

---

## Performance review process report

Institute of Biomedical Science, 2018-2022

---

### Executive summary

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

We have

- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed.
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The education provider submitted appropriate reflections which indicated they were performing well.
- The provider should next engage with monitoring in two years, the 2024-25 academic year, because:
  - The education provider does not have established data points but are working with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data for the next submission.

---

<b>Previous consideration</b>	The education provider previously engaged with the performance review process through the pilot in 2020-21. This is therefore their second engagement with this process.
<b>Decision</b>	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be.</li></ul>
<b>Next steps</b>	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The provider's next performance review will be in the 2024-25 academic year.</li></ul>

---

## Included within this report

Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:.....	1
Section 1: About this assessment.....	3
About us .....	3
Our standards .....	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The performance review process.....	3
Thematic areas reviewed .....	4
How we make our decisions.....	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: About the education provider.....	5
The education provider context.....	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider.....	6
Institution performance data.....	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes .....	8
Portfolio submission.....	8
Quality themes identified for further exploration .....	8
Section 4: Findings .....	8
Overall findings on performance .....	8
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	8
Quality theme: Thematic reflection .....	12
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection.....	14
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection .....	14
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions.....	15
Data and reflections .....	17
Section 5: Issues identified for further review.....	18
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes .....	18
Assessment panel recommendation .....	18
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution.....	20

## Section 1: About this assessment

### About us

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

### Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

### Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:

- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see,

rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

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

### **Thematic areas reviewed**

We normally focus on the following areas:

- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

### **How we make our decisions**

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### **The assessment panel for this review**

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this education provider:

Peter Abel	Lead visitor, biomedical scientist
Colin Jennings	Lead visitor, clinical scientist
Sheba Joseph	Service User Expert Advisor
Saranjit Binning	Education Quality Officer

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

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

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

## Section 2: About the education provider

### **The education provider context**

The education provider currently delivers five HCPC-approved programmes across two professions. It is the professional body for the biomedical scientist profession, delivering education UK wide. It has been running HCPC biomedical scientist approved programmes since 2003. In addition, the education provider has been running a clinical scientist programme since 2018.

There are several routes to registration at the education provider:

- The provider accredits programmes against its own standards, and then the graduates of these programmes are taken through a portfolio exercise with the IBMS to gain practical experience to meet proficiency standards.
- Learners who have not undertaken an IBMS-accredited degree engage with a portfolio exercise to have their learning and practical considered against proficiency standards.
- Attainment and equivalence routes, demonstrate how learners skills, knowledge and experience meet proficiency standards.

The HCPC approved routes are:

- 1) Certificate of Competence (accredited degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio)
- 2) Certificate of Competence (accredited degree followed by the Registration Training Portfolio)
- 3) Certificate of Competence (Non -accredited degree followed by the Registration Training Portfolio)
- 4) Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist)
- 5) Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential Route)

They were included in the pilot for the current quality assurance model in 2020-21. Through this process the lack of data points was noted, which was considered a risk. Due to this risk the Education and Training Panel agreed a two year monitoring period.

The last annual monitoring under the legacy model was in 2018-19. They have engaged with major change process in the legacy model in 2019 relating to the design and delivery of the programme clinical scientist programme.

## Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Biomedical scientist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2003
	Clinical scientist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2018

## Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes<sup>1</sup>.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	792	1449	10/05/23	<p>The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission.</p> <p>The education provider is recruiting learners above the benchmark.</p> <p>We explored this by reviewing the data and narrative submitted. Further information about the</p>

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

				outcome of establishing data reporting is available in section <a href="#">Data and reflections</a> .
Learner non continuation	3%	N/A	2021-2022	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided to establish this data point through the submission. Further information about the outcome of establishing data reporting is available in section <a href="#">Data and reflections</a> .
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	N/A	2021-2022	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided to establish this data point through the submission. Further information about the outcome of establishing data reporting is available in section <a href="#">Data and reflections</a> .
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	N/A	N/A	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided to establish this data point through the submission. Further information about the outcome of establishing data reporting is available in section <a href="#">Data and reflections</a> .

Learner satisfaction	N/A	N/A	N/A	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided to establish this data point through the submission. Further information about the outcome of establishing data reporting is available in section <a href="#">Data and reflections</a> .
----------------------	-----	-----	-----	---

## Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

### Portfolio submission

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

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

### Quality themes identified for further exploration

Visitors reviewed the portfolio and the supporting documentation and were satisfied with the submission. The level of detail and reflection in the submission was acknowledged, which provided visitors with appropriate evidence to indicate the education provider were performing well.

## Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

### Overall findings on performance

#### Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

#### Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
  - The education provider confirmed they were financially stable and



continued to see a rise in income despite the pandemic. They however recognised how they relied on the membership fees, which ensured their financial stability and acknowledged a decline in this income would have an impact on their sustainability.

- Various staff changes took place during this period, which included the appointment of a new Chief Executive and Executive Head of Education. The education provider reflected on how the various new skills sets complimented the organisation and the quality of education and training they deliver.
- They were in the process of developing a IBMS Digital Strategy to enhance the education and training they offer. The aim of this strategy would be to improve access to digital resources for the HCPC approved routes.
- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
  - Due to the nature of their provision, the education provider worked closely with stakeholders in a supportive capacity, such as practice educators, employers and practice partners. They provided these stakeholders with guidance relating to clinical laboratory services. For example, the Good Professional Practice and Conduct (GPPC) in Biomedical Science and the Laboratory Training Approval Guidance for the Application Process provide information on good practice and developing this in practice.
  - Their unique position as both a professional body and education provider enabled them to engage with all education providers delivering degree programmes. They reflected on how the IBMS degree accreditation process facilitated their engagement with learners and academic staff and how this contributed to their quality assurance processes.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
  - The education provider's quality assurance processes were clear and ensured all programmes aligned with the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Subject Benchmark Statement. To maintain the quality of all programmes, accreditation and reaccreditation documentation were reviewed by the IBMS accreditation panel. The purpose of this panel was to scrutinise the documentation to ensure programme quality and suggest any improvements that would enhance the programmes. Monitoring the quality of placements was part of this process and the IBMS accreditation panel met with stakeholders to ensure learners were being provided with a high standard of good quality placements. This also provided them with an opportunity to discuss other aspects of the placement provision in relation to quality.
  - Reflections were provided on the additional workload that was created due to the Change Notification process, which had to be approved by the Executive Head of Education. To address this issue, the education provider developed a new quality assurance process. The purpose of this was to create a simplified process to manage minor and major changes with the aim of reducing the workload attached to the process.

- Training for Trainers events were offered to all assessors online, which led to an increase in the number of assessors the IBMS had. It was noted in June 2022 they had 560 assessors and how this figure had now increased to 695. The education provider recognised the importance of increasing the number of assessors they had, particularly due to the high volume of Registration Training Portfolios being submitted. The benefits included them being able to identify quality assurance issues. All concerns were considered by the senior leadership team at IBMS and actioned accordingly. It was acknowledged the assessors provided the education provider with an additional layer of quality assurance.
- Visitors noted the five-year review for programmes where changes had taken place and the annual monitoring report which had to be completed by all programmes for quality assurance purposes.
- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Interprofessional education –**
  - Reflections were provided on how the Biomedical Science programmes were normally included with the Allied Health Professions (AHP) and therefore learners had access to interprofessional education and were able to learn from other professions, such as nursing and paramedic science. Other examples included learners on the BSc Healthcare Science who were provided with opportunities to work with learners in medical physics.
  - Learners on the HCPC approved routes engaged with interprofessional learning through their work-based learning where they were able to collaborate with professionals from other teams and service users. This learning was then evidenced through the 'Communication' and 'Professional Relationships' modules and learning outcomes, which were included in all the HCPC approved routes.
  - To facilitate interprofessional education further, the education provider delivered a bi-annual IBMS Congress event for learners on IBMS accredited programmes. The purpose of this event was to provide learners with the opportunity to learn from other professions through various presentations.
  - Through clarifications we found the IBMS had introduced Support Hubs to facilitate interprofessional education. This involved them working in partnership with other professional bodies to deliver joint sessions and providing them with opportunities and learning from other professions. Visitors considered this to be an innovative approach to supporting interprofessional education.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Service users and carers –**
  - The IBMS recognised the importance of service user and carer involvement and expected all biomedical scientist practitioners to work with them in their practice. The IBMS 'Good Professional Practice and Conduct in Biomedical Science' guidance stated this, which also aligned with the HCPC standards of proficiency.
  - The IBMS had their own Service User, Patient and Carer Engagement Group who were involved with future developments at the IBMS.

Feedback from this group in relation to future developments was often positive and suggestions made by this group were considered and applied to the programmes accordingly.

- Reflections were provided on how learners engaged with service users and carers, which was through the Registration Training Portfolio and Equivalence Portfolios. Gathering evidence through the portfolio's ensured learners were engaging with service users and carers appropriately and involving them in their practice.
- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Equality and diversity –**
  - The education provider outlined their commitment to equality and diversity with the IBMS Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Policy. The policy ensured fairness and respect for all individuals, however they recognised this policy was introduced in 2015 and were therefore in the process of updating it.
  - The revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) and the updated QAA Subject Benchmark Statement enabled the education provider to support the Biomedical Science programmes to embed EDI into their programmes.
  - All learners were required to illustrate EDI practice through their learning and training. This was evidenced through the submission of the Registration Training Portfolio and Equivalence portfolios. Learners were also made aware of their responsibilities as biomedical scientists in the 'Good Professional Practice and Conduct in Biomedical Science' guide, which outlined how it should be applied.
  - The education provider had extensive input into updating the Subject Benchmark Statement for Biomedical Science. This enabled other education providers to embed EDI into the Biomedical Science programmes they deliver. With these updates and the revisions to the SOPs the IBMS also introduced an EDI group who were responsible for overseeing and considering matters relating to EDI and ensuring education providers were developing EDI appropriately.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Horizon scanning –**
  - The education provider reflected on the changes the government were proposing in the Health and Care Bill and how these changes would impact the profession. The proposal included suggestions of reducing the number of regulators, which the education provider recognised was a risk for the Biomedical Scientist profession. The purpose of the changes was to 'improve the protection of the public' and 'develop a flexible workforce', however the education provider considered these changes would be a risk to patient care. They confirmed they had provided a response to this proposal and were optimistic the profession would not be deregulated.
  - NHS England were recognised as an important stakeholder who the education provider worked with closely. They reflected on the support NHS England provided them with and how they made various funds available to them to develop the profession. For example, they provided funding for a practice educator role to be created in the 29

NHS-England regions. The purpose of this role was to improve practice for biomedical scientists and clinical scientists and to provide them and staff with additional support to do this.

- It was noted Health Education England would be merging with the NHS. The education provider expressed some uncertainty on how this would impact them and their level of engagement with them in future.
- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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

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

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**
  - The education provider undertook work to embed the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) into the programmes. For example, all Registration Requirement documents were updated to align with the implementation of the SOPs from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2023.
  - A working group was formed by the Executive Head of Education, which consisted of trainers, assessors and programme leads for the accredited programmes. This group worked together on updating the Registration Training Portfolio, the Certificate of Competence by Equivalence Portfolio and the Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment portfolio to reflect the revised SOPs.
  - In addition to this, a new virtual learning environment (VLE) was being developed, where new digital resources would be available for learners and practice educators.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
  - To ensure government guidelines were followed, the education provider moved the accreditation and reaccreditation events online. They reflected on how effective this approach had been from both a cost and time saving perspective and how they intended to continue using this approach going forward.
  - During the pandemic placements were affected and to minimise the impact of this on learners the education provider supported the use of simulated activities. In addition to this they also offered extensions for the verification of the Registration Training Portfolio.
  - Reflections were provided on the issues experienced with the online assessments that were developed during the pandemic and grade inflation. The education provider recognised this as an issue, as a pattern emerged whereby graduates were achieving grades above the benchmark. To address this issue, they contacted all education providers to remind them of the criteria for IBMS accreditation and that online assessments should not be used as a main method of assessment. In future, to ensure academic standards are maintained

education providers will be required to provide details of the online assessments.

- It was recognised there was an increased need for verifiers during the pandemic. In response to this need, the education provider offered verifier training online, which enabled them to attract verifiers from a wider geographical area. The benefit of this training was noted, as during the pandemic the number of verifiers the education provider had increased to 500.
- Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
  - The education provider acknowledged how the pandemic impacted the delivery of all Biomedical Science programmes and reflected on education providers adopting a remote approach to teaching. It was noted this was a temporary measure and post pandemic the expectation was for all teaching to return to face to face delivery.
  - The benefits of using simulation activities during this period were highlighted, as it provided learners with the opportunity to enhance their skills during the pandemic. Simulation activities continued to be used when education providers returned to normal delivery for placement preparation and as a mechanism to provide learners with additional support to develop their experience and skills.
  - The IBMS support hubs were recognised as helpful forums where feedback was provided by learners, staff and trainers on digital resources. The feedback provided enabled the education provider to develop a suite of digital resources, which would support future learners, staff and trainers and would be accessible on the new IBMS virtual learning environment.
  - Through clarifications we found the education provider accredited Biomedical Science programmes across the UK and internationally. This was highlighted as good practice by the education provider and the visitors agreed, as this approach ensured there was consistency across all programmes and a channel of communication.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Apprenticeships –**
  - Reflections were provided on the growth of the level 6 Healthcare Science Practitioner degree apprenticeship across England with NHS Trusts. The popularity of this apprenticeship route is evident given the number of education providers requesting accreditation by the IBMS.
  - It was clear the education provider was committed to developing and supporting apprenticeships. They encouraged regular engagement with other education providers on IBMS accreditation requirements and programme design to support the growth of apprenticeships.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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

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

## Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

### **Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
  - It was not appropriate for the education provider to provide a reflection in this area, due to the post-registration aspect of their provision.
  - Visitors identified no concerns in this and were satisfied.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
  - It was not appropriate for the education provider to provide a reflection in this area, due to the post-registration aspect of their provision.
  - Visitors identified no concerns in this and were satisfied.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
  - It was not appropriate for the education provider to provide a reflection in this area, due to the post-registration aspect of their provision.
  - Visitors identified no concerns in this and were satisfied.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
  - There was evidence of the education provider engaging with a range of professional bodies and regulators. Reflections were provided on the positive relationships they had developed specifically in the pathology area. It was noted how proactive the Chief Executive had been in developing these links and how this level of engagement enabled the education provider to identify the needs of the profession and support programmes with making changes.
  - The education provider is a member of the Science Council who they have a full licence with for the Registered Science Technician, Registered Scientist and Chartered Scientist. They work closely with the council to ensure professional standards maintained.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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

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

## Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

### **Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Curriculum development –**
  - The updates to the HCPC Standards of Proficiency and the QAA Subject Benchmark for Biomedical Science and Biomedical Sciences were acknowledged. In response to these updates, changes were made to the Registration Training, the Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist) and the Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment portfolios. This ensured the revised SOPs were reflected in the portfolio and guidance documents. The QAA Subject Benchmark updates were included in the curriculum and education providers were required to map programmes when they engaged with the accreditation or re-accreditation process.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
  - The education provider is the professional body in this instance for biomedical scientists. They reflected on this position and acknowledged how they were different to other professional bodies due to them also being a HCPC approved education provider.
  - As a professional body the IBMS are responsible for developing guidance for the biomedical science programmes, which they review regularly.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
  - The education provider acknowledged the lack of financial support available to learners to complete a placement year. It was noted how this and the lack of placements impacted the number of learners who completed Route 1 Certificate of Competence (accredited degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio). Due to this the apprenticeship route was favoured, however the education provider recognised how the expansion of this route could impact placement opportunities and therefore ensured they were monitoring this.
  - Reflections were provided on the benefits and challenges of training learners and apprentices. It was clear the shared learning environments were beneficial to learners and provided an enhanced learning experience and the opportunity for them to learn from each other. However, some of the challenges identified with this were the various requirements to support, check and sign off evidence for learners and apprentices at the same time, which impacted staff time. To assist with this issue, the use of simulation activities was encouraged to support learners and apprentices with learning and to reduce some of the pressure from the laboratory environment.
  - When education providers propose new programmes, they are required to demonstrate they have developed placement opportunities within the geographical area they are based in and an awareness of the workforce requirements. This provides assurances that there are an adequate number of placement opportunities available.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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

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

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learners –**
  - The education provider recognised the importance of gathering learner feedback and providing learners with a process to raise concerns through. To ensure there were appropriate processes in place the IBMS accreditation criteria required education providers to demonstrate this at accreditation events. Learner feedback from module evaluation

- forms, the National Student Survey (NSS) and action plans were reviewed and discussed at these events as part of the criteria.
- There were several mechanisms in place to report issues and concerns to education providers and the IBMS, such as the monitoring forms. Any issues or concerns reported to the IBMS directly by learners were considered by the Education Manager and the Executive Head of Education and resolved accordingly. There was a clear commitment to addressing issues and concerns relating to training.
  - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
  - **Practice placement educators –**
    - The education provider outlined the importance of involving practice educators with the Biomedical Science programmes and explained how their involvement was an IBMS accreditation requirement.
    - Reflections were provided on how the development of the practice educator role across the regions enabled the education provider to communicate with a wider audience of practice educators and gather feedback and discuss issues. It was also recognised how these roles had helped strengthen links with other education providers, laboratories, and NHS Trusts. To ensure the needs of all the Biomedical Science programmes were being met nationally the education provider developed these roles in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales.
    - To increase the volume of feedback received, the education provider encouraged practice educators to submit feedback throughout the year. They recognised the importance of receiving and actioning feedback. Feedback was also gathered from all practice educators on all the routes when the assessment had been completed. All feedback was reviewed and responded to accordingly by the Executive Head of Education.
    - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.
  - **External examiners –**
    - All education providers delivering Biomedical Science programmes were required to submit external examiner reports as part of the annual monitoring report. In addition to this, the education provider worked with their own external examiner who reviewed and commented on all the HCPC approved routes.
    - During this period, there was an overlap with the external examiner position due to a contract ending. Feedback received from both externals during this period had been positive, however some issues were experienced with the review in 2021/22, which were addressed in the action plan for 2022/23.
    - Visitors were satisfied with the information provided in this section, which demonstrated the education provider was performing well.

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

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



## Data and reflections

### **Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learner non continuation:**
  - The education provider acknowledged they do not directly monitor learner non continuation rates and therefore do not collate data directly. However, all education providers who deliver Biomedical Science programmes are required to gather and collate this data as part of the Annual Monitoring process.
  - It is noted that due to the delivery method of the HCPC approved routes and there not being specific start and end date, it is not possible to collect non continuation data. To address this gap the education provider has suggested they could potentially gather learner continuation rates on the routes as a future data point, which could be shared with the HCPC. Visitors acknowledged the explanation and data provided by the education provider, however noted this was not a regular supply of data They noted how beneficial it would be for the education provider to monitor this data for future submissions.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
  - The process for collecting this data was acknowledged and reflections were provided on completion rates during this period. The inconsistency of the data was noted, which was impacted by the pandemic.
- **Teaching quality:**
  - This data point does not apply to the education provider, however there is data available for the Biomedical Science programmes publicly, which they have provided reflections on. Based on the available data the scores are ranked at either silver or gold, which is higher than expected.
  - Going forward the education provider will continue to review and monitor data in this way as part of their quality assurance processes.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
  - The education provider outlined how learner satisfaction for the Biomedical Science programmes was assessed through the National Student Survey. For the purposes of this submission, the education provider collated a mean overall satisfaction score for this review period. Based on the data provided, the score in 2021-22 was lower in comparison to the score in 2020-21, which was most likely due to the pandemic.
  - Going forward the education provider will continue to review and monitor data in this way as part of their quality assurance processes.
- **Programme level data:**
  - Reflections were provided on the number of learners enrolled during this period on the following HCPC approved routes.
    1. Certificate of Competence (accredited degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio)
    2. Certificate of Competence (accredited degree followed by the Registration Training Portfolio)
    3. Certificate of Competence (Non -accredited degree followed by the Registration Training Portfolio)

4. Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist)
5. Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential Route)

The data was compared and for the HCPC approved routes 1-3, the learner numbers were higher in 2021-22 in comparison to 2020/21, however this figure reduced for routes 4 and 5 during this period.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** The education provider acknowledged they were unable to provide the standard data points required, however explained that this was due to the nature of their provision. Through this submission they have however, provided data on the Biomedical Science programmes, which has been gathered by the education providers who deliver these programmes. The education provider understands the importance of data points and is keen to develop these and has suggested alternative options for their next submission. Visitors acknowledged this and were satisfied with the information provided and noted there would be an improvement in data points for the next submission.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** The education provider will work with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data points and will reflect on these in their next performance review.

## Section 5: Issues identified for further review

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

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

## Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

### Assessment panel recommendation

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

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2024-25 academic year.

### Reason for next engagement recommendation

- Internal stakeholder engagement
  - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, external examiners.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
  - The education provider engaged with eight professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
  - The education provider engaged with the HCPC. They considered the findings of the HCPC in improving their provision.

- The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
  - Through this review, the education provider has not established how they will supply quality and performance data points which are equivalent to those in external supplies available for other organisations. Where data is not regularly supplied, we need to understand risks by engaging with the education provider on a frequent basis (a maximum of once every two years)
- What the data is telling us:
  - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.
- In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a two year monitoring period is:
  - The education provider does not have established data points but are working with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data for the next submission.

### **Education and Training Committee decision**

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

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2024-25 academic year.

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

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

<b>Name</b>	<b>Mode of study</b>	<b>Profession</b>	<b>Modality</b>	<b>Annotation</b>	<b>First intake date</b>
Certificate of Competence (Degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio)	FLX (Flexible)	Biomedical scientist			01/07/2003
Certificate of Competence (Degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)	FLX (Flexible)	Biomedical scientist			01/07/2003
Certificate of Competence (Non-accredited degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)	FLX (Flexible)	Biomedical scientist			01/07/2003
Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist)	FLX (Flexible)	Biomedical scientist			01/09/2015
Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential Route)	FLX (Flexible)	Clinical scientist			01/01/2018

Appendix 2 – summary report

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

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Institute of Biomedical Science	CAS-01234-T9S0R0	Peter Abel & Colin Jennings	2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The education provider does not have established data points but are working with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data for the next submission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.</li> </ul>