
Performance review process report

Edinburgh Napier University, Review Period 2018-23

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of Edinburgh Napier University. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission against quality themes and found that we needed to undertake further exploration of key themes through quality activities
- Undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance, including when the institution should next be reviewed
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
 - Quality activity 1: We explored how the education provider implements feedback from learners, and how they monitor learner satisfaction overall. We considered that the education provider had clear mechanisms for gaining feedback and incorporating learners' thoughts and views on the programme.
 - The provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2028-29 academic year, because:
 - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users and practice educators.
 - The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - 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.
-

Previous consideration N / A as this process did not arise from a previous process

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

Next steps Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2028-29 academic year.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	4
About us	4
Our standards	4
Our regulatory approach	4
The performance review process	4
Thematic areas reviewed	5
How we make our decisions	5
The assessment panel for this review	5
Section 2: About the education provider	6
The education provider context	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	6
Institution performance data	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	8
Portfolio submission	8
Quality themes identified for further exploration	9
Quality theme 1 – Use of learner feedback to drive improvement	9
Section 4: Findings	9
Overall findings on performance	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	13
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	14
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	15
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	16
Data and reflections	17
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	17
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	18
Assessment panel recommendation	18
Education and Training Committee decision	18
Appendix 1 – summary report	20
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:

Jennifer Caldwell	Lead visitor, Occupational Therapist
Kathryn Campbell	Lead visitor, Physiotherapist
Mohammed Jeewa	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer
Chris McKenna	Advisory visitor, Occupational Therapist

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we required professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 5 HCPC-approved programmes across 2 professions and including an Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2007.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 2](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Occupational therapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2019
	Physiotherapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2019
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.

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

Data Point	Bench- mark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	231	246	2022	<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 was staffing their programmes and providing appropriate quantities of teaching and learning spaces and equipment.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	0%	2020-21	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 3%.</p>

				<p>We did not explore this specific issue in depth as the education provider appears to be very good at retaining learners.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	100%	2020-21	<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 5%.</p> <p>Based on this data, we did not consider that we needed to consider this area in great depth, as it indicates the education provider is well able to deliver learners into next steps.</p>
Learner satisfaction	79.9%	93.5%	2023-24	<p>This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms</p>

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

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

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

Quality themes identified for further exploration

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

Quality theme 1 – Use of learner feedback to drive improvement

Area for further exploration: The education provider submitted information in their portfolio about learner involvement. They provided detail about the processes used and the kind of feedback received. We considered that they had a clear record of engagement and discussion with learners during the review period. However, the visitors could not make a full assessment of performance during the review period. This was because the education provider did not include specific detail about how learner feedback was incorporated into the programmes. They also did not provide reflection on whether, for example, learners were satisfied with their opportunities to feed back. Without this information, it was impossible to determine whether the learner involvement was at the necessary level, so we explored through quality activity how learner feedback was put into practice, and how the education provider gauged service user satisfaction.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We had a virtual meeting with the education provider in which we requested additional reflection in certain areas.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained in the virtual meeting how they had put learner feedback into practice. They noted that there had been changes to assessment of clinical practice, to practice modules, in response to feedback from learners.

They also provided more detail about the Stop-Start-Continue model used to manage and implement feedback. The education provider noted this feedback was good overall. Learners had the opportunity to feed back on all areas of the programmes.

The visitors considered this was strong reflection and that it reflected good performance in this area. This was because the education provider was able to keep open channels of communication with an appropriately sized group of learners.

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 how they had used the annual planning process to consider resourcing and sustainability. The faculty in which the HCPC-approved programmes sit – the School of Health & Social Care - collaborates with central authorities as part of this process. The reflection noted how they had considered issues such as learner retention, learner experience and health of recruitment. Data is used in these reflections. The faculty as a whole uses this opportunity to define staffing needs, budgetary requirements and risks to programmes.
 - The key challenge identified through this process during the review period were recruitment to the occupational therapy provision and staff workload. The education provider explained how they had reviewed their recruitment process timeline to ensure that it met their needs. Regarding staff workload, the education provider noted that this is a standing item in the programme review process.
 - The education provider noted through their reflection that their HCPC provision remains well-staffed and that they face few issues with recruitment to these programmes.
 - The visitors considered that the education provider was performing well in this area, because they had clearly identified key risks to sustainability and taken defined actions to address them.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The reflection in this area focused on the education provider's shared initiatives with various stakeholders. They noted that they had long-standing partnerships with a number of NHS Boards for their various programmes, for example NHS Lothian, NHS Borders, NHS Dumfries and Galloway, NHS Fife and Tayside and the Scottish Ambulance Service. They noted too that they have regular meetings with NHS Education for Scotland (NES).
 - The education provider gave examples of several workstreams that they have taken forward as part of their work with these groups. These include joint bids for research funding, shared staff development and projects to improve and develop practice-based learning opportunities.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had demonstrated that they were working effectively with a range of partners.
- **Academic quality –**
 - The key context for the education provider's reflection in this area was the university-level standards framework. This sets out requirements and expectations for individual programmes, and provides metrics and key performance indicators (KPIs) through which programmes can be

objectively assessed. Data from the National Student Survey and from the education provider's own survey of recent graduates is used, as well as module evaluations.

- The education provider noted some of the good feedback they have received, from learners and from annual programme reviews. They also reflected on quality development actions still to be taken, including:
 - improved tracking of learner experience at all stages;
 - quicker responses to learner feedback;
 - more effective recording of actions taken in response to external examiner feedback.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider was clearly able to reflect on their methods for maintaining academic quality, and to adapt and improve as necessary.
- **Placement quality –**
 - The education provider noted that they reflect on placement quality via “module and programme overview, external examiner reports and input at Progress Boards”. Their agreements with NHS boards contain quality maintenance requirements.
 - A key part of the education provider's reflection was their desire to extend the range of placements available on the occupational therapy and physiotherapy provision, and to improve the development opportunities available to their practice educators.
 - The education provider also reflects on the quality of practice-based learning at the level of NHS Boards, on a yearly basis. They also use the Issues in Practice (IP) process, developed by regional stakeholders, as a way of monitoring placement quality in real time.
 - The education provider considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider was clearly able to reflect on placement quality through different mechanisms and take effective action as required.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The education provider's reflection focused on how they had identified areas for improvement within their interprofessional education (IPE). They noted some of the general challenges of providing appropriate IPE, including issues related to scheduling and learning spaces. They also gave some examples of concrete and specific difficulties of which they had become aware through their monitoring processes. For example, learners did not always fully understand what was required of them in IPE sessions. Additionally, the model used by the education provider to deliver IPE in practice-based learning relies on a certain amount of non-direct supervision and is therefore not always easy to monitor appropriately.
 - The education provider noted some of the actions they had taken in response to these findings. For example, they had undertaken a review of how they communicated the purpose of IPE to learners, and made the relevant sessions more explicit. They had also reviewed their training of practice educators to ensure that practice educators had a

clear view of how to assess learners' achievement and clinical skills even if they had not been physically present with that learner.

- The education provider reflected specifically on how they used IPE on the prescribing and physiotherapy / occupational therapy programmes, and stated that they had received strong feedback.
- The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly reflected on their delivery of IPE across the HCPC-approved provision, and made changes where appropriate during the review period.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they had used various mechanisms and initiatives to maintain and develop the quality and appropriateness of their service user and carer involvement. These included the allocation of a staff member from their programmes to be a lead on diversity initiatives for recruitment and learner experience and engagement.
 - The education provider has developed, and are implementing, an action plan, based on feedback from service users, to ensure that their service user involvement continues to be high quality and representative.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good. This was because the education provider had submitted a detailed account of how they had reflected on their service user involvement during the review period.
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider reflection on equality and diversity monitoring is guided and driven by institution-level policies.
 - For the HCPC provision, certain groups have been identified as being under-represented, notably ethnic minorities and those without a family background in higher education. The education provider has put together an action plan to improve performance for these groups. This action plan requires them to gather accurate data, to undertake specific targeted interventions, and to evaluate those interventions.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clear, defined mechanisms for making their programmes as accessible as possible to learners from different backgrounds.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider submitted reflections on long-term challenges facing all the programmes in the HCPC provision. For their physiotherapy programme, they noted that there is a national shortage of practitioners and that the profession is becoming more complex and demanding, with an ageing population and a move towards working in multi-disciplinary teams.
 - For non-medical prescribing, the education provider reflected on changes in the professional landscape which were likely to affect learners when they joined the Register. For example, the increasing need for patients to be involved in decision-making meant that learners required a clear understanding of what healthy and appropriate involvement looked like.

- Overall, the education provider highlighted three key issues identified as long term challenges: maintaining placement capacity, ensuring the recruitment process delivered the best candidates, and getting better feedback from stakeholders. They had action plans in place to address all of these areas.
- The visitors considered that performance was good because the education provider had clearly set out how they had reflected on upcoming challenges to their provision.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
 - Across their provision, the education provider used their regular review processes to consider how each programme might need to be amended or updated to embed the revised SOPs. They explained how each of the individual programmes were comprehensively reviewed and the content or delivery amended as necessary. The education provider submitted reflections on how this had been done.
 - For example, all modules on the physiotherapy programme were rewritten and remapped to ensure that they reflected the need for learners to take a leadership role and to embed equality and diversity in their practice. On the non-medical prescribing programme, case studies were reviewed to ensure that they reflected an appropriate diversity of service users. On the physiotherapy programme, to meet the revised SOP around centring the service user, all service user involvement was reviewed to ensure that it gave a clear sense of the service user's own experience.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider set out in detail how each programme had reflected on how they might need to change in light of the revised SOPs.
- **Learning and developments from the COVID-19 pandemic –**
 - The education provider reflected on how each of their programmes had adapted to the pandemic, and which of the adaptations had been taken forward post-pandemic. These adaptations tended to be similar across professional areas. For example, several programmes now make greater use of virtual learning, and offer more flexibility for learners who wished to use more virtual learning. The education provider also noted in the portfolio that the more frequent communication with practice educators required by pandemic conditions has improved their collaboration. Pastoral support for learners has also been developed, after the additional arrangements put in place during the pandemic to offer help to isolated learners proved useful in maintaining their wellbeing.

- The education provider has also retained some of the changes to assessment made during the pandemic, e.g. moving it online, as these offer more flexibility to learners. Also, digital upskilling of both staff and learners was implemented, as a result of the education provider considering how best to use new technologies.
- The visitors considered performance in this area was good, as the education provider had submitted a clear account of how each programme had reflected on what had worked well during the pandemic and what would be useful in the “new normal”.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** –
 - During the review period, the education provider significantly increased their use of clinical simulation. This was the main technological innovation. They reflected on why they had invested in this technology, how they had used it, and how they had enabled staff, learners and practice educators to gain most benefit from it.
 - They noted that they had delivered many training sessions, both informal and formal, to prepare these groups to use the technology. They also stated that they have feedback mechanisms in place so that any difficulties or issues with simulation can be discussed and addressed. They have specifically brought in service users to advise on the best way to use simulation, and regular meetings are held with staff to discuss best practice.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had reflected closely on the best way to make use of new technology and integrate it into their provision.
- **Apprenticeships in England** – Not applicable as this is a Scottish education provider

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education** – The education provider noted in their reflection that their institution-level quality committee sets strategic goals around quality compliance.
- They are aware of the consultation on the updated Quality Code; when appropriate this will be considered by their quality committee and integrated into their provision.
- The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider was clearly aware of the relevant requirements and had reflected on how they would react to the Quality Code update.
- **Office for Students (OfS)** – Not applicable as this is a Scottish education provider
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies** –
 - The education provider noted that they had made changes to both the physiotherapy and occupational therapy provision to align with recent

updates to guidance from the Royal College of Occupational Therapy (RCOT) and the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP).

- Similarly, during the review period they had taken account of updated guidance from the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPharm) around practice education and supervision. The education provider reflected on how to incorporate this updated guidance into their prescribing provision.
- The visitors considered performance was good because the education provider had clearly engaged well with relevant regulators and professional bodies.

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 –**
 - The education provider reflected on some of the areas where they had been working on curriculum updates during the review period. Some of these curriculum changes were downstream of their integration of the revised SOPs. For example, they noted some new assessment activities had been introduced to test learners' understanding of public health advocacy and equality and diversity. However, other developments were distinct from the SOPs revision. For example, they were already undertaking planning for full integration of update guidance and standards from the CSP and RCOT.
 - The visitors considered performance was good in this area, because the education provider was clearly reflecting on their curriculum in a structured way and making changes where appropriate.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider noted that professional body guidance had changed in several key areas.
 - During the COVID-19 pandemic, the education provider relied on virtual assessment guidelines from the professional bodies noted above. These guidelines are now used more widely in programme delivery, and have shaped the education provider's creation of new assessment materials and placement planning.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had shown evidence of considering and adapting to updated guidance.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**
 - The education provider reflected on some of the challenges they experienced around capacity. These included:
 - re-establishing capacity after the COVID-19 pandemic; and
 - the Scottish government not funding placement expenses for learners in Scottish institutions who undertake placement in England, making it hard to find appropriate placements for all learners.

- The education provider described how they were addressing these problems by appointing specific staff members to particular liaison roles. They also sought more funding from central government in Scotland to meet any shortfall. Additionally, they were ensuring that communication with learners around placement was prompt and accurate so that any capacity issues could be raised and resolved.
- The visitors considered performance was good, as the education provider had reflected on their opportunities and issues around capacity, and given examples of action being taken to capitalise on, or address, these.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

- **Learners –**
 - The education provider gave examples of some of the learner feedback they had received, and how they had reflected on the feedback. For example, learners on the physiotherapy provision identified digital skills gaps that were preventing them from achieving at their best on the programme. They also reported that they were not feeling appropriately prepared for placement. The education provider responded to both of these by introducing additional skills sessions and by restructuring some modules to better prepare learners for clinical settings.
 - On the occupational therapy programme, learner feedback is received in real time and results are reported back to learners as promptly as possible on a “You said, we did” basis. An example of the education provider’s reflection was their clarification for learners, in response to a complaint, of expectations around attendance and what steps would be taken if attendance was not adequate.
 - The visitors considered performance was good because they had seen evidence of the education provider receiving feedback and considering how best to implement it.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The education provider reflected on the feedback received from practice educators during the review period. Some examples of this feedback and the action taken in response include:
 - Practice educators felt under-prepared to supervise effectively, and so were offered a redesigned training package. After this training they report feeling more confident.
 - On the physiotherapy programme, practice educators requested, and were given, extra training to help them manage learners who were failing.
 - High-level feedback was received from a Health Board who said that they would like more direct contact with the programme team.

- The visitors considered that performance was good because the education provider had demonstrated responsiveness to practice educator feedback on the programme.
- **External examiners –**
 - The portfolio reflection included several examples of the education provider acting on feedback received from external examiners. For example, external examiners suggested more uniformity and reliability in moderation, and changes were made to ensure this. External examiners for that programme also contributed to discussions about whether assessment in the post-COVID “new normal” should remain mostly online or not.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had shown they had useful and constructive relationships with their external examiners.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel: We considered the data available about the education provider and concluded that the data indicated good performance across various areas.

- **Learner non continuation:**
 - The learner non-continuation rate is zero and we considered that this reflected good performance from the education provider in supporting learners to complete their programmes.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - The education provider is performing well above benchmark in this area, and data indicates that all those who complete programmes move on to employment or further study. The visitors were satisfied that there were no concerns about the education provider’s ability to help learners move on to the next stage of their academic or professional careers.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - The visitors considered that support for learners was strong, and that they were provided with a good experience by the education provider. The data confirmed that the education provider scored well in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The programme level data did not raise any concerns for the visitors.

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, the senior team, external examiners, practice educators and service users.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - The education provider engaged with the Royal College of Occupational Therapists, the Royal Pharmaceutical Society and the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy.
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
 - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
- What the data is telling us:
 - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year.

Reason for this decision: The Panel agreed with the visitors' recommended monitoring period, for the reasons noted through the report.

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on the next steps for the provider. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation (including their reasons) and any referrals.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Edinburgh Napier University	CAS-01376-C9F3C4	Jennifer Caldwell Kathryn Campbell	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 learners, service users and practice educators. • The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. • The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way. 	N / A

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-Registration)	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/01/2021
Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-Registration)	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/01/2021
MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-Registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/01/2021
Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-Registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/01/2021
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2020