
Approval process report

University of Derby, Diagnostic Radiography, 2022-23

Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve programme at University of Derby. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme(s) against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme(s) 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 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 Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) education standards and therefore is approved.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Previous consideration | Not applicable. This assessment was not referred from another process. |
| Decision | The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether the programme is approved |
| Next steps | We are currently undertaking an approvals assessment for paramedic provision at the education provider. |

Included within this report

| | |
|---|----|
| Section 1: About this assessment | 3 |
| About us | 3 |
| Our standards..... | 3 |
| Our regulatory approach..... | 3 |
| The approval process | 3 |
| How we make our decisions | 4 |
| The assessment panel for this review..... | 4 |
| Section 2: Institution-level assessment | 4 |
| The education provider context | 4 |
| Practice areas delivered by the education provider | 5 |
| Institution performance data | 5 |
| The route through stage 1 | 6 |
| Admissions..... | 7 |
| Management and governance | 8 |
| Quality, monitoring, and evaluation | 10 |
| Learners..... | 11 |
| Section 3: Programme-level assessment..... | 14 |
| Programmes considered through this assessment..... | 14 |
| Stage 2 assessment – provider submission | 14 |
| Quality themes identified for further exploration | 14 |
| Quality theme 1 – collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers..... | 14 |
| Quality theme 2 – ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners..... | 15 |
| Quality theme 3 – ensuring there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff | 16 |
| Quality theme 4 – accessing simulation learning | 17 |
| Quality theme 5 – training for practice educators | 17 |
| Quality theme 6 – ensuring practice educators have the appropriate skills..... | 18 |
| Section 4: Findings..... | 19 |
| Conditions..... | 19 |
| Overall findings on how standards are met..... | 19 |
| Section 5: Referrals..... | 21 |
| Recommendations..... | 22 |
| Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes | 22 |
| Assessment panel recommendation..... | 22 |
| Education and Training Committee decision | 22 |
| Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution | 23 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Rachel Picton | Lead visitor, Radiographer, Diagnostic Radiographer |
| Shaaron Pratt | Lead visitor, Radiographer, Diagnostic Radiographer |
| John Archibald | Education Quality Officer |

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 19 HCPC-approved programmes across seven professions. It is a higher education institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1992. The education provider currently runs two degree apprenticeship programmes, BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Degree Apprenticeship, and BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics Degree Apprenticeship.

The education provider currently runs a direct entry undergraduate diagnostic radiography programme, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography.

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 | Arts therapist | <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2002 |
| | Occupational therapy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 1995 |
| | Operating Department Practitioner | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2019 |
| | Practitioner psychologist | <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2022 |
| | Prosthetist / Orthotist | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2022 |
| | Radiographer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 1992 |
| Post-registration | Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing | | | 2014 |

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 | 672 | 552 | 2022 | This data comes from the education provider (value) and is compared against the records we hold (benchmark). There is a disparity here with the value |

| | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-----------|---|
| enrolment numbers | | | | below the expected learner figures. However, the visitors considered this did not adversely impact the sustainability of the programme, and so did not need to explore it further. |
| Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing | 3% | 7% | 2019-2020 | This data comes from Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). The visitors considered this difference in learner satisfaction did not impact further on the programme and did not need to explore it further. |
| Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study | 94% | 96% | 2019-2020 | This data comes from Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). This is 2% above benchmark and indicates the education provider is doing well here. |
| Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award | n/a | Gold | June 2017 | This data comes from the Office for Students (OfS). A gold award would indicate the institution is doing well. |
| National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27) | 76.0% | 79.7% | 2022 | This data comes from the Office for Students (OfS). This score indicates the percentage of learners who are satisfied with their learning is higher than average. |

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.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Information for applicants –**
 - The education provider will ensure information related to admissions will be on their website. This will include entry requirements and information about the process to apply to study on the programme. There will be a dual admission procedure for this programme, so both the employer's recruitment requirements as well as the education provider's minimum entry requirements for the academic programme are satisfied. Additional information is provided on education provider open days where applicants can speak to the programme team. The programme specification and programme website are in development and will provide information about the admission process.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 education provider will direct all international applicants to specific guidance about visas and immigration on their website. It will include specific guidance on tier 4 visas which allows international learners from outside the UK or Europe to study in the UK. All international applicants studying on HCPC programmes are required to demonstrate evidence of 6.5 in all elements of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) as part of the admissions criteria and having a good command of English. Applicants are subject to an occupational health assessment for all HCPC-approved programmes. All learners are also required to undergo checks with the Disclosure and Barring Service and are subject to an occupational health assessment. This information will be in programme specification and clearly outlined on marketing information.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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) –**
 - The education provider has a recognition of prior learning policy within their academic regulations. Applications for prior learning and experience for entry onto HCPC approved programmes must comply with this.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 –**
 - The education provider has an equality, diversity, and inclusion policy which is available on their website. They are committed to providing an environment which is open and diverse. They will not tolerate unlawful discrimination, intimidation, or harassment of anyone connected to them. Also, they work to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between all stakeholders. The aims and objectives of this policy are addressed through the equality and diversity strategy and action plan, quality processes, annual monitoring, business planning, policies, and guidelines.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 Register¹ –**
 - The education provider has several policies which ensure the programme meets the threshold level of entry. These are the procedures for validation and approval; external examiner processes; academic regulations; and oversight and governance by Academic Board and Academic Development and Quality Committee (ADQC).
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Sustainability of provision –**
 - The education provider has several policies which ensure the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose. These are the procedures for validation and approval; continual monitoring procedures and processes; and oversight and governance by Academic Board and Academic Development and Quality Committee (ADQC).
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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

- **Effective programme delivery –**
 - The education provider said they have an online academic principles framework. They also have procedures for the validation and approval of programme; continual monitoring procedures and processes and oversight and governance by the ADQC.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 said the College of Health, Psychology and Social Care is comprised of three schools. They have responsibility for the day-to-day delivery of the academic programmes and associated staff and physical resources. Individual discipline areas are the focus for professional specific management of the curriculum and learner experience. Staff training and continuous professional development is centred around either school, discipline, or individual development needs. These are further centred to curriculum and pedagogy, learner experience and outcomes, scholarship and research, and business development.
 - The education provider said due to the nature of the environment in which they work, staff are required to understand various laws, regulations and policies which apply to day-to-day job responsibilities. The education provider therefore has to ensure training is in place in accordance with those roles and responsibilities. As part of the appraisal and interim review process, all staff must ensure their mandatory training is complete.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 said there are several processes which underpin partnership working. They are:
 - validation and approval procedures and processes;
 - continual monitoring procedures and processes; and
 - oversight and governance by collaborative partnerships sub-committee reporting to ADQC and Academic Board.
 - As the programme is a degree apprenticeship, the education provider said this is not a partnership provision. However, there will be formal contracts in place between the education provider and employers as part of the apprenticeship.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 –**
 - There are several processes which ensure academic quality of programmes is maintained and improved. These include the:
 - validation and approval process - a rigorous process undertaken with academic staff, learners, independent subject experts and employers to ensure the programme is current, of high quality, and able to prepare learners well for their future employment or further study;
 - the continual monitoring - the primary means by which the education provider assures itself on an on-going basis academic standards and quality are maintained;
 - external examining - a key element of the education provider's system of quality assurance and enhancement; and
 - quality standards assessment - monitoring and review of the programme and partner collaborative arrangements will follow the education provider's quality and standards assessment review procedures.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 –**
 - The education provider said programmes operate a system of practice education audit prior to learners being allocated to those areas. These are reviewed on a two-year cycle as a minimum. There are also educator forum in all disciplines. All employers will be expected to complete or provide a satisfactory employer audit detailing the support available to learners and confirming the suitability of the learning environment.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - Learners have multiple ways of giving feedback and feeding into the development of programmes. There are surveys such as National Student Survey, Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, and the education provider survey and module evaluations. There are four officer trustees who lead the Students Union and represent learners.

The Students Union are responsible for the academic representation structure at the education provider. Learners elect over 800 representatives and student officers each year to represent them. Their job is to work closely with the union's Vice-President (Education) to identify any issues or needs and represent the learner voice at the highest meetings at the education provider.

- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
- 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 –**
 - Service user and carer involvement is key to many aspects of programme development, delivery, and evaluation and is an intrinsic element of programme development and review and re-approval. Service user and carer representatives are full members of the College Programme Planning Group and their involvement takes place in forms such as programme committees and learner interviews.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 –**
 - The education provider support learners through different avenues, such as college student centres, health and wellbeing support, support with English language skills, and careers and employability support. There is also support from resources such as virtual learning environment, programme and module handbooks, and personal academic tutors. The academic regulations provide support for learners. For instance, the student charter, which is a clear statement of the responsibilities of the education provider and Student Union to provide a quality academic experience for every learner. It sets out the expectations and responsibilities for learners to get the most from their experience at the education provider.
 - The academic regulations sit alongside local practice education provider procedures and policies. The education provider said learners also get support by working with and reviewing aspects of the development of practical skills through skills and simulated learning.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.

- We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - The education provider said the professional conduct and professional suitability procedure ensures learners are fit to practice and comply with the education provider's learner code of conduct.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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) –**
 - The college has an interprofessional learning strategy which applies to all learners in health and social care related programmes. These learners are sited in the College of Health, Psychology and Social Care, and includes all Arts Therapies learners.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 –**
 - Overarching equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) monitoring and compliance applies to all approved HCPC programmes. EDI is monitored within programme level performance and is supported by overarching institutional monitoring. Annual reporting is used to drive actions and interventions. The education provider is compliant with the required accessibility statement related to their website and VLE. They support learners to develop digital wellbeing skills, ensuring learning spaces are safe and secure for all users. The education provider considers learning design which serves the needs of all learners and incorporates equality, diversity, and access. They create learning activities which engage learners and enable them to consider real-world application of their learning in an appropriate structure and flexible format.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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 –**
 - The education provider applies anonymous marking which is applied to ensure objectivity. This is contained within the internal moderation policy as part of academic regulations.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Progression and achievement –**
 - The education provider ensures learners can apply for a fresh assessment at the next submission point. This is dependent on their being circumstances out of their control, such as hospitalisation and family emergencies, which mean they won't be able to meet an assessment deadline and a late submission of seven days won't be enough time for them to complete their assessment. The education provider says they use the online academic framework and the on-demand data and learning analytics, to recognise the digital footprint for online learners is a key resource to understand and support learners. The education provider also uses internal and external moderation of learners' work, and this is overseen by the internal moderation process.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Appeals –**
 - The education provider has an academic appeals policy. This underpins what constitutes a valid ground for appeal and how to make an appeal.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs degree apprenticeship programmes.
 - 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

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.

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 Degree Apprenticeship | DL (Distance learning) | Radiographer, Diagnostic radiographer | 30 learners per cohort, one cohort per year | 01/01/2024 |

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.

Quality theme 1 – collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers

Area for further exploration: The education provider informed us in the programme specification about the onboarding process. This process ensures each learner has a suitably qualified practice educator. We were also informed there are regular tripartite reviews between the learner, their employer, and education provider. The education provider explained they will hold regular meetings with employers to discuss any issues arising, share good practice and feedback. The education provider informed us they meet with practice education partners three times a year. These meetings subsequently feed into programme committee meetings. However, the visitors did not receive any evidence of the meetings with practice education partners and needed to see this to assure themselves how this collaboration takes place. They therefore sought more evidence about this.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the

most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider informed us collaboration between themselves and practice education providers takes place through clinical academic forum meetings. These take place each semester. We understood this is current practice for the direct entry pre-registration approved programme which would also take place in the new programme. We were able to recognise feedback from these forums feeds into programme committee meetings. The visitors were therefore satisfied the education provider effectively collaborates with practice education providers. We were satisfied with the evidence provided and considered the quality activities adequately addressed the issues raised.

Quality theme 2 – ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners

Area for further exploration: The visitors were informed all learners must be employed in an approved setting and they undertake practice-based learning outside of this setting. However, the visitors were unsure how the education provider ensures there is the availability of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore required more information about how the education provider ensures there is adequate practice-based learning for all learners.

We also noted learners will be expected to undertake different practice-based learning activities to those on direct entry programmes. However, the visitors were unsure how the education provider fully considers any potential impact on practice-based learning with the introduction of this apprenticeship. The visitors therefore sought more information about how the education provider considers any likely impact on practice-based learning with the introduction of the apprenticeship.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider informed us the programme is yet to be approved, so they are not able to enter discussions about capacity with employers. We were informed the academic part of the programme is delivered online and has the potential to recruit from a wide geographical area. We understood the education provider may not know where learners will originate from as they have involved employers from across the geographical region. The education provider explained learners will be an employee. We were informed decisions to take on and support learners on-the-job learning will be undertaken by the employer. We were also informed issues around capacity of practice-based learning will be a part of initial discussions between the learner and employer. We recognised there are other apprenticeship education providers currently operating in the East Midlands. The

education provider informed us this has no impact on practice-based learning capacity.

The visitors considered the education provider has effective mechanisms and processes in place to manage practice-based learning. This means it will be available to all learners and consider any impact of the programme's introduction. We were satisfied with the evidence provided and considered the quality activities adequately addressed the issues raised.

Quality theme 3 – ensuring there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff

Area for further exploration: The visitors noted the education provider supplied curriculum vitae of two programme staff. The education provider informed us all on-campus lecturers are either HCPC-registered radiographers or registered healthcare practitioners. The education provider explained they continuously monitor the student:staff ratio to assure themselves there is an appropriate number for the programme to be delivered effectively. However, the visitors were unclear what the education provider's plans are should staff members be unavailable. The visitors therefore sought more detail about this.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: We were informed the curriculum vitae provided were for the two main team members who were involved in the development of the programme. The education provider explained the programme sits alongside both undergraduate and postgraduate diagnostic radiography provision. The education provider explained they have an extensive radiography staff group who will support the programme. The contingency plan for absence or sickness would be managed through this line management. We recognised the total radiography staff group is 13 members of staff of 10.2 full time equivalence. We recognised the initial maximum number of learners recruited to the programme will be no more than 30.

We were informed the programme will be included in regular weekly team meetings for pre-registration programmes. This meeting discusses and manages short term support for the programme team. The education provider informed us the radiography provision has a network of associate lecturers who can be used if required. We were informed the programme leaders and assistant leads meet monthly. This meeting gives them the opportunity to analyse any matters relating to longer-term support which may be needed. The visitors understood how the education provider can ensure there is an adequate number of staff should other programme team members be unavailable. We were satisfied with the evidence provided and considered the quality activities adequately addressed the issues raised.

Quality theme 4 – accessing simulation learning

Area for further exploration: The visitors were informed the academic part of the programme is mostly delivered online. Online elements will be delivered through the education provider's online platform. The education provider informed us there are also a wide range of resources available, both physical and online, including skills and simulation environments. The visitors noted there is an optional study school where learners can work alongside each other in role play and access simulation. However, the visitors were unsure whether there are opportunities for learners to access simulation equipment outside of this study school, and if so, how and when this will take place. The visitors therefore sought more information about this.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider informed us there are two on-campus study schools planned and which are optional for learners. They explained some learners appreciate the chance to build a sense of community on campus, but others may not need it. We were informed the study schools would complement the delivery of the curriculum. The education provider informed us there would be opportunities for learners to access simulation software and tutor-led hybrid teaching sessions during the study school. The education provider stated learners will be able to access simulation resources applicable to planned activities. They envisaged this will be tailored to learners needs as the education provider will ask learners about their needs in advance of the study school. For example, we were informed if learners needed to gain confidence in theatre environments the education provider can use the simulation suite to create mock exercises in that situation.

The education provider stated simulation equipment, and access to it, may vary in each learner's place of work. They explained workplace mentors will need to facilitate and organise learner's use of simulation equipment as part of on-the-job learning if they consider it will enhance the learner's understanding of a specific skill or learning outcome. The visitors considered they fully understood the opportunities for learners to access simulation equipment outside of the study school. We were satisfied with the evidence provided and considered the quality activities adequately addressed the issues raised.

Quality theme 5 – training for practice educators

Area for further exploration: The visitors' were informed workplace mentors will be HCPC-registered radiographers, selected by the employer to support the learners. There is also access to training and support. The visitors noted training for practice educators is either through a webinar or a self-directed training package. The visitors

however were not clear what the webinar and training package involved. They therefore sought more details about this.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider informed us practice educators will be required to complete a short online course hosted by the education provider. The education provider informed us the training involves different facets such as:

- The skills required to support the programme;
- How knowledge, skills, and behaviours are integrated into the programme structure;
- Expectation of learners and high-level learning, such as developing autonomy;
- Role of the practice educator in facilitating learning;
- Fundamentals of mentoring and coaching;
- The role of the progress review; and
- Assessing in practice.

The visitors noted the education provider provides training for practice educators and understood what the training involves. We were satisfied with the evidence provided and considered the quality activities adequately addressed the issues raised.

Quality theme 6 – ensuring practice educators have the appropriate skills

Area for further exploration: The visitors' were informed the practice-based learning audit the education provider completes requires practice education providers to confirm the skills of practice educators are appropriate. However, the visitors were unsure about what steps are taken if practice educators do not have the required skills. The visitors therefore sought more information about actions taken should the skills of practice educators not be appropriate.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained if practice educators do not have the required skills, they support them in various ways. For example, to gain practice educator accreditation, or access to appropriate workshops. The education provider informed us records of training and updating are kept. If a workplace mentor needs to refresh their skills and knowledge, the education provider sends a standard email to them about how to do so, if they have not contacted the

education provider themselves. This is followed up and practice educators are expected to engage with refresher training in a three month grace period.

The visitors recognised the education provider keeps a record of the practice educators who have received training. We understood the work which is taken if practice educators do not have the required skills. We were satisfied with the evidence provided and considered the quality activities adequately addressed the issues raised.

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 –**
 - Selection and entry criteria were clear and set at an appropriate level for an apprenticeship programme. The criteria included qualifications at foundation degree and level 2 qualifications in Maths and English or equivalency, an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service check and occupational health clearance.
 - The process to apply for the programme was clearly outlined with employer and education provider involvement. As employees, applicants will be recruited by the employer. Dual admission

procedures are in place to ensure the employer's recruitment requirements are satisfied, as well as the education provider's minimum entry requirements.

- The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership –**
 - Through [quality theme 1](#), there was evidence of regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers to discuss issues related to practice-based learning.
 - Through [quality theme 2](#), the education provider demonstrated an effective process to ensure the availability of practice-based learning for all learners.
 - Through [quality theme 3](#), we recognised how many learners the education provider will initially accept onto the programme, and their plans should staff members be unavailable. The education provider ensures an appropriate number of staff, both within the profession and wider school, to effectively deliver the proposed programme. Subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant experience and knowledge.
 - Through [quality theme 4](#), there was evidence of the opportunities for learners to access simulation equipment outside of the study school.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - Through the module descriptors and mapping document, visitors noted the learning outcomes were clearly outlined for the degree apprenticeship programme.
 - Professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics, are taught throughout the programme, as demonstrated in the module descriptors.
 - There was evidence of the programme being relevant to current practice using external frameworks from the professional body, the Society and College of Radiographers.
 - Integration of theory and practice is central to the programme. Eighty percent of learning takes place in employment. Learners will be working within a clinical and technical setting where current practice will be in place.
 - The programme uses a wide variety of teaching and learning methods, as outlined in the programme specification. The module descriptors also outlined the learning activities.
 - Autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence-based practice is appropriately outlined in the module descriptors. Modules will offer opportunities for discussion and reflection and offer theoretical underpinning while looking for links to the workplace.

- The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**
 - Through [quality theme 5](#) and [quality theme 6](#), there was evidence of the training for practice educators and how the education provider ensures they have appropriate skills. Practice educators will be HCPC-registered radiographers to support learning.
 - Learners must be employed in an appropriate setting. Each employer and practice area will be audited prior to learners starting the programme.
 - Work-based and practice-based learning are integrated into the programme with appropriate learning outcomes.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 6: Assessment –**
 - The learning outcomes of the programme are based on the HCPC standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers. The assessments are aligned to allow learners to demonstrate how they meet the learning outcomes.
 - The education provider will use an e-portfolio to ensure all learning outcomes are met and clinical skills are assessed. It will record off the job training hours, attendance, clinical learning experience, meetings and individual learning reviews; and for formative and summative assessments.
 - Professional expectations, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the context of radiography are embedded throughout the assessment of practice and theoretical parts of the programme.
 - Visitors noted the assessment strategy has been developed with apprenticeship in mind, and is premised along principles such as being current, professionally relevant, innovative and future-focused.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards 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.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

The visitors did not set any recommendations.

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

Reason for this decision: All standards are met, and therefore the programme should be approved

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

| Name | Mode of study | Profession | Modality | Annotation | First intake date |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| MA Art Therapy | FT (Full time) | Arts therapist | Art therapy | | 01/09/2002 |
| MA Dramatherapy | FT (Full time) | Arts therapist | Drama therapy | | 01/09/2002 |
| MA Music Therapy | FT (Full time) | Arts therapist | Music therapy | | 01/09/2018 |
| BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy | FT (Full time) | Occupational therapist | | | 01/10/1995 |
| MSc Occupational Therapy | FT (Full time) | Occupational therapist | | | 01/09/2009 |
| PG Dip Occupational Therapy | FT (Full time) | Occupational therapist | | | 01/08/2017 |
| BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice | DL (Distance learning) | Operating department practitioner | | | 01/05/2019 |
| BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Degree Apprenticeship | WBL (Work based learning) | Operating department practitioner | | | 01/05/2019 |
| Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice | PT (Part time) | Practitioner psychologist | Forensic psychologist | | 01/01/2022 |
| Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice | FT (Full time) | Practitioner psychologist | Forensic psychologist | | 01/01/2022 |
| BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics | FT (Full time) | Prosthetist / orthotist | | | 01/01/2022 |
| BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics Degree Apprenticeship | WBL (Work based learning) | Prosthetist / orthotist | | | 01/01/2022 |
| BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography | FT (Full time) | Radiographer | Diagnostic radiographer | | 01/09/1992 |
| MSc in Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration) | FT (Full time) | Radiographer | Diagnostic radiographer | | 01/08/2016 |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--|--|--|------------|
| Post-graduate Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (Physiotherapists) | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing | 01/08/2014 |
| Post-graduate Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (Podiatrists) | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing | 01/08/2014 |
| Post-graduate Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Paramedics | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing | 01/01/2019 |
| Postgraduate Practice Certificate in Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Physiotherapists | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing | 01/09/2020 |
| Postgraduate Practice Certificate in Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Podiatrists | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing | 01/09/2020 |