on this area in the portfolio. In particular they noted their ongoing efforts to re-establish capacity in placements after COVID-19. They noted that all programmes had experienced pressure on placements during the review period. They mentioned how the relevant bodies were working with individual programmes to develop and maintain capacity.
 - In their response the education provider stated that they did not have plans to significantly increase learner numbers on their HCPC provision, partly because of the pressures of capacity. Additionally,

numbers for all programmes are dependent on the decision-making of NHS Education Scotland.

- The visitors considered that performance was good. This was because the education provider had submitted strong reflection on how they monitored, maintained and developed capacity in clinical learning.

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 submitted detailed reflection on how they gathered feedback from learners across the provision, and how they had taken action in response to such feedback.
 - For example, they use Staff-Student Liaison Groups to gather learner feedback. Regular virtual sessions are also held, to gather real-time views on learners' experience. There are other formal and informal channels for feedback, notably mid-term and end-of-year reviews, and group discussions of clinical placement experience.
 - It was clear from the portfolio that the education provider had recorded considerable feedback from learners, and had considered how best to incorporate that feedback into programme delivery and content. For example, in biomedical science, learner concerns about assessment clustering were addressed by spreading assessment more evenly. Paramedic learners requested a "buddy" system, which was introduced. Operating department practitioner learners had their IT problems resolved.
 - The visitors considered that the reflection was useful and that performance was good. This was because there was a clear commitment to reflecting on the best ways to gather, and respond to, learner feedback.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The portfolio contained several examples of how the education provider received, and took action on, input from practice placement educators. For example, they noted that the practice educators on the paramedic programme were concerned about their ability to mentor the number of learners who were on the programme. This was addressed by the education provider and the ambulance trust working together to clarify expectations for these practice educators.
 - There were numerous mechanisms for gathering practice educator feedback. These include the Employer Liaison Group (ELG) on the biomedical science programme, and for paramedic and operating department practitioner learners, direct regular meetings between education provider staff and operational managers in the relevant departments.
 - The education provider gave examples of action taken in response to such feedback. In particular, practice educators on the paramedic and biomedical science programmes wanted clearer expectations and

boundaries set at the beginning of clinical placements, and this was taken forward by the education provider. End of placement surveys have identified gaps in the preparation of some learners for their placements, and this has also been addressed.

- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. They had seen clear evidence of the education provider's willingness to seek feedback from practice educators and to consider the best ways to implement necessary changes.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider submitted reflection on how they responded to external examiner feedback and advice. In particular they identified two challenges faced by some external examiners during the review period: heavy workload and teething troubles with the rapid move to all-virtual working during the COVID-19 pandemic.
 - Other issues noted include inconsistency in volume of external examiners' responses, and inconsistency in how information was submitted to external examiners. The education provider committed themselves in their reflection to working on both these issues to ensure that good relationships were maintained with external examiners and that their input continued to be useful and high quality.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, as it was clear that external examiner feedback was taken into account, and that the education provider was genuinely trying to reflect on how best to help external examiners perform well.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

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

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel: The visitors considered the data as part of their decision-making. None of the data points they considered suggested issues that required further exploration.

- **Learner non continuation:**
 - The learner non-continuation rate was below the benchmark. This demonstrated to us that the education provider was performing well when it came to supporting learners to complete the programme.
 - We considered that the education provider's approach to supporting and enabling learners was good.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - The data showed that 94% of learners on the education provider's programmes moved on to further education or training, or employment. The benchmark is 94%. This suggests that the education provider is performing at the expected level in supporting learners into next steps. The portfolio review supported this conclusion because it showed that learners are well supported and have access to resources preparing them for professional practice.

- **Teaching quality:**
 - The education provider does not participate in the Teaching Excellence Framework but they provided good evidence of their ability to monitor and maintain the quality of their teaching. They also demonstrated that they can develop the skills of their staff.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - The education provider is underperforming its benchmark. This suggests that there may be issues with how learners are supported and engaged. However, the education provider did reflect on the reasons for this and so the visitors had no outstanding concerns. This was because they had seen mechanisms by which learners were contributing to programme improvement and quality monitoring.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The education provider provided good programme-level data. Some programmes are somewhat below their expected strength. However, the portfolio demonstrated that these lower cohort numbers can be managed without threatening the viability of the programmes, as funding is guaranteed.

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 local health Trusts, practice education providers, learners, service users, practice educators and programme staff.

- The education provider engaged with 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 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. We saw multiple examples of this in the initial portfolio and in responses to quality activity and requests for clarification.

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

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	FT (Full time)	Biomedical scientist			01/09/2007
BSc Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2020
DipHE Operating Department Practice	DL (Distance learning)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2019
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing Level 11	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2020
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing Level 9	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2020

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 West of Scotland	CAS-01262-C6K1F8	Peter Abel Paul Blakeman	Five years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were local health Trusts, practice education providers, learners, service users, practice educators and programme staff. • The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. • The education provider engaged with the NMC. They considered the findings of the 	None

				<p>NMC in improving their provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.• 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. We saw multiple examples of this in the initial portfolio and in responses to quality activity and requests for clarification.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

