Approval process report

University of Lincoln, Diagnostic Radiography, 2022-23

Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve a diagnostic radiography programme at the University of Lincoln. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme are fit to practice.

We have:
- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area.
- Reviewed the programme against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Recommended all standards are met, and that the programme should be approved.
- Decided that all standards are met, and that the programme is approved.

Through this assessment, we have noted:
- The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.

Previous consideration	Not applicable. This approval process was not referred from another process.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: • whether the programme is approved.
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: • The provider's next performance review will be in the 2027-28 academic year.

Included within this report

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 approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme(s) detailed in this report meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme(s) approval / 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 approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:
- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)

- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

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 this review:

Helen Best	Lead visitor, Radiographer, Diagnostic Radiography
Shaaron Pratt	Lead visitor, Radiographer, Diagnostic Radiography
John Archibald	Education Quality Officer
Saranjit Binning	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 14 HCPC-approved programmes across seven professions. It is a higher education institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2005.

The education provider engaged with our current model of quality assurance in 2021-22 for new speech and language therapy provision, and in 2022-23 for the paramedic profession.

The last annual monitoring was 2018-19 in the legacy model of quality assurance. The education provider engaged with the major change process in the legacy model. In 2019 they introduced a new programme, Certificate of Higher Education (Cert HE) Ambulance Clinical Technician. Learners in the third year of the programme were given the option to 'top-up' previous qualifications to BSc level. While this programme does not lead to HCPC registration, they share resources with HCPC-approved programmes. In 2021 they modified existing modules, learning methods, and learning outcomes.

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	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2006
	Occupational therapy	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2019
	Paramedic	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2018
	Physiotherapist	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2018
	Practitioner psychologist	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2005
	Speech and language therapist	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2023
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2005

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.

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	230	260	2022	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 is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is proposing through the new provision.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	4%	2020-21	This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 2%. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there was no impact on SETs considered.

Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	94%	98%	2019-20	This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 7%. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there was no impact on SETs considered.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Gold	2017	The definition of a gold TEF award is "Provision is consistently outstanding and of the highest quality found in the UK Higher Education sector." We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there was no impact on SETs considered.
Learner satisfaction	77.6%	88.1%	2023	This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the summary. This means the data is the provider-level public data. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.

We also considered as follows:

- NHS England (Midlands) – we received intelligence that there are currently pressures on the provision of practice-based learning in the Midlands. This was particularly impacting the physiotherapy profession and therefore we did not consider this for the proposed programme.

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

<u>Admissions</u>

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Information for applicants** –
  - The education provider will use the school's Admissions Guidance for the programme. It builds on the institution wide admissions policies to include the professional requirements of the programmes within the school. It provides guidance to all admissions onto the pre-registration programmes (undergraduate, postgraduate and apprenticeships). It links to the school's website where details of each programme are available to prospective learners. It is reviewed annually by the school Teaching Leadership Team.
  - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health** –
  - The Admissions Guidance outlines how professional body or regulatory requirements may require a different level of English language comprehension on completion of the programme. International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirements will align to the recommendations of the College of Radiographers (CoR) of seven, to account for the early placement requirements and the technical language required.
  - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)** –

- o The education provider will use their institutional wide policy, University of Lincoln Accreditation of Prior Learning Policy (2018). This policy is set with minor amendments where professional requirements mandate. It also functions as the standard for accreditation of certified learning and accreditation of experiential learning.
  - o The proposed programme will also use School of Health and Social Care admissions guidance which articulates the programme specific modifications from the institution wide policy.
  - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion** –
  - o All staff involved in recruitment interviews are required to undertake equality, diversity and inclusion training and unconscious bias training. All academic staff in the school are involved in interviews for their programmes. For programmes with very high application numbers there is support from other programme teams to ensure timely responses.
  - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register[1]** –
  - o The education provider is registered with the Office for Students (OfS) which is an independent public body. They report to Parliament through the Department for Education (DfE). Registration with the OfS ensures the education provider has the power to award degrees and titles to learners, enabling them to gain suitable qualifications to enter the Register.
  - o All programmes are assessed by the University Programme Oversight group to ensure delivery of the provision to the expected threshold level of entry to the Register.
  - o The education provider is currently approved by the HCPC to deliver degree-level programmes in paramedic science, physiotherapy, speech and language therapy and occupational therapy.
  - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

---

[1] This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

- **Sustainability of provision** –
  - The education provider uses its University Programme Oversight Group to assess all proposed programmes to ensure consideration of finance, IT, planning, marketing, library resources, careers, business and academic risk, estates. These considerations evidence the sustainability of the programme. The proposed programme has been scrutinised and approved for development by this group.
  - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Effective programme delivery** –
  - The school is part of the College of Social Science and reports through Programme Leads, Associate Professors, deputies, and the Head of School. Examples of the quality assurance tools which will be used to ensure effective programme delivery include continuous programme monitoring, programme health and performance monitoring, and periodic academic review.
  - These mechanisms ensure there are appropriate staff in place to enable effective programme delivery, and the education provider has effective monitoring and reviews in place to ensure ongoing sustainability.
  - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Effective staff management and development** –
  - The education provider runs an annual performance review and has development planning which all staff involved in the programme will be required to participate. If school programme staff are completing the PGCert Health Professions Education, they will be provided with appropriate support. The programme is designed to prepare health care professionals to develop an educational role in academia and practice.
  - There is also a funded Academic Professional Apprenticeship which staff can complete. This is a work-based learning programme designed to equip new academics with the knowledge, skills, and behaviours they need for working in the Higher Education sector. The apprenticeship offers a development opportunity for new academic staff and has been designed to support the education provider's commitment to teaching excellence and great learner experience.
  - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level** –
  - The education provider has an Academic Partnerships Quality Assurance Manual which outlines their processes for partnership approval, monitoring, and review. Their office for quality, standards and

partnerships manages this institutional policy. They work in partnership with local NHS Trusts to ensure the requirements of this policy are met.
- o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
- o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Academic quality** –
  - o The Office for Quality Standards and Partnerships is responsible to the Academic Board through the Academic Affairs Committee for the assurance and enhancement of the quality and standards of programmes and awards.
  - o The school is part of the College of Social Science and reports through programme leads, associate professors, deputies, and the head of school.
  - o The programme will apply continuous programme monitoring, periodic academic review, and postgraduate taught experience survey as quality assurance tools.
  - o The education provider ensures academic quality by putting appropriate staff in place to deliver the programmes and monitoring the programmes over time to ensure they are sustaining high quality.
  - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments** –
  - o The education provider has processes in place for placement allocation and completion. School level processes outline the expectations of both learners and practice educators in relation to practice learning.
  - o The education provider has processes in place for learners to raise concerns. These include Academic Complaints, Raising Concerns Process and Guidance, Whistleblowing (Public Interest Disclosures) Policy, and Problem Resolution Protocol.
  - o Biennial audits of placement providers are undertaken to ensure they align to the schools' processes and have appropriate safe and supportive environments for learners. Practice educators are required to undertake training, and this will be facilitated by the education provider.
  - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Learner involvement** –

- o The education provider has subject committee meetings each semester which involves the programme team, learner representatives, the appropriate Associate Professor or Deputy Head of School, the Subject Librarian, and a representative from the practice placement hub. Learner representatives give feedback in these meetings. They are also informed of any potential updates or changes, to feed back to the wider learner body for consultation.
    - o Lincoln Academy of Learning and Teaching (LALT) oversees learner engagement and the learner experience. LALT administers module evaluations which are delivered electronically at the end of each module.
    - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
    - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Service user and carer involvement** –
    - o The Together Group is a diverse patient and public involvement group who work with the school across the provision. They are involved with programme and curriculum design.
    - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
    - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Support** –
    - o The education provider's Fitness to Study Policy 2016 will provide support offered by personal tutors and the education provider's learner wellbeing service, such as a wellbeing toolkit and cost of living advice. The Raising Concerns Process and Guidance, and Problem Resolution Protocol provide school-level support. The education provider's learner services and academic complaints process are both institution wide processes.
    - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
    - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Ongoing suitability** –
    - o Learners will be subject to Fitness to Practise processes in line with the school policy as outlined in the general regulations. As mentioned above, the provider has processes in place for raising concerns, whistleblowing, and problem resolution.
    - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
    - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)** –
    o The education provider's work is underpinned by their University of Lincoln Interprofessional Higher Education Network 2020-2025 Strategy.
    o The school delivers four other allied health profession (AHP) programmes (paramedic science, speech and language therapy, occupational therapy, and physiotherapy) as well as social work, nursing, and midwifery. The school hosts a large interprofessional event annually which includes all these professions plus up to six others from the wider education provider.
    o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
    o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion** –
    o The education provider uses institution wide policies covering inclusive practice, equality and diversity. They hold the Race Equality Charter bronze award, Advance HE's race equality charter to improve the representation, progression and success of Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic staff and learners within higher education. The education provider stated they are one of only 21 UK institutions to hold this award.
    o The school holds the Athena Swan Bronze award, which recognises work undertaken to address gender equality. Six of their Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and Medicine (STEMM) Schools hold bronze awards, their first Silver Award was achieved in 2019 through the School of Psychology.
    o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
    o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Objectivity** –
    o Through the initial validation planning the programme team are supported by the Associate Professor for Quality and the Associate Professor for Teaching and Learning to ensure assessment authenticity and variety across the programme, links to the module learning outcomes and the appropriateness for the level of study. This is ratified by the validation event.
    o Assessments are marked against level marking criteria (in this case level 4, 5 and 6) which consider knowledge, cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills, and scholarship. All modules are internally moderated, with examples from all markers and all bands being

considered for a minimum of 10% of the cohort or larger for very small cohorts. A sample is then externally moderated by an expert in the field before the results are ratified at an exam board.
- o Any modification to assessments is reviewed by the School, the University Quality team and the External Examiner.
- o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
- o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

- **Progression and achievement** –
  - o Individual learner's marks are discussed at the subject progress panel, attended by the Associate Professor for the suite of programmes, the programme lead and programme team. Individual achievement and progression and issues for personal tutors to support should things not be progressing as expected are considered here.
  - o The programme will undergo a programme health check annually where the programme team will present the data on factors such as admission, retention, marks, degree classifications, and learner feedback. This allows the team to see trends across cohorts and comparisons with other AHP programmes.
  - o The external examiner will also ensure degree classifications are commensurate with the wider sector.
  - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

- **Appeals** –
  - o The education provider and learners will have institution wide policies available to them. These can be accessed through the University of Lincoln Student Services which provide services for disputing grades and hold a review and appeals process.
  - o This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs.
  - o We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- Currently the staff team consists of a Programme Lead (1.0 whole time equivalent (wte)) and Senior Lecturer (0.6wte) to deliver the proposed

programme. As the number of learners increase there are plans to recruit additional staff to support the proposed programme.

- The education provider has recently updated their facilities to accommodate the additional learners, which has included the expansion of the seminar rooms and simulation suites. They are also in the process of building a virtual reality suite. In addition to this, learners will have access to the clinical skills suites where they will be provided with the opportunity to familiarise themselves with a ward environment.

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	FT (Full time)	Radiographer, Diagnostic radiographer	20 learners; 1 cohort	16/09/2024

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. 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 met our standards.

We have reported on how the provider meets standards, including the areas below, through the Findings section.

Quality theme 1 – Appropriate number of suitably qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme for the number of learners on the programme.

Area for further exploration: As background information, visitors noted inconsistencies with the learner numbers provided in the documentation. For

example, on the approval request form the education provider stated they would be recruiting 30 learners per year. However, the Portfolio Oversight Group document stated they would recruit 20 learners. Further clarification was therefore sought on the number of learners that would be recruited per year.

The visitors noted 1.6 WTE roles had been allocated to deliver the programme to 20 learners, however it was not clear what the exact split was across two members of staff and how absences would be covered. In addition to this, the visitors acknowledged the education provider intended to use clinical experts and associate lecturers to assist with delivering the programme. Based on the Curriculum Vitaes (CVs) provided, there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate these individuals had appropriate teaching experience. Due to the uncertainty about learner numbers, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on if there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email and documentary evidence from the education provider. We considered this would be the most effective method to understand how the programme demonstrated this area.

Outcomes of exploration: In their response, the education provider confirmed they would be recruiting a maximum of 20 learners in September 2024, with the aim of increasing this to 25 learners for the next intake. The staff allocation for the 20 learners would be 1 (WTE) Programme Lead and 0.6 (WTE) Lecturer, however further staff will be recruited in line with the increase in learner numbers. With regards to covering sickness and absences, the education provider informed us there is additional capacity within the school to support the programme if necessary. Currently there is an associate professor who is a diagnostic radiographer within the School and there is also other expertise, such as social work, physiotherapy, occupational therapy and nursing.

With regards to experience, we noted the associate lecturers are provided with training and have access to the Principles of Teaching and Learning modules. They are also offered support with resources and teaching materials and advise them on the areas they need to cover. It was noted how a similar approach was adopted with clinical experts. The input from clinical experts was specific to a specialised area and therefore the knowledge and expertise would be specific to the session being delivered, however relevant supported would be provided by the team.

The visitors acknowledged the additional information supplied by the education provider and were satisfied this demonstrated there were an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme.

Quality theme 2 – Appropriate number of suitably qualified and experienced practice educators to support safe and effective learning.

Area for further exploration: Visitors noted all practice educators had to be registered with the HCPC. They acknowledged the placement audit document that had to be completed by the practice-based learning providers, required the details of the practice educator. However, it was not clear at what point these audits were completed. Therefore, it was unclear to the visitors how the education provider ensured there were an adequate number of practice educators to support the proposed learner numbers prior to the start of practice-based learning. Furthermore, there was no evidence of how they would ensure practice educators had relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners on this specific programme.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email and documentary evidence from the education provider. We considered this would be the most effective method to understand how the programme demonstrated this area.

Outcomes of exploration: Visitors acknowledged the education providers 'Process for educational audits in placement' document. This process enabled the education provider to monitor live data, which included learner numbers and availability of practice educators to support learners. As part of this process the education provider and the practice-based learning sites were required to discuss learner numbers regularly, which enabled them to manage capacity. Visitors noted this process ensured there was an adequate number of practice educators for the proposed learner numbers and that it was completed three months prior to the placements commencing. We recognised the education providers commitment to working with stakeholders to increase the number of practice educators, which would support future growth.

The education provider offered in house training to practice educators, which covered the assessment strategy, the MyPad Portfolio, overview of the module's learners were undertaking and placement objectives and expectations. Based on the information provided it was clear this training prepared practice educators appropriately to support learners during placement.

The visitors acknowledged the additional information supplied by the education provider and were satisfied this demonstrated there were appropriately qualified and experienced practice educators to support safe and effective learning.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

The visitors were satisfied that no conditions were required to satisfy them that all standards are met. The visitors' findings, including why no conditions were required, are presented below.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** – this standard is covered through institution-level assessment.

- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
    - The selection and entry criteria are clearly articulated and set at an appropriate level for an undergraduate programme. The entry criteria is available on the education provider's website and accessible to applicants.
    - The evidence confirmed appropriate academic and professional entry standards would be applied fairly and consistently.
    - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.

- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
    - Through clarification, we noted the collaboration and ongoing engagement between the education provider and practice education providers. They outlined the 5-point plan they had developed, which ensured there was regular communication between the two stakeholders.
    - In addition to this, the education provider also set up a channel on Microsoft Teams to enable them to share documents with practice education providers and obtain feedback. This enabled them to have continuous input into the development of the programme.
    - There were appropriate processes in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning. This was demonstrated through the process for educational audits in placement, new placement development process and the placement learning opportunities partnership agreement.

- o Visitors acknowledged the various documents supplied, which provided details of the placements that will be offered to learners and the agreements in place. Through clarification, we noted the education provider made maximum use of the placements available, however recognised these were shared with another Higher Education Institution in the local region. To manage this and avoid any overlap, the education provider ensured there were never more than two cohorts out on placement at the same time.
- o Through Quality theme 1, visitors received assurances there were a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff with relevant knowledge and skills to deliver the proposed programme.
- o Through clarification, we noted there were adequate resources to support learners. This was in the form of handbooks, module guides and all other course material, which was accessible via the virtual learning environment. We were assured the reading list was up to date and included the most up to date editions of books. In addition to this, learners had access to the library, clinical resources and the simulation lab.
- o The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.

- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery** –
  - o The learning outcomes are clearly mapped against the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) mapping document and outlined in the module specifications.
  - o Professional behaviours and the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics are embedded throughout the programme to ensure learners understand the expectations.
  - o The philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base are clearly articulated in the mapping of College of Radiographers Education and Career Framework and the HCPC SOPs.
  - o There were appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure the curriculum remained relevant to current practice. This included the involvement of clinical experts and placement practice providers with the delivery of the teaching.
  - o The structure of the programme ensured the integration of theory and practice across the three years. This was demonstrated through the module specifications, programme specification and the practice assessment portfolio.
  - o A range of learning and teaching methods were used, which were evidenced in the programme and module specifications. This ensured the learning outcomes were appropriate and were delivered effectively across the programme. This included the use of virtual platforms.
  - o Autonomous and reflective thinking were embedded in a range of learning outcomes and assessments. The programme design ensured learners were able to develop this throughout the programme. Visitors noted how there was a gradual increase in learners taking

responsibility for their own learning as they progressed, which was recognised as autonomous learning.
- o Evidence based practice is demonstrated in various modules, which are delivered across all three years. Visitors noted learners were encouraged to be active researchers and were offered opportunities to be co producers of knowledge.
- o The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.

- **SET 5: Practice-based learning** –
  - o There was evidence to demonstrate the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning, which was appropriate to support the SOPs and achievement of the learning outcomes.
  - o Through clarification, we noted learners would be undertaking 420 hours of placement in each year. It was also noted that a block placement structure approach was used to enable learners in year 2 and 3 to support learners in year 1 during their placements.
  - o Visitors acknowledged the programme had a spiral curriculum design and recognised the complexity of theory and practice increased at each level.
  - o Visitors noted the clear integration of practice-based learning in the programme. Practice-based learning was delivered in four blocks across the programme and structured around the teaching element of the programme.
  - o Through [Quality theme 2](#), visitors received assurances there were a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced practice educators with relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners during placement.
  - o The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.

- **SET 6: Assessment** –
  - o Assessment methods are clear and appropriate and are outlined in the module specifications and the SOPs mapping document.
  - o The module specifications outline the content, learning outcomes and appropriate assessment methods to demonstrate professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.
  - o There were a range of assessments used to allow learners to develop and demonstrate knowledge and skills across the programme.
  - o The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

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

Section 5: Referrals

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

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:
* All standards are met, and therefore the programme should be approved.

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 programme is approved.
* 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 and Training Committee Panel agreed with the findings of the visitors and were satisfied with the recommendation to approve the programme.

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 approval. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation, and the nature, quality and facilities of the provision.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
University of Lincoln	CAS-01413-P6F5H1	Helen Best & Shaaron Pratt	Through this assessment, we have noted: • The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.	Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities: • Currently the staff team consists of a Programme Lead (1.0 whole time equivalent (wte)) and Senior Lecturer (0.6wte) to deliver the proposed programme. As the number of learners increase there are plans to recruit additional staff to support the proposed programme. • The education provider has recently updated their facilities to accommodate the additional learners, which has included the expansion of the seminar rooms and simulation suites. They are also in the

				process of building a virtual reality suite. In addition to this, learners will have access to the clinical skills suites where they will be provided with the opportunity to familiarise themselves with a ward environment.

Programmes		
Programme name	**Mode of study**	**Nature of provision**
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	Full time	Taught (HEI)

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			01/01/2019
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2018
MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/01/2018
Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/2005
MSc Speech and Language Therapy	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Speech and language therapist			30/01/2023
Independent/Supplementary Prescriber Preparation Post Graduate Certificate	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/10/2021
Independent/Supplementary Prescriber Preparation Practice Certificate	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/10/2021