

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Bournemouth University
Name of programme(s)	DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Approval visit date	4 - 6 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-12972-H7M2W5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	4
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	5
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	6
Section 5 Visitors' recommendation	10
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	11

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
David Whitmore	Paramedic
Frances Ashworth	Lay
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 - Diploma of Higher Education and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice; BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioners
- Panel 2 - PG Dip Social Work, MA Social Work and BA (Hons) Social Work
- Panel 3 - PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families) and MA Social Work (Children and Families)
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy

For the paramedic programme there were representatives from the professional body, College of Paramedics. For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational Therapists. For each profession assessed at this multi-professional event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at the approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Angelos Stefanidis	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (paramedic and operating department practice panel)
Julia Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Maxine Frampton	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Fiona Cownie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work panel)
Jack Guymer	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work children and families panel)
Andy Guttridge	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy)
External panel members		
Roger King	External panel member	University of West London—operating department practice
Lee Price	External panel member	University of Brighton – occupational therapy
Karin Crawford	External panel member	University of Lincoln – social work
Helen Frank	External panel member	University of Worcester – physiotherapy
Professional body panel members		
Vince Clarke	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Chris Moat	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Helen Frank	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Representative
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education advisor
Shan Aguilar-Stone	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Professional advisor

Vanessa Parmenter	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Patricia McClure	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Maureen Sheila	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education officer
HCPC MA and BA Social work panel members		
Dorothy Smith	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC – Social work panel lead
HCPC MA / PG Dip Social work (Children and Families)		
Diane Whitlock	Lay	HCPC visitor
Robert Goeman	Social worker	HCPC visitor
David Childs	Social worker	HCPC visitor
HCPC occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel members		
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist	HCPC visitor
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist	HCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HCPC visitor
John Archibald	HCPC executive	HCPC –occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive	Observer

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01674

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider informed us that they intended to offer a BSc Operating Department Practice and we decided to re-approve this DipHE Operating Department Practice during the approval process as it would likely be affected by the new programme.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner

First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01676

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	No	One of the programmes is new, and therefore no external examiner reports have been produced for this programme.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	The panel met with learners from the existing PG Dip Operating Department Practice programme.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 08 November 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that appropriate, clear and consistent information, that enables applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme, is available to applicants.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure that pertinent admissions information relating to the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme will be communicated to potential applicants in order for them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with a web link to the existing DipHE Operating Department Practice programme information. At the visit, the visitors heard that the education provider intends to create a website and information pack for the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice once the programme is approved. Additionally, the visitors were not provided with any evidence of how the education provider will ensure that the admission process will provide applicants with appropriate, clear and consistent information in order for them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how the education provider intends to communicate the following information to prospective applicants:

- the requirement for, and process associated with, any Disclosure and Barring Service or health requirements, and any associated costs to the learner;
- any additional costs learners may incur over and above the usual programme fee; and
- the expectation that learners will travel to practice-based learning settings at their own expense and that this is an additional cost for the learners.

The visitors therefore require further information showing how the education provider ensures prospective applicants are provided with the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to apply for a place on the programme.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes is appropriate

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leader. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes 'mentoring system', sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that sufficient practice-based learning is available for all learners.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors could not determine the process in place for ensuring sufficient practice-based learning is available for all learners. The programme team told the visitors that third year practice-based learning has not yet been finalised. As such, the visitors were not able to see detail of the practice-based learning opportunities that will be available, including the split between traditional and non-traditional placements, or the type of locations where learners would be based. In discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that year three practice based learning will be developed once the programme is approved along with the clinical practice document. In addition, the programme team discussed the range of placements that learners could undertake. Under these circumstances, the visitors considered that it might be difficult for the education provider to find enough practice-based learning opportunities for all learners given the possible range of practice-based learning opportunities that learners can undertake. The visitors received verbal reassurances that the programme team were confident that they could find practice-based learning opportunities for all learners, and that the education provider intends to phase out the DipHE Operating Department

Practice if the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice is approved. This would likely create more capacity in practice-based learning. However, from the discussions and the documentation the visitors were unable to determine whether an effective process was in place to ensure availability and capacity as no formal plan to ensure availability and capacity was provided. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programmes, and how they will ensure the continuation of service user and carer involvement in the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with evidence of how service users and carers contribute to the existing DipHE Operating Department Practice programme. At the visit, the visitors met several service users and carers and discussed how they are involved in the existing programme. During discussions, it was clear that the service users and carers are involved in the DipHE Operating department practice programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine how service users and carers will be involved in the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme. In discussions with the service users and carers, the visitors heard that they have not been approached to be involved in the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme. From the documentation and discussion, the visitors saw no formal information to demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in this programme. The visitors therefore could not determine:

- who the service users and carers are (or will be);
- how they will be involved in the programmes;
- how their involvement is appropriate; and
- the education provider's strategy for ensuring the continuation of service user and carer involvement in the new programme.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence demonstrating that service users and carers will be involved in the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme and senior teams, the visitors were told that new posts are to be recruited to for this programme over the next 3 years to accommodate the increase in cohort number. The visitors were informed that there will probably be 2.6 full time equivalent (FTE) staff

dedicated to the programme. From the CVs provided and discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that there will be two 1.0 Full time equivalent and 0.5 Part time staff members dedicated to the programme. The visitors saw no formal arrangements in place to ensure there will be adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme effectively. The visitors require information on what mechanisms are in place regarding the recruitment of new staff and as to how the required experience and qualification profile of the new staff members will complement the team to ensure they can support the delivery of the breadth of knowledge taught on this programme.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must clarify what significant changes have been made as a response to external panel member requirements, and how those changes ensure that resources are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit and from the conclusions of the external panel member, it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by the professional body panel. The visitors considered the programme documentation an important resource to support learning as learners are likely to refer to it often. In particular, the joint panel conditions referred to amendments to module assessments, possibly the programme specification document, and the learner handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review any changes made to the resources due to the education provider's response to the internal validation event. As such, the education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates that the amended learner resources to support learning are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme. The education provider may wish to provide the programme documentation that has been revised, or provide an overview of their response to the internal validation event.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the formal and effective process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors did not see evidence of any formal protocols to obtain appropriate consent from service users in activities with learners such as role-play and practising clinical techniques. At the visit, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures that the learning and teaching methods respect the rights of service users, and that appropriate consent is sought from service users. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence of the formal protocols in place for obtaining consent from service users. They also require evidence that demonstrates how service users are informed about their involvement in activities such as role-play and practising clinical techniques, and how records are maintained to indicate consent has been obtained. The education provider must therefore provide evidence of the formal process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must identify where learners' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify the attendance requirements for learners, or how learners were informed about the mandatory elements of the programme. In discussion with the learners from the DipHE Operating Department Practice, there was some confusion regarding the attendance policy and the associated monitoring mechanisms. The programme team highlighted that they expect full attendance at all times from learners. Through discussion with the programme team, the visitors learnt that for lectures, attendance sheets are sometimes used to monitor attendance and that poor attendance would be followed up. From the documentation sent prior to the visit and discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how learners starting the programme would be informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for learners who fail to attend. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to learners. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how learners are made aware of what effect contravening this policy may have on their ability to progress through the programme

6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment methods used in year 3 of the programme ensures that the learning outcomes are appropriately measured.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how the assessment procedures for the programme will ensure that learners who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for operating department practitioners. However, the visitors noted in their assessment that year three of the practice-based document has yet to be created and finalised. Because the visitors have not seen the final assessment strategy for practice based learning in year three of the programme, the visitors were unable to determine if the assessments of learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for ODPs. Therefore, visitors will need the finalised assessment strategy for all year three of the programme to ensure those who complete this programme meet SOPs for ODPs.

Section 5 Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme is approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 05 December 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future.

From a review of the documentation and the tour of the facilities, the visitors were satisfied the current resources available to learners and educators are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programmes. However, the education provider informed us at the visit that the programmes will be moving to a new building in 2020. This may affect the programme's ability to meet the standards relating to programme resources. Therefore the education provider should notify us of this change through the annual monitoring audit process after they have moved.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Approval visit date	18 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-12987-Y3G8S0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Roseann Connolly	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Paul Sant	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Bedfordshire
Nathan Spencer	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Bedfordshire
Guangming Cao	Internal panel member	University of Bedfordshire

Liz Grant	Internal panel member	University of Bedfordshire
Toby Smith	Internal panel member	University of Oxford
Nina Paterson	Head of Education	Chartered Society of Physiotherapists
Liz Hancock	Education representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapists

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed first intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01859

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
Proposed first intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01860

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes

Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 10 December 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify for applicants their arrangements for assessing applicants' prior learning and experience.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including information that would be available to applicants. They could not see in this evidence where the education provider's approach to recognition of prior learning (RPL) was clearly set out. The senior team and programme team told the visitors that they would consider applicants' prior learning and experience on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with a set of guidelines, which the visitors saw and considered appropriate. However, as these guidelines, and the principles underlying them, had not been set out for applicants, the visitors considered that at present applicants would not have access to all the information required to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. This was especially important in light of the senior team's declared intention to attract more mature applicants and applicants from non-traditional backgrounds. There was a strong possibility that applicants from these groups were more likely to ask that prior learning and experience be taken into account in their application. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will communicate their RPL policy to applicants.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must clarify their plans for the programmes if their planned degree apprenticeship routes go ahead.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, and discussed the future and management of the programmes with the senior team. Based on the documentation and the discussions there appeared to be appropriate arrangements in place overall. However, the visitors were aware from discussions at the visit that the education provider intends to introduce a degree apprenticeship route for both physiotherapy and occupational therapy. They considered that this might affect the sustainability of the BSc programmes. Additional routes would create additional pressure on staff time, resources, practice-based learning. They might also affect recruitment to the BSc programmes, as some applicants who wished to register as physiotherapists or occupational therapists would have another route available. The senior team stated that they were confident that there would be local demand for the BSc programmes. However, it was not clear to the visitors that the education provider had considered the impact of the degree apprenticeships on the BSc programmes, and they were not able to clarify the detail of their plans for the visitors. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that these BSc programmes will still be sustainable and fit for purpose if the degree apprenticeships are brought in as planned.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the roles and responsibilities of staff on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, which included a Quality Handbook. From this evidence, they were able to see that there was a management structure for the programmes. However, it was not clear which staff members held positions within these structures. For example, the visitors were not able to see which staff were responsible for liaison and co-ordination with providers of practice-based learning. The programme team and senior team were not able to clarify the responsibilities within the programme, meaning that the visitors could not be satisfied that there was effective management and clear lines of responsibility on the

programme. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing which staff have which responsibilities within the programme.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have an effective process in place for identifying suitable persons for the role of programme leader.

Reason: The visitors were not able to review evidence related to this standard as part of the programme documentation, as none was provided. In discussions with the senior team, the visitors were told that programme leaders were not yet in place for the programmes, but would be appointed before the programme admitted its first cohort in September 2019. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence that there was an appropriate process for identifying and appointing programme leaders. There was a university-wide procedure for doing so, but from the description given it was not clear to the visitors how it would ensure that these programmes were led by someone with appropriate qualifications and experience who could effectively organise programme delivery. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that those who hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes are appropriately qualified and experienced.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including a document outlining placement policies and processes. They could not see from this document what process the education provider would use to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning. In discussions with the senior team and programme team they were told that there had been substantial planning for practice-based learning provision, and that further such planning was intended, but the visitors were not able to see evidence of this planning and so were unable to be satisfied that the standard was met. In the meeting with providers of practice-based learning the visitors were told that there had been some discussion with the education provider, and that discussions were ongoing. The visitors were satisfied that there was appropriate collaboration between the education provider and providers of practice-based learning. However, they considered that these discussions had not yet resulted in clear and finalised plans to ensure availability and capacity for all learners. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including information about how service users and carers had given input into the development of the programmes. They also met with members of the university service user group, and discussed with the programme team how service users and carers would be involved. From the evidence, and from the discussions, the visitors were not clear how service users would be involved in the programmes. They had been told that some service users and carers had helped develop the programme, but could not see details of the nature and extent of this involvement. In terms of the programme itself, it was not clear which service users would be involved, what they would be doing, and how they would be supported. The visitors could not see where the education provider had considered which service users and carers were most appropriate and relevant to these programmes. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how service users and carers will be involved in the programme, and how this involvement will be planned and evaluated.

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the staff curriculum vitae submitted as evidence for this standard. They were not clear how the programmes could be effectively delivered with the current level of staffing, given the proposed learner numbers. The senior team stated that they had plans for further recruitment, including of programme leaders, and would be using visiting lecturers as necessary. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence relating to the recruitment planning or to the plans to use visiting lecturers, and so they were not able to make a judgment about whether there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place by the programmes' planned start date of September 2019. In discussions with the senior team the visitors were told that recruitment would be taking place in spring 2019, but no more detailed timescale was given. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider will recruit sufficient qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programmes effectively.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the staff curriculum vitae submitted as evidence for this standard. They were not clear from this evidence how the education provider would ensure that subject areas are delivered by appropriate specialists. The visitors considered that the present staff currently in place did not have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver the programmes. The senior team stated that they had plans for further recruitment, and would be using visiting lecturers as necessary, to ensure appropriate coverage of all subject areas. However, the visitors were not able to see clear evidence of which staff would have responsibility for which curriculum areas. They were not clear that the education provider had prepared appropriate job specifications to ensure that newly recruited permanent or visiting staff would, between

them, be able to cover all subject areas. They were therefore not able to make a judgment about whether subject areas on the programmes would be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. In discussions with the senior team the visitors were told that recruitment would be taking place in spring 2019, but no more detailed timescale was given, and no indication was given by the senior team of what areas would be covered by visiting lecturers and which by permanent staff. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider will ensure that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the following:

- that it is clear to learners that completion of an HCPC-approved programme gives eligibility to apply for registration, rather than entitlement to register; and
- that learners not eligible to apply for registration are not given an award that refers to a title protected by the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the Course Information Form provided as evidence for this standard, and the information given about the step-off awards from the programme. They noted that in the information provided for learners it said that completion of the programme would mean that learners could register with the HCPC. In fact, completion of an approved programme confers eligibility to apply for admission to the Register rather than automatic eligibility for admission. The visitors additionally noted that the name of the step-off awards for the programme included the words “physiotherapy” and “occupational therapy”. The visitors considered that this created a lack of clarity around which awards actually led to eligibility for registration. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that there is no confusion about which programme we approve and which we do not.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programmes’ learning outcomes are worded in such a way that it is clear how they are related to the standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the module learning outcomes provided as evidence for this standard. They noted that the wording of the learning outcomes was quite different from the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for physiotherapists and occupational therapists, and therefore that it was not clear how the learning outcomes related to the SOPs. The visitors considered that this lack of clarity might present a barrier to learners meeting the SOPs, as it might be possible to meet the learning outcomes without having met the SOPs. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that the learning outcomes on the programmes will ensure that learners meet the SOPs for physiotherapists and occupational therapists.

4.3 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programmes will reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of the relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard including module information. From this module information, and from discussions with the programme team and senior teams, the visitors were not clear how the education provider would ensure that the programmes consistently reflected the key values and professional expectations of the two professions, as articulated in guidance from the professional bodies. They were not able to see materials showing how the education provider would meet this standard, for example mechanisms for reviewing and updating the curriculums in light of changes in the profession, or a mapping document showing how the curriculum could reflect relevant curriculum guidance. They considered that there was a link to the condition set under SET 3.10, regarding the lack of evidence that there were sufficient specialist staff on the programmes. Without staff who are either from a profession or well-grounded in it, it is harder for an education provider to ensure that a programme reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of that profession. The visitors therefore require that the education provider submit evidence showing how they will ensure that the programmes will continue to reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of the professions.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the curriculum is updated in line with changes and developments in practice.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including staff curriculum vitae. From the documentation it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that the curriculum reflected current professional practice on an ongoing basis. In discussions with the programme team and senior team the visitors were given verbal assurances about this, but it was not clear to the visitors how it would be done. There did not appear to be mechanisms in place for ensuring regular review to maintain professional currency in the curriculum. The visitors considered that there was a link to the condition set under SET 3.10, regarding the lack of evidence that there were sufficient specialist staff on the programmes. Without staff who are either from a profession or well-grounded in it, it is harder for an education provider to ensure that a programme remains relevant to current practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the curriculum is updated in line with changes and developments in practice.

Reason: The visitors were not able to view documentary evidence relating to how the education provider would ensure that all learners were able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. In discussions with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors were informed that there was planning underway for inter-professional education (IPE), and that there had been some consideration at the education provider of the best way to go about this. Staff stated that they had given some consideration to which other professions were most appropriate

and relevant for IPE. They also mentioned that IPE might be available to learners via the professional practice modules. However, there was no evidence available for the visitors to consider. For example, they were not able to see IPE-related content in the professional practice modules, or detailed plans for IPE scheduling or records of communication with possible IPE partners. They were therefore not able to determine whether the standard was met. They require the education provider to submit further evidence relating to how they will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how learners will be informed of how they can catch up if they miss scheduled teaching and learning activities on the programmes.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard. They also discussed attendance and monitoring policies with the programme team and senior team. There were appropriate procedures in place for monitoring attendance, and explaining to learners which parts were mandatory. However, from their review and from these discussions it was not clear how it was communicated to learners what opportunities were available to catch up with programme content if they missed scheduled activities on the programmes. The visitors were therefore not clear that learners were fully aware of the consequences of missing compulsory parts of the programme. They require the education provider to demonstrate how learners will be enabled to understand how to catch up with missed learning.

5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners have access to an appropriate range of practice-based learning.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the Course Information Form submitted as evidence for this standard. From this document it was not clear that learners would have access to the range of placements that would fully prepare them for safe and effective practice as physiotherapists or occupational therapists. For example, there did not appear to be any opportunities for learners to spend time in mental health settings. The HCPC does not mandate that education providers must offer specific types of practice-based learning. However, the visitors considered that the type of practice-based learning settings presently available were not appropriate to the design of the programme as they did not match the breadth of topics covered in the curriculum. The senior team and the programme team stated that they wanted to offer a wide range of practice-based learning and that they had had discussions with placement providers, but there did not appear to be evidence available to show that all learners would have access to an appropriate range. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that the range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists and occupational therapists.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that practice educators are appropriately trained.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, which stated that the education provider would have access to supervisor registers at partner Trusts after the programme was approved. It was not clear to the visitors from this evidence how the education provider would ensure that practice educators had received appropriate training, or how they would ensure that ongoing training took place. They asked the senior team, programme team and practice educators about this, but it was not clear from these discussions who would be ultimately responsible for monitoring the training status of practice educators, or ensuring that such training was appropriate. It was also not clear who had final ownership of the training process. The visitors therefore require further evidence showing how the education provider can ensure that practice educators receive appropriate initial and ongoing training.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design in the modules ensures that learners can meet the standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including course information and module information forms. They also reviewed the standards of proficiency mapping (SOPs) document. It was not clear to them from this evidence how the assessment strategy and design would ensure that learners met the SOPs. This was because it was not clear how assessments were appropriately matched to the SOPs, that is to say, the visitors could not be sure that passing assessments, especially at the higher levels of the programme, would result in learners possessing all the skills and knowledge they will require to practise safely and effectively. It might be possible for learners to pass all the assessments on the programmes without actually having met the SOPs. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that assessment will be clearly linked to the SOPs. They considered that this condition is linked to the condition set under SET 4.1.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how assessment will escalate appropriately at different levels of the programmes.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including course information forms. From this evidence, and from discussions with the programme team and senior team, it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that the assessment strategy on the programme provided a reliable measure of learners' achievement. This was because it was not apparent how the assessment of learners' abilities and knowledge would take into account their position on the programme. For example, there did not seem to be any evidence of how the education

provider would guide practice educators to adjust their expectations across Levels 4, 5 and 6. Learners can reasonably be expected to achieve higher standards in the second and third years of a programme than in the first, but the visitors could not see where in the assessment strategy or other programme documentation the education provider had a way of ensuring that learners would develop higher levels of skill and knowledge to enable them to practise safely and effectively as independent professionals. The visitors therefore require that the education provider submit additional evidence showing how they will ensure that learners are assessed at the appropriate level for the level of the programme they have reached, especially in their practice-based learning.

6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must clarify their process for appointing an external examiner, and the timelines for the appointment.

Reason: The visitors were not able to access the evidence submitted for this standard, as it was a hyperlink which did not appear to be functioning. They were therefore unable to be clear about the process and requirements for appointing an external examiner for the programmes. They asked the programme team and senior team about this issue, and were told that plans were in place to make an appointment before the programmes started. The visitors understood that the programmes were not due to start for another year and so it was reasonable for an appointment not to have been made. However, in this situation, the HCPC does require evidence of a clear procedure for an appointment. The visitors were not able to see evidence relating to this process, for example a person specification or job description, and so were not able to be certain that the standard was met. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider can ensure that an appropriate external examiner will be appointed.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Bournemouth University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Approval visit date	4 – 6 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-11743-P9J4W1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	4
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	5
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	6

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Susanne Roff	Lay
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 - Diploma of Higher Education and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice; BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioners
- Panel 2 - PG Dip Social Work, MA Social Work and BA (Hons) Social Work
- Panel 3 - PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families) and MA Social Work (Children and Families)
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy

For the paramedic programme there were representatives from the professional body, College of Paramedics. For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, Chartered Society

of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational Therapists. For each profession assessed at this multi-professional event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at the approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Angelos Stefanidis	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (paramedic and operating department practice panel)
Julia Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Maxine Frampton	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Fiona Cownie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work panel)
Jack Guymer	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work children and families panel)
Andy Guttridge	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy)
External panel members		
Roger King	External panel member	University of West London—operating department practice
Lee Price	External panel member	University of Brighton – occupational therapy
Karin Crawford	External panel member	University of Lincoln – social work
Helen Frank	External panel member	University of Worcester – physiotherapy
Professional body panel members		
Vince Clarke	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Chris Moat	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Helen Frank	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Representative
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education advisor
Shan Aguilar-Stone	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Professional advisor
Vanessa Parmenter	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative

Patricia McClure	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Maureen Sheila	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education officer
HPCP MA and BA Social work panel members		
Dorothy Smith	Social worker	HPCP visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HPCP visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HPCP visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HPCP executive	HPCP – Social work panel lead
HPCP MA / PG Dip Social work (Children and Families)		
Diane Whitlock	Lay	HPCP visitor
Robert Goeman	Social worker	HPCP visitor
David Childs	Social worker	HPCP visitor
HPCP occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel members		
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist	HPCP visitor
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist	HPCP visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HPCP visitor
John Archibald	HPCP executive	HPCP –occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead
Tamara Wasylec	HPCP executive	Observer

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01672

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider advised the HCPC it intended to review the programme with the view to making a major overhaul of curriculum and assessment to update the inter-professional learning for the programmes. The programme is also moving to new facilities from September 2019.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2005

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01673

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider advised the HCPC it intended to review the programme with the view to making a major overhaul of curriculum and assessment to update the inter-professional learning for the programmes. The programme is also moving to new facilities from September 2019.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 07 December 2018.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for both programmes is appropriate.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leader. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced and, on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes a 'mentoring system', sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not provided with the documented process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate the system used to initially approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning in role emerging environments is thorough and effective.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. In discussions with the programme team and the practice educators, the visitors heard all practice-based learning settings are audited using the same system. They heard the education provider instigates the re-audit process every three years. The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (for example, NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered physiotherapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that this same audit system is effective to ensure role emerging practice-based learning environments provide suitable opportunities for learners. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervision or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the system used to initially approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning in role emerging environments and how the education provider ensures it is thorough and effective.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures the environment is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. In discussions with the programme team and the practice educators, the visitors heard all practice-based learning settings are audited using the same system. They heard the education provider instigates the re-audit process every three years. The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (for example, NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered physiotherapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that this same audit system is effective to ensure role emerging practice-based learning environments are suitable and support safe and effective learning. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervision or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of

the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments, and how the education provider ensures it is a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. In discussions with the programme team and the practice educators, the visitors heard all practice-based learning settings are audited using the same system. They heard the education provider instigates the re-audit process every three years. The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (for example, NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered physiotherapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that this same audit system is effective to ensure there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning in role emerging practice-based learning settings. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervision or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments, and how the education provider ensures an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are involved in practice-based learning.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. In discussions with the programme team and the practice educators, the visitors heard all practice-based learning settings are audited using the same system. They heard the education provider instigates the re-audit process every three years. The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (for example,

NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered physiotherapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that this same audit system is effective to ensure practice educators are suitable and are able to support and develop learners in a safe and effective way. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervisory or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the system used to initially approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate how practice educators in role emerging practice-based learning environments undertake regular training appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: In a review of the documentation the visitors were made aware new practice educators attend the education provider's practice placement educator training course. The visitors were made aware those practice educators who had received training at any education provider were recommended to attend an update every two years. From discussions at the visit with the practice educators and the programme team, the visitors understood practice educators in role emerging practice-based learning environments are also invited to receive training.

Based on these findings, the visitors were not clear how the education provider ensures practice educators in role emerging practice-based learning environments, where the practice-based educator may not be from the relevant part of the Register, undertake regular training so they are appropriately prepared to support learning and assess learners effectively. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervisory or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures practice educators in role emerging environments undertake regular training appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Recommendation: The education provider should explore a wider range of methods of maintaining collaboration between themselves and practice education providers across both programmes.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware of various methods of communication between the education provider and the practice education providers. The documentation explained the physiotherapy programme team consults with practice education providers to discuss any issues related to placement learning. The visitors were informed there are regular update events for occupational therapy practice education providers throughout the academic year. In the meeting with practice educators however, the visitors were told by some practice educators they felt uninformed of the process of change to the programmes. Some practice educators conversely said they were essentially told by the education provider of the changes to the programmes.

From the review of these communication methods the visitors were satisfied this standard was met. However, they recommended the education provider should consider further how they work in partnership with those who provide practice-based learning and should explore a wider range of methods of maintaining regular and effective collaboration between themselves and practice education providers.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Recommendation: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider should increase efforts for a more diverse range of placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were informed that at the moment most practice-based learning is based in NHS practice-based learning settings. The documentation stated they currently have provision for placements away from the National Health Service (NHS) in the private sector and within the Ministry of Defence. The programme team informed the visitors they have had a small number of role-emerging placements but these were not currently sustainable.

From the review of the placements, the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors recommend the education provider continue with their efforts to offer practice-based learning experiences in non-NHS practice-based learning settings.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should review the reading lists of modules to ensure the programme reflects current practice.

Reason: On review of the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team at the visit, the visitors noted the reading lists for the modules were becoming dated. In the programme team meeting the visitors were told the programme team would look at the lists. Whilst the visitors were satisfied the standard was met, they recommend the education provider revisit the reading lists for modules and bring

them more up-to-date, to ensure appropriate and effective resources were referenced and available to support learning.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Recommendation: The education provider should explore other opportunities for how learners are prepared to work with other professionals and across professions.

Reason: From the review of the documentation and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed the process of learning and working together with and from other relevant professionals (inter-professional Education (IPE)) was through a research-based unit. The programme team said there was no treatment-based IPE unit. The programme team said they had inter-professional theme days but these were separate to the research-based unit and consisted more of a case-based study exercise. From the evidence provided, the visitors were satisfied the standard was met. However, the visitors recommend the education provider look into other opportunities for learning with and from professionals and learners from other relevant professions so inter-professional education is as relevant as possible for learners and is of the most benefit for their future professional practice and for service users and carers.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Bournemouth University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Approval visit date	4 - 6 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-14167-Q8G7G0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	4
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	5

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
David Whitmore	Paramedic
Frances Ashworth	Lay
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 - Diploma of Higher Education and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice; BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioners
- Panel 2 - PG Dip Social Work, MA Social Work and BA (Hons) Social Work
- Panel 3 - PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families) and MA Social Work (Children and Families)
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy

For the paramedic programme there were representatives from the professional body, College of Paramedics. For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational Therapists. For each profession assessed at this multi-professional event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at the approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Angelos Stefanidis	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (paramedic and operating department practice panel)
Julia Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Maxine Frampton	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Fiona Cownie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work panel)
Jack Guymer	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work children and families panel)
Andy Guttridge	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy)
External panel members		
Roger King	External panel member	University of West London—operating department practice
Lee Price	External panel member	University of Brighton – occupational therapy
Karin Crawford	External panel member	University of Lincoln – social work
Helen Frank	External panel member	University of Worcester – physiotherapy
Professional body panel members		
Vince Clarke	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Chris Moat	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Helen Frank	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Representative
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education advisor
Shan Aguilar-Stone	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Professional advisor

Vanessa Parmenter	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Patricia McClure	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Maureen Sheila	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education officer
HPCP MA and BA Social work panel members		
Dorothy Smith	Social worker	HPCP visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HPCP visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HPCP visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HPCP executive	HPCP – Social work panel lead
HPCP MA / PG Dip Social work (Children and Families)		
Diane Whitlock	Lay	HPCP visitor
Robert Goeman	Social worker	HPCP visitor
David Childs	Social worker	HPCP visitor
HPCP occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel members		
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist	HPCP visitor
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist	HPCP visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HPCP visitor
John Archibald	HPCP executive	HPCP –occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead
Tamara Wasylec	HPCP executive	Observer

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01676

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was

provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 07 December 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that admissions information will give applicants the information they require so that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up the offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures pertinent admissions information will be communicated to potential applicants in order for them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the education provider is intending to change the admission procedure. The visitors were unclear as to what these changes will be, and therefore could not determine how pertinent information would be appropriately communicated to prospective applicants. In particular they were not clear how the education provider intends to communicate the following information:

- the requirement for, and process associated with, any Disclosure and Barring Service or health requirements, and any associated costs to the learner;
- any additional costs learners may incur over and above the usual programme fee; and
- the expectation that learners will travel to placements at their own expense and that this is an additional cost for the learners;

The visitors therefore require further information showing how prospective applicants are provided with the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to apply for a place on the programme.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes is appropriate

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leader. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced and, on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes 'mentoring system', sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to

demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is an effective process to ensure that all learners have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that ambulance practice-based learning will be provided by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) and South Western Ambulance service (SWAS). The education provider explained that practice-based learning opportunities are allocated for ambulance practice-based learning by identifying where learners live, along with mentors available within the specific area. The available mentors are checked to ensure there are no conflicts of interest with learners on the programme. In discussions with the practice education providers and the programme team, the visitors learned that there was not a process in place for allocating non-ambulance practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider would ensure the availability and capacity of non-ambulance practice-based learning. As such, the education provider must demonstrate there is an effective process in place to ensure all learners on the programme have access to non-ambulance practice-based learning that meets their learning needs.

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme and senior teams, the visitors heard that two new member of staff have been recruited to support the programme. However, the additional staff are not yet in post. The visitors were not able to see evidence relating to who would be delivering the different aspects of the programme, following the recruitment to these posts. As a result, the visitors were unable to determine whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is, or will be, an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver this programme effectively.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information, which demonstrates that module leaders and external have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise for their role in the programme.

Reason: From the programme documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the module descriptors and module leaders are still in draft form. During discussion at the visit, the visitors were informed that two new member of staff have been recruited to support the programme. However, the additional staff are not yet in post. In order to be assured that there is enough profession specific input, and to ensure subject areas will be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further evidence. As such, the education provider must demonstrate who the module leaders and external lecturers are, and that they have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver the programme content for which they are responsible. The visitors therefore require details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external tutors will be in order to determine how this standard can be met.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate what significant changes have been made as a response to the professional body's requirements, and how those changes ensure that resources are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit and from the conclusions of the College of Paramedics, it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by the professional body panel. The visitors considered the programme documentation an important resource to support learning as learners are likely to refer to it often. In particular, the professional body panel conditions referred to amendments to module assessments, possibly the programme specification document, and the learner handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review any changes made to the resources due to the education provider's response to the internal validation event. As such, the education provider must provide evidence, which demonstrates that the amended learner resources to support learning are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme. The education provider may wish to provide the programme documentation that has been revised, or provide an overview of their response to the internal validation event.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the resources to support learning in all setting are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that some of the information contained within the documentation regarding HCPC requirements is inaccurate. Within the programme brochure it states that "successful completion of this course means you can apply to register with the HCPC". However, this is not accurate as successful completion of the programme gives the learner the eligibility to apply for registration, not entitlement to register with the HCPC. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence, which demonstrates that the documentation has been amended to reflect the correct information.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving some information about how learners who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, the SOPs mapping made broad references to modules, rather than specific references to the learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the module learning outcomes linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that learners completing the programme can meet the SOPs. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes were in place but were yet to be finalised throughout the documentation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define the link between the learning outcomes associated with all aspects of this programme and how these outcomes will ensure that learners completing the programme can meet all of the relevant SOPs.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must identify where learners' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: From reviewing of the documentation, the visitors could not identify the attendance requirements for learners or how learners were informed about the mandatory elements of the programme. In discussion with the learners from the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme there was lack of clarity regarding understanding of the attendance policy and the associated monitoring mechanisms for this programme. The programme team highlighted that they expect full attendance at all times from learners. However, the visitors were unable to see where in the documentation this requirement was communicated to learners. Through discussion with the programme team, the visitors learnt that for in house lectures, attendance sheets are sometimes used to monitor attendance and that poor attendance would be followed up. From the documentation sent prior to the visit and discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how learners starting the programme would be informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for learners who fail to attend. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to learners. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how learners are made aware of what effect contravening this policy may have on their ability to progress through the programme.

5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners have access to practice-based learning of appropriate structure, duration and range to support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that ambulance practice-based learning will be provided by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) and South Western Ambulance service (SWAS). From the documentation, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that for ambulance placements there is an appropriate structure, duration and range of placements. However, it was unclear from the discussions and the documentation how the education provider will manage the non-ambulance placement. In particular the visitors were unclear on the structure, duration and range of these placements and how they will support the achievement of the learning outcomes. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the structure, duration and range of non-ambulance practice based learning for learners on this programme, and how it supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs for paramedics. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is a thorough and effective system in place for approving and monitoring non-ambulance practice-based learning.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that ambulance practice-based learning will be provided by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) and South Western Ambulance service (SWAS). From the documentation, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that there was a process in place to approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning at SCAS and SWAS. However, it was unclear from the discussions and the documentation how the education provider would maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of non-ambulance practice-based learning. In discussions, the programme team provided verbal assurances that a system is in place to approve and ensure the quality of non-ambulance practice-based learning. However, this process was not reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to determine that the education provider would approve and ensure the quality of all non-ambulance practice based learning. As such, the education provider must demonstrate that there is a well-defined, robust process for approving and ensuring the quality for non-ambulance placements.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that practice-based learning environments are safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were unclear what policies the education provider has in place to ensure that the non-ambulance practice-based learning environment is safe and supportive for learners and service users. During discussions with the programme team and practice educators, the visitors learned that a system was in place for ambulance placements. However, the education provider has not demonstrated what process was in place for non-ambulance placements. As the visitors were unable to determine that there is an effective system for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements, they were unable to establish whether there

was a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users for non-ambulance practice based learning. As such, the education provider will need to demonstrate what systems they have in place in the non-ambulance setting that will ensure there is a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in non-ambulance practice-based learning.

Reason: As the visitors were unable to determine that there is an effective system for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements (the condition set under SET 5.3 above), they were unable to determine whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in the practice-based setting. As such, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning in non-ambulance practice-based learning.

Reason: As the visitors were unable to determine that there is an effective system for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements (the condition set under SET 5.3 above), they were unable to determine that the practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. In order for the visitors to be able to make a judgement on whether this standard is met, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that practice educators are appropriately qualified to support safe and effective learning when learners are on a non-ambulance based placement.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have a process in place to ensure that all practice educators in non-ambulance practice-based learning undertake appropriate initial and ongoing training and that this is recorded and monitored.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that practice educators from South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) and South Western Ambulance service (SWAS) will complete a mentorship programme at the university focusing upon learning styles and the best ways of coaching in practice, as well as access to ongoing training. This is available for ambulance placements. The visitors were satisfied that the standard as far as ambulance placements were concerned. However, as the visitors

were unable to determine that there is an effective system for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements, they were unable to determine what training non-ambulance practice educators would receive. As such, the education provider must demonstrate that they have a process in place to ensure that all practice educators are receiving appropriate initial and ongoing training and that this is recorded and monitored.

5.8 Learners and practice educators must have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that learners and practice educators have the information they need in order to be prepared for practice-based learning in the non-ambulance setting.

Reason: As the visitors were unable to determine that there is an effective system for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements (cf. the condition set under SET 5.3 above), they were unable to determine how learners and practice educators will have the information they require to be prepared for non-ambulance placements. As such, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that they provide learners and practice educators with all the information required in a timely manner to ensure that they are prepared for the non-ambulance placement on the programme.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessments of learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how the assessment procedures for the programme will ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, the SOPs mapping made broad references to the modules and rather than specific references to learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how the assessment of each module and the associated learning outcomes were linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme has demonstrated that they meet the SOPs. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes and associated assessments were in place but were yet to be finalised throughout the documentation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define the link between the assessment of students associated with all aspects of this programme and how these assessments will ensure that students completing the programme have demonstrated that they have met all of the relevant part of the register.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must finalise the assessment strategy and design to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how the assessment procedures for the programme will ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the visitors noted that the module descriptors were still in draft form and still not finalised. As the visitors did not have sight of the final module descriptors, they were unable to determine the following:

- the module content for this programme;
- which learning outcomes are contained in each module; and,
- how those learning outcomes would be assessed.

As the visitors have not seen the final version of the modules for the programme, the visitors were not clear how the final version of the learning outcomes would be assessed. As such, the visitors could not determine how the assessment strategy and design would ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Bournemouth University
Name of programme(s)	PG Dip Social Work, Full time MA Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Approval visit date	4 – 6 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-12973-N6P3V8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	4
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	5
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	6

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Dorothy Smith	Social worker
Kate Johnson	Social worker
Manoj Mistry	Lay
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 - Diploma of Higher Education and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice; BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioners
- Panel 2 - PG Dip Social Work, MA Social Work and BA (Hons) Social Work
- Panel 3 - PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families) and MA Social Work (Children and Families)
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy

For the paramedic programme there were representatives from the professional body, College of Paramedics. For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational Therapists. For each profession

assessed at this multi-professional event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at the approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Angelos Stefanidis	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (paramedic and operating department practice panel)
Julia Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Maxine Frampton	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Fiona Cownie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work panel)
Jack Guymer	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work children and families panel)
Andy Guttridge	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy)
External panel members		
Roger King	External panel member	University of West London—operating department practice
Lee Price	External panel member	University of Brighton – occupational therapy
Karin Crawford	External panel member	University of Lincoln – social work
Helen Frank	External panel member	University of Worcester – physiotherapy
Professional body panel members		
Vince Clarke	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Chris Moat	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Helen Frank	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Representative
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education advisor
Shan Aguilar-Stone	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Professional advisor
Vanessa Parmenter	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative

Patricia McClure	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Maureen Sheila	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education officer
HPCPC MA and BA Social work panel members		
Dorothy Smith	Social worker	HPCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HPCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HPCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HPCPC executive	HPCPC – Social work panel lead
HPCPC MA / PG Dip Social wok (Children and Families)		
Diane Whitlock	Lay	HPCPC visitor
Robert Goeman	Social worker	HPCPC visitor
David Childs	Social worker	HPCPC visitor
HPCPC Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel members		
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist	HPCPC visitor
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist	HPCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HPCPC visitor
John Archibald	HPCPC executive	HPCPC –occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead
Tamara Wasylec	HPCPC executive	Observer

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 March 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01856

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 March 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01857

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 August 2003

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01858

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programmes continue to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment.

The education provider submitted a major change notification flagging changes to curriculum and assessment, and updates to the inter-professional learning for the programmes, as part of a review of all the programmes within the Faculty. From the major change, we decided to assess the programmes via the approval process against all of the standards of education and training.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 07 December 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must revise documentation so information regarding entry requirements for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme is consistent, to ensure applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors noted inconsistencies with the entry requirements relating to UCAS tariff points for the BA (Hons) Social Work. The 'Briefing resources document' includes the UCAS tariff points requirement, which is different to the requirement included in the programme specification. The visitors noted that the inconsistency of information may cause confusion for potential applicants, and does not ensure that the applicant has the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme. At this visit, the programme team confirmed this needs to be amended. As such, the visitors require further information to be assured that the documentation provides consistent information in relation to entry requirements, to ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants are monitored.

Reason: From review of programme documentation and from discussions with the senior team and programme team, the visitors were aware that there were equality and diversity policies relating to admissions in place. They considered that these policies were appropriate. However, they could not see from the evidence provided, or from

discussions with the programme team and senior team, how data generated from equality and diversity monitoring was used to ensure that there was no unfair discrimination in admissions. Similarly, members of the senior team were involved in working groups that focused on equality and diversity but the visitors could not see how this work fed into the completion of feedback loops regarding equality and diversity in admissions. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how the data gathered from equality and diversity monitoring is used to implement changes in admissions procedures where appropriate.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes is appropriate

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leader. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes 'mentoring system', sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including staff profiles. From this documentation and from discussion with the programme team and senior team about the number of learners, the visitors could not determine whether the existing staff team would be able to deliver the programme effectively. For example, they were not able to see a breakdown of the staff's full time equivalent (FTE) commitments to the different programmes across the social work provision. When the visitors asked about staffing, the programme team were not able to give assurances that they could deliver an effective programme with current staffing levels. The visitors also noted from discussions at the visit that a staff member who had previously been working one day a week on the social work programmes was now on secondment and

could no longer commit any time to the programmes. The senior team suggested to the visitors that more recruitment was possible but the visitors were not able to see plans or timescales for this recruitment. They were therefore unable to be satisfied that there were an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure an appropriate level of staffing for the programmes.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must revise documentation for the MA and PG Dip Social Work programmes to ensure consistency, in order to demonstrate that the resources to support learning in all settings are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

Reason: For the MA Social Work and PG Dip Social Work programmes, the visitors found there are inconsistencies in module titles across the documentation. This includes mention of the 'Understanding Mental Health and Substance Misuse' module which is included in the Unit Guide. The programme team confirmed this module was included in error, and agreed that inconsistencies in module titles needed to be amended. The visitors require updated information to ensure that the documentation contains consistent information on the modules, including module titles, in order to be assured that the resources to support learning in all settings are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

3.14 The programme must implement and monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to learners are monitored.

Reason: From review of programme documentation and from discussions with the senior team and programme team, the visitors were aware that there were equality and diversity policies in place relating to learners. They considered that these policies were appropriate. However, they could not see from the evidence provided, or from discussions with the programme team and senior team, how data generated from equality and diversity monitoring was used to ensure that the programme provided an impartial, fair and supportive environment. Similarly, members of the senior team were involved in working groups that focused on equality and diversity but the visitors could not see how this work fed into the completion of feedback loops regarding equality and diversity for learners on the programme. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how the data gathered from equality and diversity monitoring is used to implement changes on the programme where appropriate.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the university's "Fusion" plan for promoting research, teaching and practice. In the documentation the visitors could not see how the education provider intended to ensure that learners on social work programmes would be enabled to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. The programme team and senior team informed the visitors that they hoped learners would have opportunities for inter-professional education (IPE) in practice-based learning. They also stated that they hoped to develop IPE in the academic setting, but the visitors were not able to see evidence relating to how this would be developed and how the education provider would ensure that all learners would have access to appropriate IPE. They were also not clear how the education provider would ensure that the IPE would be designed and delivered in such a way as to ensure that it was as relevant and useful as possible. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that learners will be enabled to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators complete practice-based learning audit forms as required.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the audit process for practice-based learning. The education provider used a process known as QAPL, or quality assurance of practice learning. They considered that the audit system itself was appropriate for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. However, the programme team informed the visitors that they sometimes found it difficult to ensure that local authority practice educators completed their QAPL forms at the appropriate time. The visitors were therefore not clear how the education provider ensured that their system for practice-based learning was thorough and effective. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that their system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning is effective.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators receive regular training appropriate to their role.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the expected qualifications for practice educators. They also discussed training for practice educators with the programme team and practice educators. From their review and from discussions it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that all practice educators had received appropriate training. The programme team told visitors that they had confidence in their partners to train their staff appropriately, and the practice educators informed the visitors that they had access to training as required. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence of a process by which the education provider could consistently monitor the training status of practice educators, and could ensure that practice educators undertook ongoing training where

appropriate. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence of how they will ensure that practice educators undertake regular training.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to encourage staff to continue their professional and academic development in line with the programmes in place.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met at threshold, as there was a programme in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, both in the university setting and in practice-based learning. The education provider had a strong university-wide focus on staff development, and provided professional and academic development opportunities for practice educators. However, from discussion with the programme team the visitors were aware that some staff member's opportunities to take part were limited by time or other factors. The visitors considered that this may create a risk that in future the development programme would no longer be effective, because staff were not taking part. They therefore suggest that the education provider keep under review how they enable staff to participate in professional and academic development.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Bournemouth University
Name of programme(s)	PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families), Full time MA Social Work (Children and Families), Full time
Approval visit date	4 – 6 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13069-C3N6G8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	4
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	5
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	6

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Robert Goemans	Social worker
David Childs	Social worker
Diane Whitlock	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 - Diploma of Higher Education and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice; BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioners
- Panel 2 - PG Dip Social Work, MA Social Work and BA (Hons) Social Work
- Panel 3 - PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families) and MA Social Work (Children and Families)
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy

For the paramedic programme there were representatives from the professional body, College of Paramedics. For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational Therapists. For each profession

assessed at this multi-professional event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at the approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Angelos Stefanidis	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (paramedic and operating department practice panel)
Julia Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Maxine Frampton	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Fiona Cownie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work panel)
Jack Guymer	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work children and families panel)
Andy Guttridge	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy)
External panel members		
Roger King	External panel member	University of West London—operating department practice
Lee Price	External panel member	University of Brighton – occupational therapy
Karin Crawford	External panel member	University of Lincoln – social work
Helen Frank	External panel member	University of Worcester – physiotherapy
Professional body panel members		
Vince Clarke	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Chris Moat	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Helen Frank	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Representative
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education advisor
Shan Aguilar-Stone	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Professional advisor
Vanessa Parmenter	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative

Patricia McClure	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Maureen Sheila	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education officer
HPCP MA and BA Social work panel members		
Dorothy Smith	Social worker	HPCP visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HPCP visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HPCP visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HPCP executive	HPCP – Social work panel lead
HPCP MA / PG Dip Social work (Children and Families)		
Diane Whitlock	Lay	HPCP visitor
Robert Goeman	Social worker	HPCP visitor
David Childs	Social worker	HPCP visitor
HPCP occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel members		
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist	HPCP visitor
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist	HPCP visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HPCP visitor
John Archibald	HPCP executive	HPCP –occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead
Tamara Wasylec	HPCP executive	Observer

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01874

Programme name	MA Social Work (Children and Families)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01875

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programmes continue to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programmes via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment.

The education provider submitted a major change notification flagging changes to curriculum and assessment, and updates to the inter-professional learning for the programmes, as part of a review of all the programmes within the Faculty. From the major change, we decided to assess the programmes via the approval process against all of the standards of education and training.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 07 December 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will make it clear to applicants that these programmes offer a generic social work qualification rather than a specialist Children and Families qualification.

Reason: The visitors were aware that the programmes' titles included the subtitle "Children and Families", even though the HCPC approves social work programmes as generic qualifications that need to equip social workers in England for all areas of practice. From discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that the content of the programme was appropriately generic. However, the visitors considered that the generic nature of the programme was not made clear on the programme website. In discussions at the visit, some of the learners and practice educators appeared to be under the impression that the programmes were specialist Children and Families programmes. The visitors considered that this title, and other information about the programme, created a risk that applicants or potential applicants would misunderstand the nature of the programme, and so would not be able to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place. As a result they could not determine whether applicants would have all the information which they might need. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure that all applicants understand that they are applying to a generic social work programme, not a specialist children & families one; and

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they communicate to applicants whether recognition of prior learning is available on the programmes.

Reason: From their review of documentation and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors understood that the Step Up programmes did not offer recognition of prior learning (RPL). The HCPC does not require education providers to offer RPL so this is not an issue in itself. However, the visitors were not able to see where applicants would be informed of the RPL policy in the information available to them, and so it was not clear to them that the education provider had appropriately explained their processes in this area to applicants. As a result they could not determine whether the education provider gave applicants the information they required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they inform applicants of their policy regarding RPL.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants are monitored.

Reason: From review of programme documentation and from discussions with the senior team and programme team, the visitors were aware that there were equality and diversity policies relating to admissions in place. They considered that these policies were appropriate. However, they could not see from the evidence provided, or from discussions with the programme team and senior team, how data generated from equality and diversity monitoring was used to ensure that there was no unfair discrimination in admissions. Similarly, members of the senior team were involved in working groups that focused on equality and diversity but the visitors could not see how this work fed into the completion of feedback loops regarding equality and diversity in admissions. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how the data gathered from equality and diversity monitoring is used to implement changes in admissions procedures where appropriate.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the roles and responsibilities in the working relationship between the education provider, the local authority and the Step Up organisation.

Reason: The visitors were aware from programme documentation that Step Up programmes are a partnership between the education provider, their local authority partners and the central Step Up organisation. They considered that this is an appropriate means of programme management, but they were not able to see evidence clarifying the various roles and responsibilities of the different organisations. In particular it was not clear who would bear the responsibility for addressing issues arising in practice-based learning. The programme team and the practice educators did give verbal assurances to the visitors that there were mechanisms in place, but the visitors did not see evidence of a clear written process. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that there is a process to deal with any issues or problems that arise in practice-based learning.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes is appropriate

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leader. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes 'mentoring system', sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence showing regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the stakeholders in the Step Up partnership.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including the programme handbook. This contained a description for learners of the practice placement cycle and the placement preparation process. However, the visitors were not able to see specific evidence relating to the collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers. The senior team, programme team and practice educators gave the visitors verbal assurances that there was ongoing collaboration between the stakeholders in the Step Up partnership. However, the visitors were not able to make a judgment about whether this collaboration was regular and effective. In particular, they were not able to determine whether the programme team had an ongoing relationship with the local authority's adult social care services, through which the education provider could ensure that learners would have access to appropriate practice-based learning opportunities in adult social work settings. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating regular and effective collaboration with all stakeholders.

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including staff profiles. From this documentation and from discussion with the programme team and senior team about the number of learners, it was not clear to the visitors that the existing staff team would be able to deliver the programme effectively. They were not able to see a breakdown of the staff's full time equivalent (FTE) commitments to the different programmes across the social work provision. When the visitors asked about staffing, the programme team were not able to give assurances that they could deliver an effective programme with current staffing levels. The visitors also noted from discussions at the visit that a staff member who had previously been working one day a week on the social work programmes was now on secondment and could no longer commit any time to the programmes. The senior team suggested to the visitors that more recruitment was possible but the visitors were not able to see plans for this recruitment. They were therefore unable to be satisfied that there were an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure an appropriate level of staffing for the programmes.

3.13 There must be effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners in practice-based learning have access to appropriate wellbeing and learning support.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including university-level policies on academic support and an additional learning needs policy. From this evidence, and from discussions with the programme team and with learners, they were satisfied that the arrangements for supporting learners in the academic setting were appropriate. However, it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that learners would have access to such support while in practice-based learning. The visitors were aware from discussions with the programme team and practice educators that staff from the education provider did not visit learners while they were in practice-based learning. The HCPC does not require that education providers send staff to visit learners in practice-based learning, but the visitors could not see that any other appropriate arrangements were in place to provide wellbeing and learning support to learners in practice-based learning. The programme team informed visitors that they were planning to start visiting learners in practice-based learning, but the visitors did not see evidence relating to the planning for this. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that learners have access to appropriate support while in practice-based learning.

3.14 The programme must implement and monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to learners are monitored.

Reason: From review of programme documentation and from discussions with the senior team and programme team, the visitors were aware that there were equality and diversity policies in place in relation to learners. They considered that these policies were appropriate. However, they could not see from the evidence provided, or from discussions with the programme team and senior team, how data generated from equality and diversity monitoring was used to ensure that the programme provided an impartial, fair and supportive environment. Similarly, members of the senior team were involved in working groups that focused on equality and diversity but the visitors could not see how this work fed into the completion of feedback loops regarding equality and diversity for learners on the programme. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how the data gathered from equality and diversity monitoring is used to implement changes on the programme where appropriate.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the university's "Fusion" plan for promoting research, teaching and practice. In the documentation the visitors could not see how the education provider intended to ensure that learners on social work programmes would be enabled to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. The programme team and senior team informed the visitors that they hoped learners would have opportunities for inter-professional education (IPE) in practice-based learning. They also stated that they hoped to develop IPE in the academic setting, but the visitors were not able to see evidence relating to how this would be developed and how the education provider would ensure that all learners would have access to appropriate IPE. They were also not clear how the education provider would ensure that the IPE would be designed and delivered in such a way as to ensure that it was as relevant and useful as possible. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that learners will be enabled to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is appropriate availability of practice-based learning in adult social care settings.

Reason: The visitors reviewed documentation relating to this standard, including the description of practice-based learning in the programme specification and guidance for learners in the practice-based learning handbook. They were aware from the documentation that, even though the programme was subtitled "Children & Families", the curriculum content was appropriately generic. However, from the evidence provided, they were not able to determine whether the programme was able to ensure that learners had access to sufficient adult social care placements. At the practice education provider meeting the majority of attendees were from children and families settings, and they were not able to assure the visitors that there would be appropriate adult

placements available as required. Some practice educators appeared to be under the impression that the programme was a specific children and families programme, even though the HCPC approves social work programmes as generic qualifications that need to equip social workers in England for all areas of practice. The learners to whom the visitors spoke about this issue stated that their own practice-based learning had been heavily focused on children and families work. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were given assurances that all learners would have access to appropriate adult social care experience in practice-based learning. However, they were not able to see evidence relating to how the education provider would ensure an appropriate level of genericism in practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners have appropriate experience of adult social care settings in their practice-based learning, such that learners are able to meet the relevant learning outcomes and standards of proficiency.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators complete practice-based learning audit forms as required.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the audit process for practice-based learning. The education provider used a form known as QAPL, or quality assurance of practice learning. They considered that the audit system itself was appropriate for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. However, the programme team informed the visitors that they sometimes found it difficult to ensure that local authority practice educators completed their QAPL forms at the appropriate time. The visitors were therefore not clear how the education provider ensured that their system for quality-assuring practice-based learning was thorough and effective. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that their system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning is effective.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators receive regular training appropriate to their role.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the expected qualifications for practice educators. They also discussed training for practice educators with the programme team and practice educators. From their review and from discussions it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that all practice educators had received appropriate training. The programme team told visitors that they had confidence in their partners to train their staff appropriately, and the practice educators informed the visitors that they had access to training as required. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence of a process by which the education provider could consistently monitor the training status of practice educators, and could ensure that practice educators undertook new training where appropriate. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence of how they will ensure that practice educators undertake regular training.

6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify for learners whether, and under what circumstances, resits of modules are permitted.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence relating to this standard, including a section in the programme handbook laying out for learners the detail of learning hours and assessment. For the PGDip programme, it was not clear to the visitors from this evidence whether learners would be allowed to resit modules. The programme team were able to answer the visitors' questions about resit procedures, and the visitors were satisfied that there were appropriate policies in place, but the learners did not appear to be familiar with the policies. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that learners understand the circumstances, if any, under which resits of modules might be permitted.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how they communicate to applicants and staff the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) and occupational health check procedures, and the principles of the decision-making process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as all the appropriate information about the Step Up applications process was available for applicants on the relevant websites. However, they considered that it was not easy for applicants to discover the principles that would underlie the education provider's decision-making process if either occupational health or DBS checks highlighted a potential issue. For example, it was difficult for applicants to find out what kind of health condition or what kind of past convictions might be disqualifying. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were told that such cases were considered on an individual basis according to a set of guidelines, and that applicants who inquired could have this explained to them. The HCPC does not have specific requirements around the level of detail about checks that must be communicated to applicants. However, the visitors considered that there was a risk that if the principles underlying the case-by-case decision-making were not easily accessible, it might mean that in future an applicant might be prevented from making an informed choice about whether to take up a place.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to encourage staff to continue their professional and academic development in line with the programmes in place.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met at threshold, as there was a programme in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, both in the academic setting and in practice-based learning. The education provider had a strong university-wide focus on staff development, and provided professional and academic development opportunities for practice educators. However, from discussion with the programme team the visitors were aware that some staff members' opportunities to take part were limited by time or other factors. The visitors considered that this may create a risk that in future the development programme would no longer be effective, because staff were not taking part. They therefore suggest that the education provider keep under review how they enable staff to participate in professional and academic development.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, PT (Part time)
Approval visit date	11 - 12 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13063-Y9Y3X5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	9

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Rebecca Khanna	Occupational therapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Susanne Roff	Lay
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Darrell Brookes	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Central Lancashire
Carl Nuttall	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Central Lancashire
Helen Roberts	External panel member	University of Derby
Caroline Livesey	External panel member	Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre Hospitals NHS Trust

Andy Ginty	Internal panel member	University of Central Lancashire
Kartina Choong	Internal panel member	University of Central Lancashire
Clair Parkin	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education manager
Anne Longmore	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Julie-Anne Lowe	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01891

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01893

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was

provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	This is a new programme, so the panel met with learners from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further

evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 16 November 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify their process for recognition of prior learning and experience.

Reason: From their review of the documentation and in discussions, the visitors were made aware there is a process for assessing applicant's prior learning and experience on a case-by-case basis. The visitors were made aware from a planning consent form that graduates with a Foundation Degree as an Assistant Practitioner who work within an Occupational therapy or a therapies service were able to have their prior learning assessed and recognised so they were able to start in the second year of the programme. However, the visitors could not see this communicated in other documentation for applicants. The visitors could not determine how or at what point in the programme learners from the foundation degree could apply for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy at Level 5. The visitors could therefore not determine the information provided throughout the admissions process is clear and allows for informed decision-making. Therefore, the education provider needs to provide evidence of the programme's process for assessing applicants' prior learning and how this will be reflected in the information provided to both applicants and the education provider.

2.4 The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Condition: The education provider must provide assurance about their process for applicant criminal conviction checks for candidates from outside the UK enables them to assess the suitability of applicants in an appropriate way.

Reason: From the review of the documentation provided and in discussions at the visit, the visitors were made aware that applicants had to demonstrate a satisfactory enhanced disclosure and barring check. As this check is appropriate for UK applicants, the visitors were not clear as to the process for international applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review information and provide clarification as to the process for carrying out criminal conviction checks when assessing the suitability of applicants from outside of the UK.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate all learners on the programme will have sufficient resources to support their learning and the educators will have the appropriate resources to deliver the programme effectively.

Reason: In the resources presentation at the visit, the visitors were made aware the education provider is developing a purpose-built occupational therapy facility. This facility included two learning areas, a flat set-up including two supporting skills technicians and clinical skills lab facilities. On the tour of facilities, the visitors were able

to view teaching and learning areas and resources, and discuss resourcing of the programme. However, the new facilities, which are being proposed as a dedicated space for occupational therapy learners were still being developed. Also, the visitors were not provided with any supplementary information around the planning for this new facility. As such, the visitors were not clear what physical teaching space and facilities there will be for learners and educators on the programmes and what facilities will be dedicated to the programmes. In particular, it was not clear whether learners on the programmes would be using the resources alongside learners from other programmes, and if so, how they will be timetabled.

Based on these findings the visitors were not satisfied learners and educators will have access to sufficient learning resources to support learning in all settings. They could not be certain the education provider would have the resources and be able to use the rooms effectively for the projected number of learners on the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programmes if they were going to be alongside learners from other programmes. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate all the learners on the programme will have sufficient resources to support learning and the educators will have the appropriate resources to deliver the programme effectively.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must review the documentation to make sure it is clear which programmes provide eligibility to apply for admission to the Register and which do not.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the course handbook, programme specification and module descriptors. The visitors noted that the exit awards for this programme are the Bachelor Degree Rehabilitation Studies, Diploma of Higher Education Rehabilitation Studies and the Certificate of Higher Education. Firstly, the visitors were unsure what the names of the latter exit award was as there was no programme title attached to the award. However, when reviewing the programme specification the visitors did not also see any evidence of how learners and educators will be made aware these exit awards will not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the Register. The education provider must review its documentation to clearly specify what programme will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC, the exit awards for this programme, and that they do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how learners will be able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were provided with evidence within the course handbook and the practice placement information document. The visitors were made aware there is an IPE group, staffed from all schools within the faculty. The learners said they were expected to have IPE experience in the practice-based learning setting. In the meeting with the senior team the visitors were informed the education provider's

overarching IPE strategy was not yet developed. The programme team informed the visitors they were hoping the design principles for the MSc Occupational Therapy would feed into IPE for the undergraduate programme. The visitors were informed there were links between the programme and social care provision in practice-based learning and colleagues from Pharmacy, and that they were to work on shared sessions with physiotherapists.

The visitors were unclear about the education provider's plans for developing an IPE strategy, and how this would lead to planned and meaningful IPE engagement for learners on this programme. They were unclear how the IPE will ensure learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners from other relevant professions and how the education provider had decided which professions are most relevant to the programme and most useful for preparing learners for practice. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence on the design, delivery and long-term development of IPE on the programme, and how this ensures it is relevant for learners and is beneficial for their future practice.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate they have a process in place for obtaining consent from learners where appropriate.

Reason: In discussions at the visit, the learners informed the visitors there is a consent process. During the visit, the visitors received a copy of the consent form, and accompanying information for learners, for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. The visitors did not receive a consent form for the programmes under review but were informed the same format of form and information would be used. From their review of this document, the visitors were not clear the process for obtaining consent from learners was in place. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate they have an effective and up-to-date process in place for obtaining formal consent from learners on the programme where appropriate.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must review their documentation to ensure learners are able to give informed and appropriate consent.

Reason: In discussions at the visit, the learners informed the visitors there is a consent process. During the visit, the visitors received a copy of the consent form, and accompanying information for learners, for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. The visitors did not receive a consent form for the programmes under review but were informed the same format of form and information would be used. The visitors noted the form contained language which could prove to be confusing to learners. The visitors are therefore concerned the learners would not be fully aware of any implications from signing the form, and so informed consent could not be obtained. As such, the visitors require the education provider to review the documentation to ensure it is clear for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the system used to approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning in role emerging environments is thorough and effective.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. The visitors were made aware from the documentation practice-based learning providers are visited by a member of the programme team or Work Based Learning Team prior to the approval of the placement in order to complete a Learning Environment Audit. At the visit, the education provider provided the visitors with the North West Learning Environment Educational Audit, which is completed to approve new practice-based learning settings and to monitor the quality of existing ones.

The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional, practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (e.g. NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered occupational therapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied this same audit system is effective to ensure role emerging practice-based learning environments provide suitable opportunities for learners. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings with long-arm, and not direct, supervision from registered occupational therapists. Additionally, they noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the system used to approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning in role emerging environments and how the education provider ensures it is thorough and effective.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the system used to approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures the environment is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. The visitors were made aware from the documentation practice-based learning providers are visited by a member of the programme team or Work Based Learning Team prior to the approval of the placement in order to complete a Learning Environment Audit. At the visit, the education provider provided the visitors with the North West Learning Environment Educational Audit, which is completed to approve new practice-based learning settings and to monitor the quality of existing ones.

The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional, practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (e.g. NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered occupational therapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied this same audit system is effective to ensure role emerging practice-based learning environments are suitable and support safe and effective learning. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings with long-arm, and not direct, supervision from registered occupational therapists. Additionally, they noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the system used to approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments, and how the education provider ensures it is a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider further strengthening its system and strategy of moderation of practice-based learning assessments.

Reason: From the documentation provided and from the discussions during the visit, the visitors were informed about the system of moderation on the programme. The visitors were made aware the education provider has a moderation process for practice-based learning assessments and a policy for academic work. Results were examined at the education provider by an individual and also seen by external examiners. The visitors also heard the education provider is beginning to strengthen links for role-emerging placements, which could be in smaller settings with long-arm, and not direct, supervision from practice educators who may not be registered occupational therapists. Additionally, they noted practice educators in such environments may not have the same amount of experience in grading as those in traditional NHS-based practice-based learning settings. The visitors are satisfied the standard has been met. However, the visitors would recommend the education provider strengthen their systems of moderation, so the assessment strategy is more rigorous.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 December 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Cumbria
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Approval visit date	12-14 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-12171-C1V7C1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	5
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	7

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Louise Whittle	Lay
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with two HCPC panels. One panel for the occupational therapy programmes and another for the physiotherapy programmes. For both programmes, there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, the Royal College of Occupational Therapists and the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy.

For both professions at this multi-professional event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at this approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Michael Mitchell	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Cumbria
Suzanne Parkes	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Cumbria
Karen Mills	Internal panel member	University of Cumbria
Michael Mitchell	Internal panel member	University of Cumbria
Tony Greenwood	Internal panel member	University of Cumbria
External panel members		
Elizabeth McKay	External panel member – Occupational therapy representative	Edinburgh Napier University
Anne Wallace	External panel member – Physiotherapy representative	Robert Gordon University
Professional body panel members		
Helen Carey	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Maureen Shiells	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Ruth Heames	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Nina Paterson	Representative for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Steven Ryall	Representative for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
HCPC Physiotherapy panel members		
Fleur Kitsell	HCPC panel member – Physiotherapist	HCPC
Joanna Jackson	HCPC panel member – Physiotherapist	HCPC
Joanne Watchman	HCPC panel member – Lay	HCPC
Eloise O’Connell	HCPC panel member – Executive	HCPC
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC panel member – Observer	HCPC

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed First intake	01 September 2008

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01816

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01813

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment.

The education provider informed the HCPC that they were revalidating their pre-registration occupational therapy provision. The education provider highlighted there were significant changes in practice-based learning since the last validation, and there will be major changes in the structure and content of the programmes.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes

Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 16 November 2018.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there is a process in place to ensure that the individual holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider provided the name and curriculum vitae of the current programme leader for the programmes. In discussions with the senior team, the visitors explained that as this is a new standard, we now require the education provider to make sure there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. The senior team explained there is no formal written process in place, however there is a process they follow to ensure there is an appropriate person at all times. The senior team explained they work on '5 year rotation' where a senior lecturer would be recruited, and would shadow the current programme leader before moving into the position. The education provider ensure the senior lecturers are appropriately qualified and registered, as it is part of their job description. While the visitors agree this is an effective process, as it is not currently a written formal process they cannot be sure that this will be ongoing, in order to meet the standard. As such, the visitors require evidence of the education provider's process to ensure that there is an effective process in place to ensure the person holding overall professional responsibility for the

programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Condition: The education provider must articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there was an interprofessional learning strategy but they were unable to find any information on how this strategy would be applied in the programme. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed there would be ‘opportunities for interprofessional learning’ with paramedics, physiotherapists and social workers such as during “home visits” to make the situation realistic to the real-life setting. There were plans to have two activities per year with one per semester on a different topic area. However, from the visitors understanding, this session was an extracurricular activity as opposed to required learning. With this information, the visitors were unable to determine how these ideas would be embedded into different levels of the programme. Therefore, the education provider is required to articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners on this programme will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must communicate to learners where attendance is mandatory and the consequences associated with not attending

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted, “The university expects 100% attendance”. In discussions with the learners, the visitors were informed that attendance was an issue and there were several sessions where learners did not attend as there was no tutor present. During the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed that learners are expected to attend all sessions. To monitor this, a paper register is taken to monitor attendance but an electronic system has now been introduced where tutors will now be noting down attendance in a spreadsheet. Where there are group sessions with no tutors, learners are expected to attend and sign the paper register. However, this is not currently monitored and the learners have raised this concern with the programme team to take action. With the information provided the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that learners are aware of the mandatory attendance requirements throughout the programme and what consequences there would be for any learner who failed to meet those requirements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that clearly stipulates the attendance requirements for the programme, the consequences should attendance fall below the required level, and how this is clearly communicated to learners.

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. Recommendations do

not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider keeps the information for applicants under review in light of the funding reforms and any future additional costs which may occur for learners in the future.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation and discussions with the programme team at the visit, the visitors were provided with information about the admissions process applicants would require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. As this information was provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, as there are ongoing funding reforms taking place the visitors recommend that the education provider keeps information to applicants under review in relation to any future costs which the learner may be required to cover on this programme.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that there is a strategy to ensure ongoing service user and carer involvement in the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the service users and carers, the visitors noted that service users had been involved in the development of the programme including aspects such as talking with learners, sharing their experiences, and allowing learners to “practice” on them as experience before going onto complete the practice-based learning element of the programme. As this information was provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met appropriately. However, from discussions with the service users and carers the visitors were informed there is limited involvement from the service users on the programme. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told the education provider is working on a plan for involving service users and carers more in the academic setting, which is yet to be formalised as well as developing partnerships in the local areas and third sector. As these plans had not been finalised, there may be a risk of meeting this standard in future, due to the limited nature of involvement currently. Therefore, the visitors recommend strengthening involvement of service users and carers by widening participation and the areas of the programme there are involved in.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the conditions set out in section 4, and the request for further evidence set out in section 5, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 05 December 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Cumbria
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Approval visit date	12 - 14 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-12970-M6W4Q3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	5

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Watchman	Lay
Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with two HCPC panels. One panel for the physiotherapy programmes, and one panel for the occupational therapy programmes. For both programmes, there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and the Royal College of Occupational Therapists.

For both professions at this multi-profession event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at this approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Signey Henderson	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Cumbria
Debbie Speight	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Cumbria
Karen Mills	Internal panel member	University of Cumbria
Michael Mitchell	Internal panel member	University of Cumbria
Suzanne Parkes	Internal panel member	University of Cumbria
Tony Greenwood	Internal panel member	University of Cumbria
External panel members		
Anne Wallace	External panel member – Physiotherapy representative	Robert Gordon University
Elizabeth McKay	External panel member – Occupational therapy representative	Edinburgh Napier University
Professional body panel members		
Nina Paterson	Representative for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Steven Ryall	Representative for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Helen Carey	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Maureen Shiells	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Ruth Heames	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
HCPC Occupational therapy panel members		
Jennifer Caldwell	HCPC panel member – Occupational therapist	HCPC
Joanna Goodwin	HCPC panel member – Occupational therapist	HCPC
Louise Whittle	HCPC panel member – lay visitor	HCPC
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC panel member – Executive	HCPC

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist

First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01814

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01815

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment.

The education provider informed the HCPC that they were revalidating their pre-registration physiotherapy provision. The education provider highlighted there were significant changes in practice-based learning since the last validation, and there will be major changes in the structure and content of the programmes.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes

Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 16 November 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the admissions process gives both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programmes.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors found that the information provided to applicants for both programmes did not include explicit information about additional costs associated with the programmes or the health requirements for the admissions process. For example, the visitors read in the Placement Handbook that learners may be required to provide up to date criminal convictions check, which they would need to pay for. In addition, the visitors read about the occupational health checks that would be required before going on placement. The visitors found this information in the Placement Handbook only, and note that this would typically be read when the learner has started the programme, not at the application stage. At the visit, the learners on the current programmes said there were additional costs they incurred which they did not know about before starting the programme, including costs incurred for travel and accommodation for practice-based learning. The programme team highlighted that all of this information is given to applicants at the interview and open days. While applicants may receive this information at interview and open days, the visitors are not clear if an applicant would be able to find that explicit information in the documentation and resources provided. From the information provided, the visitors

could not determine that explicit information about additional costs and admissions requirements are made clear to applicants. As such, the visitors require further information about the information provided and when it is provided to applicants, in order to make a judgement about this standard.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there is a process in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider provided the name and curriculum vitae of the current programme leader for the programmes. The visitors raised with the senior team that this standard now requires the education provider to ensure there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. The senior team explained there is no formal written process in place. The senior team explained they work on a '5 year rotation' where a senior lecturer would be recruited to the programme lead role, and would shadow the current programme-leader before moving into the position. The education provider ensures the senior lecturers are appropriately qualified, experienced and on the relevant part of the Register as it is part of their job description. The visitors agree this is an effective process; however, it is not currently a written formal process. Therefore they cannot determine that this will be formal and ongoing, in order to meet the standard. As such, the visitors require further evidence to determine that there is an effective process in place to ensure the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how there will be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider referred to the Briefing Document, which talks about how practice education providers are involved with the programme through employer feedback, training opportunities, and half way visits carried out by the education provider. The practice education providers in attendance at the visit noted that they had not been directly involved with the development of the new programmes, although there was a meeting early on in the development process that many practice education providers could not attend. The programme team told the visitors that there is a lot of informal communication, and there is an annual programme of events. The programme team also talked of their plans to develop a system to integrate academic and clinical systems. The visitors note from the documentation and discussions at the visit that there are a numbers of opportunities for collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers, however due to availability of practice educators most of the collaboration is through informal communication. The visitors could not determine how this would ensure ongoing

collaboration with all practice education providers to ensure this happens on a regular, continued basis. The visitors were provided with verbal reassurances / plans for effective collaboration going forward, and noted their plans for further involvement of practice education providers on the programmes. However, as they have not seen this in documentation, the visitors were unclear how the information provided demonstrates that regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education provider would be undertaken on an ongoing basis. As such, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates there is a plan in place to address how they intend to maintain regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must revise documentation to ensure that the information is accurate to ensure resources in all settings are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors noted that in places, the documentation refers a clinical hours requirements of 1000 hours, as required by the HCPC. HCPC does not set such requirements. The visitors note that this information could mislead and confuse learners. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure that the information is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for learners.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there is an effective process in place to monitor attendance on the programme, and demonstrate how this is communicated to learners.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors understood that there was a 100 per cent expectation of attendance for both taught sessions and practice-based learning on the programme. From the documentation, the visitors were not clear how attendance on the programme was monitored, or what the consequences were for learners who fell below the expected attendance requirement. The programme team noted that they are starting a new process, where the paper-based recording of attendance will be completed by the tutor rather than the learner and this will be kept in a shared drive. Any absences will be flagged to programme lead and tutors, and personal tutors will take forward progress review meetings with learners. The placement unit would monitor attendance for practice-based learning, and a similar process would be followed. The visitors agree that the monitoring process sounds effective, however the visitors were provided with verbal reassurances / plans and have not seen this as a formal process in documentation. From the information provided the visitors could not determine there are effective monitoring processes in place for attendance on the programme. In addition, the learners on the current programmes were not clear what the consequence would be if they fell below the expected requirement. As such, the visitors could not determine that the monitoring process were clearly communicated to learners. Therefore, the education provider needs to demonstrate what the associated monitoring process are

for attendance on the programme, what the consequences are for learners who fall below the requirements, and how this is communicated to learners.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure practice educators undertake initial and regular training, which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: In the documentation, the visitors read that the education provider offers mentorship modules, locality update days, refresher sessions, and one to one meetings with the practice education providers. From the documentation, the visitors were not clear whether the training for practice educators was mandatory, or if the education provider monitored the training of practice educators to ensure they were undergoing training before taking a learner and regular training thereafter. The programme team said that the Practice Education Facilitator (PEF) oversees the training for all practice educators, and holds a register of who has completed training. The programme team noted that a practice educator would be required to undergo some training before taking a learner, and then attending some form of training at least every two years. The programme team clarified that the education provider does not have access to the PEF information; however, the PEF would alert the education provider if they noted that a practice educator was not attending the training. On meeting with the practice education providers, the practice educators did not feel that the regular training was mandatory, and would attend training when they could however they found it increasingly difficult to be released from clinical practice in order to attend training. From the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors could not determine that there was mandatory training for all practice educators, or that this was monitored by the education provider to ensure that practice educators do undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role. As such, the visitors require further information from the education provider to demonstrate how they ensure that practice educators undertake initial and regular training that is appropriate to their role.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to ensure that there is a strategy to ensure ongoing service user and carer involvement in the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the service users and carers, the visitors noted that service users had been involved in the development of the programme including aspects such as talking with learners, sharing their experiences, and allowing learners to "practice" on them as experience before going onto complete the practice-based learning element of the programme. As this information was provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met appropriately. However, from discussions with the service users and carers the visitors were informed there is limited involvement from the

service users on the programme. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told the education provider is working on a plan for involving service users and carers more in the academic setting, which is yet to be formalised as well as developing partnerships in the local areas and third sector. As these plans had not been finalised, there may be a risk of meeting this standard in future, due to the limited nature of involvement currently. Therefore, the visitors recommend strengthening involvement of service users and carers by widening participation and the areas of the programme there are involved in.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Kingston University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work (Gibraltar), Full time BA (Hons) Social Work (Gibraltar), Part time
Approval visit date	03 - 04 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-13336-B4B8F5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	7

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Graeme Currie	Social worker
David Ward	Social worker
Prisha Shah	Lay
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Neil Williams	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Kingston University
Blanca Sainz-Garcia	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Kingston University
Martyn Higgins	External panel member	London South Bank University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Gibraltar)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 across both part time and full time routes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01961

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Gibraltar)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 across both part time and full time routes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01962

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Our legislation allows us to consider and approve programmes delivered overseas if they are run by a UK based institution. The education provider intends to deliver their social work programme in Gibraltar. They intend to operate a 'flying faculty' where programme staff from the education provider will at various times travel to Gibraltar to deliver the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes

Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	We met with learners on the Nursing programme that is currently delivered by the education provider in Gibraltar.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 15 November 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the admissions process gives the applicant the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider provided the Admissions Handbook. The document contains information about the admission policies, and details of the application and selection process. The visitors note they could not find any information specific to the proposed programme in Gibraltar on the education provider's website. From the information provided, the visitors could not see detailed information

about the programme that would provide applicants with the information they need to make a fully informed decision about taking up a place on the programme. For example, the visitors have not seen information for applicants about the costs of the programme, including accommodation and other associated costs where relevant, and any options for funding. The programme team informed the visitors that all advertising and recruitment for the programme was undertaken in Gibraltar through various social media channels. The programme team said that information relating to costs and other useful information about the programme was included in this advertising. At the visit, the programme team briefly showed the visitors what the web pages looked like, however the visitors were not able to review this in sufficient detail in order to make a judgement as to whether this standard is met. As such, the visitors require further information about the information applicants receive in order to determine whether the applicant has the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they will ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider provided the name and curriculum vitae of the current programme leader. The visitors raised with the senior team that this standard requires the education provider to ensure they are able to identify a suitable person for this role, and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. The senior team explained that the programme leader would be selected internally from the programme team, who are all registered social workers. The education provider ensures the programme team are appropriately qualified, experienced and on the relevant part of the Register as it is part of their job description. The visitors agree this process seems reasonable to appoint this person; however, they were unclear how it would be consistently applied. Therefore they cannot determine that this intention will be formal and ongoing, in order to meet this standard. As such, the visitors require further evidence to determine that to the education provider will ensure the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the Gibraltar based staff contributing to teaching on the programme, to demonstrate that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider provided the curriculum vitae's for a number of educators in the Department of Social Work at the education provider, who will be travelling to Gibraltar at various times to teach on the programme. The programme team talked about the 'flying faculty' that will involve the whole department, of about 18 educators who will at some point over the three years of the

programme travel to Gibraltar to deliver parts of the programme. The programme team explained that educators from the education provider will be delivering the main content of the programme, and there will be sessions where colleagues from the Care Agency in Gibraltar will share their expertise and experience, to allow learners to engage their learning on the programme with local context in Gibraltar. The visitors found that the arrangement would be suitable, and agree that the educators from the education provider have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. However, as the visitors have not seen any information about the educators who are based in Gibraltar, the visitors could not determine whether they had the relevant knowledge and expertise for their input to the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the educators in Gibraltar who will be contributing to teaching on the programme, in order to determine whether all subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and expertise to support safe and effective learning, and unless other arrangements are appropriate, are on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to the Resources Document, which refers to a 'Gibraltar Care Agency Practice Educator' who will be supported by the education provider. The documentation did not include information about who the practice educators are or how the education provider ensures they are appropriate for the role. At the visit, it was clarified that there would be one practice educator for the programme in Gibraltar. The visitors considered that one practice educator for the programme is reasonable, however note that if the programme were to grow or if this person left, the education provider would need to recruit another or more practice educators in Gibraltar. The visitors considered that the current practice educator is appropriately qualified and experienced to undertake the role, and note that social workers in Gibraltar do not have any requirements for registration. However, if the current arrangements were to change, the visitors were not clear what process the education provider has in place to ensure a practice educator appointed in Gibraltar will be appropriately qualified and experienced, or how they would determine whether or not it is appropriate for them to be on the relevant part of the Register or not. As such, the visitors require further information to demonstrate that the education provider can ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening the involvement of service users and carers on the programme, and should consider how they can increase the range of service users and carers that are involved in the programme.

Reason: On review of the documentation, and through discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied this standard was met. At the visit, the visitors met two carers who would be involved in the programme. The visitors heard they had attended some meetings in Gibraltar to talk about the programme, and were involved with interviews for potential applicants. In terms of future planning, the carers discussed ways in which they would like to be involved in the programme going forward, such as talking to learners of their experiences, and to share what they would like to see in future social workers in Gibraltar. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told the education provider is developing a plan for involving service users and carers more in the academic setting in Gibraltar. The programme team did not have any plans at this stage to broaden the group of service users and carers that are involved on the programme in Gibraltar. The visitors note with the involvement currently, there is a limited range of service users and carers involved. As the involvement of service users and carers on the programme in Gibraltar is currently under further development, and there are no plans to broaden the range of service users and carers, there may be a risk of meeting this standard in future, due to the limited nature of involvement currently.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 05 December 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	PG Certificate in Approved Mental Health Practice (incorporating AMHP training), Part time
Approval visit date	19-20 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13289-DOS6W9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5 Visitors' recommendation	6

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jane Hutchison	Approved Mental Health Professional
David Packwood	Practitioner psychologist
Frances Ashworth	Lay
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Karen Castle	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Manchester Metropolitan University
Anna Peters	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Manchester Metropolitan University
Dr Robert Wu	External panel member	University of Birmingham

Deborah O'Connor	Internal panel member	Manchester Metropolitan University
Arina Vaisvilaite	Internal panel member	Manchester Metropolitan University
Orlagh McCabe	Internal panel member	Manchester Metropolitan University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Certificate in Approved Mental Health Practice (incorporating AMHP training)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Approved mental health professional
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01952

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	This is a new programme therefore no external examiner reports have been produced for this programme

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	Learners were from the PG Cert Advanced Social Work programme
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 19 November 2018

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate what programme information is available to applicants, so that they can make an informed choice about whether they take up the offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided, including information to be included on the admissions web pages for the programme. They could not see how learners and referring employees could access information relating to the admissions procedures. The visitors considered that there was a risk that applicants and referring employers would not have the information they require to apply to the programme.. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence which demonstrates how they will ensure that all applicants have access to appropriate information to enable them to make an informed choice about the programme.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that how the programme delivery pattern is appropriate for the programme to be effectively managed

Reason: At the programme team meeting, it was mentioned in the presentation that the education provider will deliver the programme in a split pattern, where learners will be taught 2 days on campus and 3 days at the placement. However, from the information provided it was not clear if this pattern is confirmed and how will it be managed. Since the teaching delivery is partnership based, the visitors were unable to determine how the arrangements for on campus teaching will be overseen, and how management systems and structures of the practice placement providers will work. Additionally, the visitors are unclear how it is ensured that everyone involved has a clear understanding of their responsibilities. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that shows that the pattern of delivery is feasible, and what systems are in place to ensure effective delivery of the programme.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver this programme.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that the maximum number of learners for the first cohort will be 20 and that there is sufficient staff to deliver the programme during the first year. However, the programme team confirmed that the learner numbers will go up to 30 from the second year. Additionally, the education provider mentioned that the teaching pattern will consist of a five day teaching week split into two days in the classroom and three days in practice-based learning. The visitors could not determine how the education provider will manage staff resourcing for the subsequent year to manage an increased cohort of 30 learners. The visitors also require information as to how the required experience and qualification profile of the new staff members will complement the team to ensure they can support the delivery of the breadth of knowledge taught on this programme. This includes clarity on Rachel Rooke's role, as the programme team mentioned that she will be contributing as a consultant teacher, but in the practice educators meeting she stated that this job appointment was yet to be confirmed. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the education provider's plan to support the delivery of the programme ensuring that there will be sufficient qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme when learner numbers increase.

D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators are appropriately trained.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the practice handbook which consisted of a description of the role and responsibilities of the practice educator. However, they could not see anywhere in the programme documentation a clear statement that all practice educators

must undertake appropriate training before they can supervise learners or how they ensure that all practice educators have completed the training. In the practice handbook page 57, it states under practice placement educators heading “All PPE’s will be offered support and training by the programme team”. The visitors noted that this statement suggests that the training is optional and therefore could not determine how practice educators would know that they must attend training or how education provider ensures that all practice educators engage in appropriate training. As such, they could not determine that the standard was met. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing, by what mechanism, they will ensure that all practice educators undergo the mandatory 3 day training described at the visit, which is specific to their role, before supervising learners on this programme.

Section 5 Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme is approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 05 December 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Edinburgh Napier University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Pre-Registration in Occupational Therapy, Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-Registration), Full time MSc Pre-Registration in Physiotherapy, Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-Registration), Full time
Approval visit date	18 – 19 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13199-Q3Q8N8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	4
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	5
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	6
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation	7

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Prisha Shah	Lay
Angela Ariu	Occupational therapist
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with one HCPC panel to review both the occupational therapy and physiotherapy programmes. For both programmes there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational therapists.

The education provider was also proposing a new programme for social work, which we did not consider because social work is not regulated by the HCPC in Scotland. There were representatives from the Scottish Social Services Council to consider the Social work programme, along with the external and internal panel members.

For all three professions at this multi-profession event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions.

Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Brian Webster-Henderson	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Edinburgh Napier University
Debbie Jamieson	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Edinburgh Napier University
David Smith	Internal panel member	Edinburgh Napier University
Alan McLachlan	Internal panel member	Edinburgh Napier University
Katrina Swanton	Internal panel member	Edinburgh Napier University
Silvi Kovacicova	Internal panel member	Edinburgh Napier University
Nicole Kumbischinski	Internal panel member	Edinburgh Napier University
Nan Stevenson	Internal panel member	Edinburgh Napier University
External panel members		
Colette Ridehalgh	External panel member - Physiotherapist representative	University of Brighton
Rob Brooks	External panel member – Occupational therapist representative	Leeds Beckett University
Jill Davey	External panel member – Social work representative	Bournemouth University
Professional bodies and regulator representatives		
Claire Brewis	Representative for Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Deb Hearle	Representative for Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Lyn Westcott	Representative for Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Sally Gosling	Representative for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Carolyn Mason	Representative for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Brian Smith	Representative for Scottish Social Services Council	Scottish Social Services Council
Alice Bradley	Representative for Scottish Social Services Council	Scottish Social Services Council

Gillian Ferguson	Representative for Scottish Social Services Council	Scottish Social Services Council
Neil Gibson	Representative for Scottish Social Services Council	Scottish Social Services Council

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Pre-Registration in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 learners across the Occupational Therapy programmes (both the MSc and PG Dip exit award).
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01927

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-Registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 learners across the Occupational Therapy programmes (both the MSc and PG Dip exit award).
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02039

Programme name	MSc Pre-Registration in Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
Proposed First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 learners across the Physiotherapy programmes (both the MSc and PG Dip exit award).
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01928

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-Registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 learners across the Physiotherapy programmes (both the MSc and PG Dip exit award).
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02038

We undertook this assessment of two new programmes proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

In addition, the education provider intends to have an approved exit route for the programmes, a PG Dip in Physiotherapy and PG Dip in Occupational Therapy for learners who do not complete the research module.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required	The programmes are new and therefore no external examiners' reports were required.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	These are new programmes and have not had an intake of learners yet. We met with learners on other MSc programmes at the education provider such as midwifery, mental health and child protection programmes.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 31 October 2018.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the type of exit awards offered for both programmes, and demonstrate that learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: In the Academic Rationale document for the programmes, it states “the Postgraduate Diploma in the named professional discipline, which is awarded to students who complete all academic and practice placement modules, but choose not to complete, or fail, the dissertation module”. The visitors read that the award would lead to eligibility to apply for registration in the relevant profession. The visitors were not clear whether the education provider intends to offer the exit award for those who do not wish to complete the MSc programme, or if they intend to offer it as an award for those who cannot complete the MSc programme due to exceptional circumstances. The programme team highlighted that this award would not be available to all learners completing the MSc Physiotherapy or MSc Occupational therapy programmes. Instead, this would be available as an option for learners unable to complete the dissertation module on the MSc programme due to exceptional circumstances. From the information provided the visitors were unclear how the education provider would clearly define “exceptional circumstances”, to ensure that learners are aware this is not routinely offered as an exit award for the programmes. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine that clarification is provided to ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 December 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Newcastle University
Name of programme(s)	Post-graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice, Full time
Approval visit date	03 - 04 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-13232-R5G9W8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jacqueline Bates-Gaston	Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist
Shola Apena Rogers	Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist
Joanne Watchman	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Stephen McHanwell	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Newcastle University
Lynn Oakes	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Newcastle University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post-graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Forensic psychologist
Proposed first intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01932

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not required as it is a new programme.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes

Facilities and resources	Yes
--------------------------	-----

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 07 December 2018.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they will have regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including plans for triannual meetings between learners, academic supervisors and work-place supervisors. Based on this evidence and from discussions with the programme team at the visit, it appeared to the visitors that these meetings were more focused on the academic progress of learners, rather than the wider collaboration between education provider and practice education providers. As a result, it was not clear to the visitors that the education provider had regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers which reflected an ongoing relationship and did not only happen when issues arose in practice-based learning. They asked the senior team and programme team about this issue and were given verbal reassurances that they had good relationships with their practice education providers. However, from the meeting with practice educators and practice education providers, the visitors were aware that the settings for practice-based learning were extremely diverse and appeared to work very separately from each other and from the education provider. The visitors could not be sure from this meeting or from other discussions that all practice education providers would have regular communications and an ongoing relationship with the education provider. In particular, it was not clear that the collaboration between the education provider and the practice educators would enable the education provider to give appropriate support to work-based supervisors, and to help the supervisors understand the programme, so that they could provide suitable support for learners and help them achieve the standards of proficiency for forensic psychologists. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that collaboration with practice education providers is regular and effective.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify who they consider their service users and carers to be, and how they will be involved in the programme.

Reason: As evidence for this standard, the education provider stated that they had consulted service users and carers in the preparation of the programme, and were in the process of developing a service users and carers' group. The visitors were also able to discuss the involvement of service users and carers with the programme team and senior team. In addition, the visitors were able to meet with a number of people identified as service users by the education provider. As learners who complete the programme will mostly be working within the criminal justice system, these included some representatives of organisations that work with prisoners or ex-offenders. These discussions gave the visitors an idea of the education provider's plans and intentions for the involvement of service users and carers. However, those identified as service users did not appear to the visitors to have a clear understanding of how they were going to contribute to the programme. Staff at the education provider were also not clear about the particular areas where service users and carers would have input, which service users and carers would be involved, how they would be supported, and how their input would be evaluated. The visitors were satisfied that there were plans underway to develop the kind of involvement required by the standard, but they were not clear about the details of how service users and carers would be enabled to contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that service users and carers will be involved in the programme.

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the roles and responsibilities of the teaching staff on the programme, and demonstrate that there will be enough staff time available to deliver an effective programme to the number of learners for which they are seeking approval.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a list of the core programme team and their curriculum vitae (CVs), and a statement that other staff would be used on the programme as needed and appropriate. They also discussed staffing with the senior team and programme team. From this evidence and these discussions, they were satisfied that the programme team were appropriately qualified and experienced. However, they were not clear about how much time each of the core team would be able to commit to this particular programme, and how much other staff time would be available to this programme, and as a result they could not determine whether this standard was met. They considered that the lack of clarity about how much staff time would be available to the programme was especially important given two factors:

- that there are a number of psychology programmes at the education provider competing for staff time; and
- that the education provider plans to start with a cohort of six learners in 2019, and then increase that number significantly in 2020, perhaps up to 20 learners, which is the number for which they are seeking approval. This will create significant extra demand for staff availability.

The visitors were given verbal reassurances that there will be appropriate staff capacity at the education provider, both for the first cohort due to start in January 2019 and for the larger cohort planned for January 2020. However, they were not able to see evidence of staff workload planning. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they ensure that visiting lecturers who deliver parts of the programme have relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a list of the core programme team and their curriculum vitae, and a statement that other staff would be used on the programme as needed and appropriate. The senior team and programme team stated that visiting lecturers would be used on the programme, to support the core team and supplement the staff available in the School of Psychology. However, it was not clear to the visitors how the education provider would ensure that these staff members have relevant specialist knowledge and expertise, and there did not appear to be a process in place for ensuring that visiting lecturers' skills and knowledge is up to date. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how the education provider ensures the suitability of visiting lecturers.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an effective programme in place to ensure continuing professional and academic development of visiting lecturers.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including descriptions of the opportunities available for staff at the education provider to maintain and develop their skills and knowledge. They were satisfied that the standard was met for staff based at the education provider. However, it was not clear to them from this evidence how the education provider would ensure that educators who teach on the programme but are not members of staff at the education provider are keeping their professional and academic skills up to date. The programme team stated that there were opportunities for visiting lecturers to attend training and development activities, but there did not seem to be a process for monitoring visiting lecturers' attendance at these type of events, and their broader training needs. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit more evidence showing how they will ensure that visiting educators maintain their professional and academic skills. They considered that this condition was linked to that set under SET 3.10 above.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider did not submit evidence regarding inter-professional education (IPE). The visitors were able to discuss with the programme team their approach to IPE. The visitors were aware from these discussions that, although the education provider did not appear to have planned IPE in a systematic way, learners might have access to some IPE. For example, learners in practice-based learning would often be working in multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) including prison officers, police officers and social workers. However, the visitors were not able to determine whether all learners would have access to such opportunities, and how the education provider will ensure that learners have such access. It was also not clear whether learners would have access to IPE involving learners from other professions as well as qualified professionals, or how the education provider had made decisions about the design and delivery of IPE to ensure its relevance. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they will ensure that all learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that practice-based learning takes place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence for this standard, including the Programme Agreement Plan. From this document, the visitors were aware that the education provider asked providers of practice-based learning to declare that they would support and supervise trainees appropriately in line with the requirements of the programme. The visitors also viewed a risk assessment document which had to be completed before a learner could be placed in a particular setting. The visitors were not clear from these documents how the education provider would ensure a safe and supportive environment on a continuing basis. They could not see how the Programme Agreement Plan formed part of a process that would generate action if a setting used for practice-based learning ceased to be safe and supportive for some reason. They were not clear how the risk assessment document would be used to ensure that problems which arose could be addressed in an appropriate way. For example, they could not see information regarding the appropriate escalation process in the event that an issue could not be resolved in the practice-based learning setting.

Additionally it was not clear how the education provider addressed the issues that might arise when the practice education provider is also the learner's employer, as the visitors understood will be the case on this programme. The programme team gave verbal assurances to the visitors that any problems occurring on placement around safety and support could be resolved through contacts with the education provider, and if necessary escalated through the education provider's processes. Learners from existing psychology programmes did not express any concerns about this aspect of their experience. However, they were not from programmes where practice-based

learning was provided by employers so were not necessarily placed to speak to this concern.

In light of the above, the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence showing how they ensure that practice-based learning takes place in a safe and supportive environment for learners.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence for this standard, including the Employer Endorsement & Reference document (EER). From this document, the visitors were aware that the education provider asked practice education providers to declare that they would support and supervise trainees appropriately in line with the requirements of the programme. The visitors also viewed a risk assessment document which had to be completed before a learner could be placed in a particular setting. However, it was not clear to the visitors from these documents how the education provider would ensure specifically that these practice-based learning settings had an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. They could not see how these documents, especially the EER, would generate information for the education provider about the individual staff involved in practice-based learning settings, and so they could not be sure how the education provider would ensure that a suitable number of staff were available for all learners in their practice-based learning. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in practice-based learning.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, are registered practitioner forensic psychologists.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence for this standard, including the Employer Endorsement & Reference document (EER). From this document, the visitors were aware that the education provider asked practice education providers to declare that they would support and supervise trainees appropriately in line with the requirements of the programme. The visitors also viewed a risk assessment document which had to be completed before a learner could be placed in a particular setting. However, it was not clear to the visitors from these documents how the education provider would ensure specifically that these practice-based learning settings had staff who had appropriate knowledge, skills and experience. They could not see how these documents, especially the EER, would capture information for the education provider about the individual staff involved in practice-based learning settings, and so the visitors could not be sure how the education provider would ensure that these staff were suitable. It was also unclear under what circumstances, if at all, the education provider would waive the requirement for practice educators to be registered with the HCPC as forensic psychologists. The

visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience, and are on the relevant part of the Register, and under what circumstances they would waive the normal requirement for registration.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they monitor the training status of practice educators, and how they ensure additional training where necessary.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard. This included a Work-based briefing on a particular module and a statement that practice educators would receive training "as required". It was not clear to the visitors from this evidence how the education provider ensured that all practice educators undertook appropriate training. They could not see, for example, how the education provider made sure that practice educators had read the Work-based briefing, or how they otherwise met educators' training needs. It was also unclear how the education provider would know what training was required for practice educators. The visitors raised this issue with the programme team, and were told that the education provider made available certain training modules which practice educators could access. However, the visitors were not able to determine how the education provider monitored take-up of, and attendance at, this training, or how they provided refresher training where appropriate. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they ensure that practice educators' training is up to date and relevant, and that refresher training is given where appropriate.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	The Open University
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Distance learning
Approval visit date	09 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-13344-C1L6C1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist (Independent prescriber)
Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
Susanne Roff	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Mick McCormick	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	The Open University
Clare Wailes	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	The Open University
Angela Alexander	Team leader	General Pharmaceutical Council

Mike Pettit	Team member	General Pharmaceutical Council
Ian Marshall	Rapporteur	General Pharmaceutical Council
Christopher McKendrick	Quality assurance officer	General Pharmaceutical Council

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
Proposed first intake	01 February 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP01964

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required – new programme

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	No	The education provider was not able to arrange a meeting with learners, saying that this was difficult because the programme used a distance learning model and had not yet admitted its first cohort.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 14 December 2018.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that HCPC registered learners on the programme can receive appropriate support from staff to enable them to prescribe safely and effectively as a member of their profession.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including staff CVs and a teaching timetable. They also discussed staffing with the senior team and the programme team. From this evidence and the discussions, it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that all HCPC-registered professionals who came on to the programme as learners would be appropriately supported and supervised. For this reason, the visitors could not determine that learners who successfully complete the programme would be able to prescribe safely and effectively as part of their individual professional practice. The individuals identified as practice educators to whom the visitors spoke, did not seem to have a clear understanding of their role in giving

profession-specific support to learners from HCPC-registered professions. The visitors were aware from the documentation and discussions at the visit that there were named persons in place to provide profession-specific support for pharmacists and nurses on the programme, where necessary. There did not appear to be similar named persons for HCPC-registered professions. There were staff from therapeutic radiography and paramedic backgrounds available to the programme, but it was not clear how these staff would be used to support HCPC-registered professionals, and it was not clear whether staff would be available from other HCPC-registered professions that are eligible to become prescribers, for example diagnostic radiography. There is no HCPC requirement for prescribing programmes to have staff members from all HCPC-registered professions that may join the programme. However education providers do need to demonstrate how they will use their staff to ensure appropriate support and supervision for all HCPC-registered professionals who may come on to the programme. The visitors considered that at present it was not clear how this would be achieved. The programme team said that they had access to visiting lecturers who would provide such support but the visitors did not see evidence demonstrating how the education provider would ensure the involvement of such lecturers. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they will ensure that all learners from HCPC-registered professions will be appropriately supported and supervised on the programme, to enable them to prescribe safely and effectively as a professional.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners meet standard for independent prescribers 2.3, which states that learners must “understand the legal framework of independent prescribing as it applies to their profession”.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for standard for independent prescribers 2.3, including learning outcomes and a document laying out the scheduling of teaching and learning activities on the programme. They considered that the learning outcomes appeared to be appropriate. However, it was not clear from this evidence how all HCPC-registered learners on the programme would be enabled and supported to meet the particular learning outcomes relating to this standard for independent prescribers. This was due to the lack of clarity about whether appropriate staff would be available to support and supervise learners from some of the HCPC-registered professions, as outlined in the condition under standard for prescribing B.6 above. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how learners will be supported to meet the learning outcomes dealing with their understanding of the law governing their practice in the specific context of their profession.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify their intentions concerning interprofessional learning for HCPC-registered learners on the programme, and how they intend to identify and address the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a timetable of learning and teaching activities, and curriculum vitae for staff showing what skills those staff could bring to interprofessional learning (IPL) on the programme. They were aware that the programme team were planning to have IPL on the programme, and they discussed these plans. They were told in these discussions that decisions around IPL for particular professions would be based on the numbers joining the programme from those professions. While the visitors considered that this could be an appropriate general approach, it was not clear to them how such decisions would be made, and by whom, and what criteria would be used. There did not seem to be a process by which equitable and appropriate access to IPL for HCPC-registered learners could be ensured, so they were not able to determine whether the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group could be adequately identified and addressed. The visitors considered that there was a possible link between this condition and those set under standards for prescribing B.6 and C.1, as they all concern a lack of clarity about how the education provider will make use of its staff to meet the professions-specific needs of HCPC-registered learners.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the audit document used for practice placements is fit for purpose for all professionals on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a handbook for designated medical practitioners (DMPs) and a sample of the audit document that would be used. They noted that it seemed to be tailored towards nursing learners and did not appear to provide appropriate opportunities for capturing whether placements were appropriate for HCPC-registered learners. They considered that while the audit document appeared to be a useful tool for approving and monitoring some placements, it was not clear how it would enable the education provider to ensure that all HCPC-registered professionals on the programme would have access to appropriate support and supervision while on placement. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence of how their audit tool will assess the appropriateness of placements for all professionals who may be on the programme. The visitors considered that there was a possible link between this condition and those set under standards for prescribing B.6, C.1 and C.9 as they all concern a lack of clarity about how the education provider will make use of its staff to meet the professions-specific needs of HCPC-registered learners.

E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from a relevant part of the HCPC Register

Condition: The education provider must clarify the timescale and the process for appointing an external examiner for the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including a guide to the external examiner role, and the name and a curriculum vitae for a person who was likely to be appointed. From this evidence and from discussions with the

programme, it was not clear to the visitors when an appointment would be made and what process would be followed. The guide that formed part of the evidence for the standard was a guide for external examiners themselves rather than a full description of the appointment process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they will ensure that an appropriately experienced and qualified external examiner will be appointed for the programme.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how they might strengthen and develop the service user and carer involvement on the programme.

Reason: The visitors considered that this standard was met at threshold, as there were appropriate service users and carers who were involved with the programme in an appropriate way, and their involvement had been planned and considered by the education provider. However, the visitors noted that there were relatively few service users and carers available who had experience of interacting with HCPC-registered professionals, and that their opportunities to contribute to the programme were somewhat limited. It was not clear, for example, if service users were involved in assessment. The visitors therefore considered that there was a risk that in future service user and carer involvement with HCPC-registered learners on the programme could fall below threshold level, if for example existing service users and carers withdrew from involvement or were no longer available to contribute in the same way.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Warwick
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work (Integrated Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Approval visit date	18 - 19 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13011-P0H4T9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Christine Stogdon	Social worker
Mohammed Jeewa	Lay
Beverley Blythe	Social worker
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Patt Tissington	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Warwick
Kieran Platt	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Warwick

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Integrated Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01872

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes	This was provided for the current approved MA in Social Work programme.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	We met with learners from the current approved MA in Social Work programme.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	

Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 16 November 2018.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that appropriate information about the programme is provided to potential applicants, to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that applicants are provided with information about the internal application process (stage 1) and the joint assessment process (stage 2) when applying for the programme. All potential applicants will be invited to an open day before they are expected to make a decision about taking up a place on the programme. In discussions with the programme team, there were no final details available about what information would be provided to applicants prior to taking up a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification as to what information is available to potential applicants. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine how prospective applicants are able to make an informed choice about whether to apply for a place on the programme.

2.3 The admissions process must ensure that applicants have a good command of English.

Condition: The education provider must ensure applicants are aware of the English language requirements needed to communicate effectively with service users and carers and educators to complete the programme successfully.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted learners would need to have a minimum of a level two qualification in English before they can apply for the programme. The visitors were unable to determine what a level two qualification was in relation to the necessary level of English as set out in standard 8 of the SOPs for Social workers in England. As such, the visitors were unable to assess if the admissions process would ensure learners have the necessary level of English set out in standard 8 of the SOPs for social workers. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how the English qualification required will ensure applicants meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) once they complete the programme.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is a process in place to identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were made aware of the individual who currently has overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors noted that the current staff member identified was appropriately qualified and experienced. In the documentation, a policy was in place for identifying a programme leader. However, there was no detail provided within the policy about how the education provider would ensure that the individual appointed is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other alternative arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned that HCPC registration would be a requirement for any candidate selected for the role and this would be part of the role specification. However, as the visitors were not provided with this person specification for the role, they could not determine that process ensures that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person for the role. As such, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates that there is an effective process in place which ensures that when recruiting a person with overall professional responsibility for the programme they will be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the process in place to ensure the availability of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme is effective.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that learners would undertake practice-based learning as part of their apprenticeship. In discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider is in the process of agreeing where the practice-based learning will take place with employers. However, as the visitors did not have sight of these agreements they could not determine what arrangements are in place. As such, the visitors were unable to determine that an effective process is in place which ensures that all practice education providers associated with this programme have availability and capacity to deliver practice-based learning for all learners. As such, the visitors require further information regarding the process the education provider uses to ensure there are sufficient practice based learning opportunities for all learners, across the three years, including the agreements in place between the education provider and the practice education providers. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors learned there are currently six confirmed teaching staff appointed to deliver the programme. There are plans in place to recruit three new staff members to the team. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that recruitment is currently ongoing. The visitors considered that if for any reason this recruitment did not happen, there would be implications for the programme, including a potential strain on staff resources. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has a recruitment plan to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors learned that there are six confirmed teaching staff appointed to deliver the programme. The programme team confirmed plans were in place to recruit three new teaching staff members with relevant knowledge and expertise. As detailed information was not available about the number of the staff members involved in the teaching of the programme, and which teaching staff would be teaching particular elements of the programme, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on whether subject areas will be delivered by educators with relevant knowledge and expertise. Therefore, the visitors

require further evidence, which demonstrates that the education provider has staff members in place with the requisite specialist knowledge and experience to deliver the programme.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that programme resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors learned that the majority of the learning resources were available through the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)-Moodle. This would allow learners to access materials from teaching sessions and interactive content whilst completing the practice-based learning element of the programme. During the resources tour, a demonstration of the VLE was shown, which is currently used for the MA in Social Work programme. As well as this, the visitors were introduced to a programme called OneFile, which learners will use to complete reflective learning logs and record observations whilst in the practice-based education setting. However, the content for the OneFile programme and VLE is currently being written and is yet to be finalised. As eighty per cent of this programme is delivered offsite, the visitors considered it was paramount that the learners could access the resources to support learning and teaching activities. However, the visitors could not determine that the resources are readily available or effectively used to support the learning and teaching activities because they did not have sight of the content for this programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates resources which support the learning and teaching activities are in place and accessible to all learners and educators across the programme.

3.15 There must be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.

Condition: The education provider must amend documentation to ensure clear information is provided to learners about the process to raise complaints.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to what complaints process the learners should follow. During the programme team meeting the visitors were informed that learners should follow the education provider's process for receiving and responding to learner complaints. However when meeting the employers from the practice based learning environment, the visitors were informed that learners should follow the employer's process. Therefore, the visitors were unclear which process the learners should be using or how learners, academic staff and practice educators would know what process to follow. The visitors where therefore, could not determine whether this standards is met. As such, the visitors require further evidence that clearly defines which process the learners should use if they should need to raise a complaint and how all parties involved are informed of this process so that it is clear to all who could be involved.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revise documentation to ensure learners are provided with clear and accurate information about learning outcomes to ensure the standards of proficiency (SOPs) are met for social workers.

Reason: From a review of the module guide “key issues in professional social work”, the visitors noted that the timetable shows the adults and children and families pathways running concurrently and not consecutively for the degree apprenticeship. The visitors noted that as a result of this delivery model, learners would complete either a child or an adult pathway for the degree apprenticeship. In discussions with the programme team, it became apparent that the information in the documentation was inaccurate as learners would be expected to complete both an adult and a child pathway. Therefore, the visitors require that the information in the documentation is amended to ensure that learners are provided with accurate information about the learning outcomes they are expected to meet in order to ensure that all of the SOPs are met. Particularly, the learning outcomes must reflect how learners will meet the SOPs in Section 2 (2.1 and 2.3). In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

4.6 The learning and teaching methods used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must state the teaching methods used to deliver the programme, and demonstrate how these are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors learned that in addition to seminars and lectures, all learning materials will be available on the online platform Moodle, which will be available to learners at all times. In the facilities and resources meeting, the visitors were told that there are plans to develop a range of teaching methods such as lecture room capture (to record lectures), polls, OneFile system and the content for Moodle but these methods are currently in the stages of development and are yet to be finalised. As the visitors were unable to view all the learning and teaching methods on the programme they were unable to determine if these were appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes. Therefore, the education provider must provide information about the teaching methods specific to the delivery of the programme’s learning outcomes, which will be accessible to all learners on the programme, and demonstrate how these will ensure learners will achieve the learning outcomes.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the mandatory requirements for online engagement in the programme, the consequences of not engaging, and how this is communicated to learners.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors learned “100% engagement is mandatory”. The visitors understood that if a learner misses two or more sessions in any one module, it is referred by the tutor to the course director. Contact would be made with the learner to discuss mitigation planning for the missed learning and an

action plan would be completed. The visitors noted that these learners were employees who are entitled to annual leave of anywhere from 25 to 35 days per year, which could be requested during the teaching of an entire module. In discussions with the practice educators, this was a requirement of the contract so they would not be able to refuse annual leave requested by the employee. The programme team indicated that if learners missed online sessions due to annual leave there was no requirement in place for learners to catch up with the learning. Rather this was left for the learners to decide if this was appropriate. As such, the visitors were not satisfied that online attendance would be monitored appropriately and learners were made aware of the consequences of not attending remotely. Therefore, the visitors require evidence of how attendance is monitored when taking into account learners annual leave requirements throughout the programme, and how this is communicated to learners.

5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the range, duration and structure of practice based learning, to demonstrate that it supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to see information regarding the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning for this programme. As such, they were unable to determine how 50 learners each year would have access to the practice-based learning element of the programme, which supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers. Through discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the education provider intends to ensure that there are practice-based learning opportunities in a variety of settings, including a learning experience of 30 days in an alternative setting. However, there was no rationale provided as to why this number had been chosen. As such, the visitors were unable to establish what arrangements are in place between the education provider and the employers regarding delivery of practice-based learning for this programme. The visitors were also unable to see when, where, and for how long the practice-based learning opportunities would take place, or how their approach will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs for social workers. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the structure, duration and range of practice based learning for learners on this programme, and how it is appropriate to support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs for social workers. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the level of supervision on the practice-based learning element of the programme is appropriate and this requirement is clearly communicated to all involved.

Reason: In the apprentice handbook on page 21, it states the role of a practice educator is “to provide supervision once a month”. In discussions at the visit, there was confusion about the frequency of practice educator meetings with the apprentice. Some employers understood this to take place four times in a year (quarterly) whereas others thought it was once per month (monthly). The employers indicated that line managers would provide ongoing supervision, but this would be dependent on the situation. As

there was confusion amongst the practice educators about the level of supervision, the visitors were unable to establish whether the practice based learning environment was safe and supportive for both learners and service users.

Therefore, the education provider must clearly articulate to practice educators and learners the frequency of supervision and who carries out the supervision, whilst they are completing the practice-based learning element of the programme.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff for the practice-based element of the programme.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that there were plans to recruit staff for the practice-based element of the programme. In discussions at the visit, the visitors learned that recruitment is currently ongoing. As the visitors were not provided with any information about who is delivering the practice based learning element of the programme or the process for ensuring that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in the practice-based setting, they were unable to determine whether this standard was met. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what appropriate qualifications and experience practice-based learning staff must have and how they ensure that there is an adequate number of staff in the practice based setting who have the appropriately qualifications and experience to deliver the programme.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners on this programme.

Reason: This conditions relates to condition 5.5. In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that there are plans to recruit staff for the practice-based element of the programme, which are ongoing. As the visitors were not provided with the process for recruiting practice educators they were unable to establish whether practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what process is used by the education provider to ensure practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must communicate clearly the specific requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, the education provider referenced the generic university regulations used for all programmes which start in September. In discussions with the senior team and programme team, the visitors were told that specific university regulations would be drawn up for this programme as it falls outside

the regular format due to it starting in January rather than September. As such, the visitors were unable to determine the assessment policies and the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme. The visitors were also unclear how learners progress through the programme if they have not met the pass criteria in any or all of the modules. Also the visitors could not see what actions would be taken by the education provider and the employer if a learner should fail the programme. Therefore, the visitors need to see how this is addressed in the assessment policies for the programme. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how the programme-specific university regulations and assessment policies clearly specify the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme and how this information is made available to learners, academic staff and practice educators and providers.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Sheffield
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship), FT (Full time)
Approval visit date	25-26 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13266-V2P2M5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

David Ward	Social worker in England
Sheila Skelton	Social worker (Approved mental health professional)
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive
Brendon Edmonds	HCPC executive (observer)

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01946

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 05 December 2018.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that employers intend to support the programme, to ensure it remains sustainable and fit for purposes for the foreseeable future.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and through discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider was engaging with two local authorities who were interested in providing apprentices to undertake the programme. It was the education provider's intention to offer up to 30 places in year one, but it was currently unclear how many places they would be contracted to deliver. In this regard, the education provider also explained that a minimum number of learners were needed to make the programme viable and sustainable. The education provider also discussed the possibility of partnering with other local authorities within the South Yorkshire Teaching Partnership (SYTP) in future years. Whilst the intention of the education provider is to partner only with local authorities within the SYTP on a closed contract basis, the visitors received limited evidence that there was clear support for the programme, beyond discussions held with representatives at the senior team meeting.

Given the funding for apprentices and the provision of placement opportunities on this programme will come directly from local authorities, and the competitive environment within which degree apprenticeships operate, the visitors require further evidence to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further documentary evidence which demonstrates that partner organisations are committed to providing learners and resources to the programme, and that the programme will be financially sustainable as a result.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the Apprenticeship Steering Board is suitably defined and positioned to provide effective oversight to the management of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that the Apprenticeship Steering Board is a key element to the management of the programme. The education provider explained that the Board would be constituted with representatives from the education provider, local authorities and learners. The Board would provide strategic oversight and direction to the management and further development of the programme. The visitors understood that this Board will be important to support apprenticeship model, whereby education providers and employers are envisaged to partner closely around the delivery of the programme and progression of apprentices. However, whilst its importance was understood by the visitors, they received only limited documented information regarding how the Board will be established and governed, and how it fits into the overall management of the programme. The education provider acknowledged that further detail in this area was still to be determined.

Given these findings, the visitors require further evidence regarding the Apprenticeship Steering Board and how it will operate to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require evidence which clearly explains the role and remit of the Board, how it will be formally operated, and how it fits into the overall management of the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the role of Practice Consultant is suitably defined to ensure there is effective management of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and through discussions at the visit, the visitors noted the introduction of the Practice Consultant role which will support teaching and learning activities with apprentices. In particular, the visitors understood that this new role would be responsible for directing the academic and practice-based learning of apprentices, given a higher proportion of time will be spent learning in the workplace, in comparison to a traditional full time undergraduate route. In this regard, the role was viewed as an integral part of the programme team. The visitors also noted that the Practice Consultant would provide formal support to apprentices for up to 4 hours per month, and would work with four to five apprentices at a time as a group and, where needed, also individually. This role would be funded by the education provider, but the individuals fulfilling this role would be contracted by their local authority.

However, the visitors noted that there was limited documented information available about how the Practice Consultant role would work in practice. In particular, the visitors did not receive any information setting out the role brief for the Practice Consultant, areas of the programme this role would be formally responsible for, and the agreements in place with local authorities which ensure the role is clearly supported, and that its operation within the practice environment is understood. On this basis, the visitors were unclear around how the role would operate to effectively support the management of the programme.

Given these findings, the visitors require further evidence regarding the role of the Practice Consultant to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require evidence which clearly explains the role in detail, the criteria to fulfil the role, the areas of responsibility the role has regarding the management and delivery of the programme, and how the role will operate within the practice environment to direct and support apprentice learning.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates how the Apprentice Steering Board will operate to provide effective oversight to the monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that the newly introduced Apprenticeship Steering Board is a key element to the quality assurance arrangements of the programme. The education provider explained that the Board will be constituted by representatives from the education provider, local authorities and learners. The Board will provide oversight to the effective monitoring

and evaluation of the programme and lead on identifying and addressing issues, making changes and further developing the programme strategically and operationally. The visitors understood that the Board will be important to support apprenticeship model, whereby education providers and employers are envisaged to partner closely around the delivery of the programme and progression of apprentices. However, whilst its importance was understood by the visitors, they received only limited documented information regarding how the Board will be established and governed, and how it will fit into the overall quality assurance processes of the programme. The education provider acknowledged that further detail in this area was still to be determined.

Given these findings, the visitors require further evidence regarding the Board and how it will operate to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require evidence which clearly explains the role and remit of the Board, how it will be formally operated, and how it fits into the overall quality assurance of the programme.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of effective collaboration with practice education providers which ensures all practice educators are prepared to support apprentice learning.

Reason: The visitors received minutes from the Practice Placement Development Group (PPDG), and noted the ongoing relationship the education provider has with the South Yorkshire Teaching Partnership (SYTP) to support the delivery of practice-based learning across the region. In their discussions with practice educators, the visitors also noted that this group of stakeholders had yet to receive any information related to the degree apprenticeship programme. The education provider clarified that they intended to hold a joint meeting with practice placement educators to commence the planning required to support the delivery of this new model of training. As such, the visitors were unclear about the preparedness of the practice educators to support this new model of training.

Based on these findings, the visitors require further evidence of collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers in relation to the development of this programme. In particular, the visitors require evidence regarding the plans in place to ensure practice educators understand the requirements of the apprenticeship programme and how their role will work alongside the Practice Consultant role to support apprentices in any teaching and learning activities.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which ensures the programme has sufficient capacity of practice placements for learners.

Reason: Based on the findings set out in relation to standards 3.1 and 3.5, the visitors note that formal partnerships with two local authorities are still to be agreed around the number of apprentices to be funded and the availability of a suitable number of practice-based learning settings. Whilst the visitors noted that the education provider is seeking to support up to 30 apprentices per cohort, they also understood that the local authorities are yet to decide on the number of apprentice places they will be able to

offer the programme. In addition, the visitors also note that further discussions are still to be held within the South Yorkshire Teaching Partnership Practice Placement Development Group around placement allocations and how this programme may fit into provision of placements more broadly across the region.

Given the funding for apprentices and the provision of placement opportunities on this programme will come directly from local authorities, and the competitive environment within which degree apprenticeships operate, the visitors require further evidence to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further documentary evidence which demonstrates that partner organisations are committed to providing sufficient numbers of practice placements to support the planned cohort size. Any evidence provided should also clarify how any such capacity to this programme has been considered in the context of practice based learning already in operation throughout the region.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the mechanisms used to collect feedback from learners are effective and will contribute to the development of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion held with students on the approved Masters programme, the visitors noted it was not always clear how learner feedback was managed and acted on by the education provider. The visitors also noted the introduction of an Apprenticeship Steering Board for this programme would mean learner feedback was handled in a different way. In discussions with the programme team, it was acknowledged that the way the education provider deals with learner feedback required further development. In particular it was noted that the education provider needs to further consider how learner feedback will be gathered from apprentices, and how the current arrangements may require further adaptation to ensure they are fit for purpose. In this regard, the education provider discussed the implementation of an Annual Reflection process.

Given these findings, the education must provide further evidence of how learner feedback will be gathered, considered, and how any actions taken will be effectively fed back to apprentices. In particular, further clarity should be provided around the role of the Board in provide oversight to any mechanisms being relied upon.

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the current and projected staffing levels required to ensure the effective delivery of the programme.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation and in discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider was seeking approval to deliver the programme for up to 30 apprentices per cohort, with one cohort commencing per year. The education provider also discussed how this would be managed alongside the delivery of the existing Master programme. In order to meet the demands for year one of the programme, the education provider plans to recruit an additional Senior Lecturer post. In addition, it is anticipated that approximately four to five Practice Consultants need to be in post to support student learning. Towards the end of year one, further analysis

will be needed to ascertain further staffing requirements to support the following two years, which would provide up to a maximum of 90 students on the programme at any given time. Whilst this information was discussed at the visit, the visitors did not receive any evidence for how staff resources will be utilised to support the effective delivery of the programme.

Given these findings, the visitors require further evidence of the resourcing plan for the apprenticeship programme. In particular, the visitors require evidence which clearly articulates how many staff will be available to deliver the programme in year one, and how this in with the programme timetable. Clarity is also required around how these plans compliment the delivery of the existing Masters programme. The visitors also require further clarity around how the Practice Consultant role is, if at all, factored into the programme team resources required to deliver elements of the programme. Finally, the visitors would also expect to receive more information about the projected learner numbers of the programme, over three years, and how this may impact on further resourcing requirements for the programme team. This information should be provided in the context of filling up to the maximum number of places approval is being sought for.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that individuals fulfilling the role of Practice Consultant are suitable to support the delivery of teaching and learning on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and through discussions at the visit, the visitors noted the introduction of a Practice Consultant who would play an important role in supporting teaching and learning activities with apprentices. In particular, the visitors understood that this new role would be responsible for directing the academic and practice-based learning of apprentices, given a higher proportion of time will be spent learning in the workplace, in comparison to a traditional full time undergraduate route. In this regard, the role was viewed as an integral part of the programme team. The visitors also noted that the Practice Consultant would provide formal support to apprenticeships for up to 4 hours per month, and would work with four to five apprentices at a time as a group and, where needed, also individually. This role would be funded by the education provider, but that the individuals fulfilling this role would be contracted by their local authority.

However, the visitors noted that there was limited documented information available about how the Practice Consultant role would work in practice. In particular, the visitors did not receive any information setting out the role brief for the Practice Consultant, areas of the programme this role would be formally responsible for, and the agreements in place with local authorities which ensure the role is clearly supported, and that its operation within the practice environment is understood. On this basis, the visitors were unclear around how individuals fulfilling this role would be suitable to support the delivery of any specialist subject areas they may be responsible for.

Given these findings, the visitors require further evidence regarding the role of the Practice Consultant to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require evidence which clearly explains the role in detail, the criteria to fulfil the role, the areas of responsibility the role has regarding the delivery of the programme, and how the role

will operate within the practice environment to direct and support student learning. Where Practice Consultants are involved in supporting particular subject areas, clarity should be provided for how individuals fulfilling this role will be suitably experienced to support apprentice learning.

4.3 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The education provider must provide demonstrate how the learning hours required for the undergraduate degree are achievable within the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and through further discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the programme has been structured to support an apprenticeship learning model, whereby smaller 20 credit modules are delivered alongside larger, year-long, 40 credit modules, the latter of which are primarily completed within the practice-based setting. The education provider explained that this means around a third of the programme would be delivered within the academic setting, with a proportion of the time allocated to face to face teaching and learning. The visitors noted the reliance on self-directed and work-based learning to ensure individuals could reasonably fulfil the learning hours required for an undergraduate degree. The visitors also noted the programme had been validated by the education provider on this basis.

Based on this information, the visitors were unclear how an individual could reasonably fulfil the learning hours, considering the amount of self-directed and work-based learning required, and that this will need to be achieved alongside the apprentice also fulfilling their responsibilities as an employee. Given these findings, the visitors require further evidence of the rationale underpinning the achievement of the learning hours to ensure this standard is met.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there will be an appropriate number of suitable Practice Consultants in place to support practice-based learning.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and through discussions at the visit, the visitors noted the introduction of the Practice Consultant role which will play an important role in supporting teaching and learning activities for apprentices. In particular, the visitors understood that this new role would be responsible for directing the academic and practice-based learning of apprentices, given a higher proportion of time will be spent learning in the workplace, in comparison to a traditional full time undergraduate route. In this regard, the role was viewed as an integral part of the programme team, but in the context of this standard, would be based within the practice environment. The visitors also noted that the Practice Consultant would provide formal support to apprenticeships for up to 4 hours per month, and would work with four to five apprentices at a time as a group and, where needed, also individually. This role would be funded by the education provider, but that the individuals fulfilling this role would be contracted by their local authority.

However, the visitors noted that there was limited documented information available about how the Practice Consultant role would work in practice. In particular, the visitors did not receive any information setting out the role brief for the Practice Consultant, areas of the programme this role would be formally responsible for, and the agreements in place with local authorities which ensure the role is clearly supported, and that its operation within the practice environment is understood. On this basis, the visitors were unclear around how the role would operate to effectively support the delivery of this programme. Furthermore, they could not ascertain whether the proposed number of Practice Consultants would be adequate to support the delivery of the programme.

To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence regarding the role of the Practice Consultant and how the proposed numbers fulfilling this role will be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. In particular, the visitors require evidence which clearly explains the role in detail, the criteria to fulfil the role, the areas of responsibility the role has regarding the delivery of the programme, and how the role will operate within the practice environment to direct and support student learning. In addition to this, the visitors also require further information around how the proposed number of four to five Practice Consultants will be appropriate to support practice-based learning.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that individuals fulfilling the role of Practice Consultant are suitable to support safe and effective practice based learning.

Reason: Similarly to 5.5, the visitors noted that the newly introduced role of Practice Consultant is key to delivery of the programme. However, the visitors noted that there was limited documented information available about how the Practice Consultant role would work in practice. In particular, the visitors did not receive any information setting out the role brief for the Practice Consultant, areas of the programme this role would be formally responsible for, and the agreements in place with local authorities which ensure the role is clearly supported, and that its operation within the practice environment is understood. On this basis, the visitors were unclear around how the individuals fulfilling this role will have the necessary experience to effectively support safe and effective learning in practice-based settings.

Given these findings, the visitors require further evidence regarding the role of the Practice Consultant to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require evidence which clearly explains the role in detail, the criteria to fulfil the role, the areas of responsibility the role has regarding the delivery of the programme, and how the role will operate within the practice environment to direct and support student learning.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider continuing to work closely with local authorities to support continuing professional and academic development of the Practice Consultants.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and through discussions at the visit, the visitors noted the introduction of the Practice Consultant role which will play an important role in supporting teaching and learning activities with apprentices. In particular, the visitors understood that this new role will be responsible for directing the academic and practice-based learning of apprentices, given a higher proportion of time will be spent learning in the workplace, in comparison to a traditional full time undergraduate route. In this regard, the role was viewed as an integral part of the programme team.

Whilst the visitors are satisfied this standard is met, they recommend the education provider continues to work closely with local authorities to secure dedicated time for individuals fulfilling this role to undertake appropriate professional and academic professional development. This will ensure the role and the individuals fulfilling it continue to remain suitably qualified and experienced to effectively support apprentice learning.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the process for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

Reason: The visitors noted in their discussions at the visit that learner consent was gain at the commencement of the programme. Whilst they were satisfied that there are effective processes in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners, the visitors recommend the education provider consider developing more mechanisms to gain consent from learners at further points, where appropriate, as they progress through the programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics, Full time
Approval visit date	11 – 12 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13257-T6S6R3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Paul Blakeman	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Bee Yee Gan	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Helen Garner	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Jacki Bishop	Assessor	British Dietetic Association
Jane Wilson	Assessor	British Dietetic Association
Meena Wyn-Wright	Policy Officer	British Dietetic Association
Neil Cross	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University

Karen Vernon-Parry	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01945

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes

Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 15 November 2018.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is a service level agreement (SLA) in place for practice-based learning.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence provided for this standard, including a rationale document and records of collaborations with various stakeholders. They considered that the general arrangements for ensuring the sustainability and fitness of the programme were appropriate overall. They viewed draft copies of service-level agreements with some providers of practice-based learning. However, they were not able to view final versions of these agreements, or other evidence showing that agreements were in place with all providers of practice-based learning. Therefore they were not able to be satisfied that an effective process was in place to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they can ensure access to appropriate practice-based learning for all learners.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that all areas of the programme will be taught by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including a staffing strategy and copies of staff curriculum vitae (CVs). They also discussed

staffing with the programme team. The programme team gave verbal reassurances that there were detailed plans in place to cover all parts of the programme appropriately. However, the visitors were not able to view a detailed breakdown of which staff would be allocated to which parts of the programme. They were therefore unable to be satisfied that all subject areas would be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. They considered that this was particularly important in light of the programme structure, which has modules running all through the academic year and so has potential to place strain on workload planning. They require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that all subject areas will be taught by staff with appropriate expertise and knowledge.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that the obtaining of consent from learners has been recorded appropriately.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence provided for this standard, including learner protocols and a placement strategy document. They also discussed the issue with learners and the programme team. They were satisfied that there were appropriate procedures for obtaining consent from service users who came into contact with learners on the programme. The programme team and learners indicated that there was a procedure for obtaining consent from learners for activities such as role-play early in the programme. However, the visitors were not clear how this consent was recorded, and what information the learners have available to help them understand consent fully. They were not, for example, able to see a completed consent form. They were therefore unable to be clear that the process for obtaining consent was effective and appropriate. They require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they obtain appropriate consent.

6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence demonstrating that an appropriately qualified and experienced external examiner will be appointed.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard. They were satisfied that an appropriate process was in place for appointing an external examiner, but they were aware that one had not yet been appointed. Therefore they were not able to be satisfied that there will be relevant professional input in the external review of the assessment process. They require the education provider to demonstrate that a suitable external examiner will be appointed.

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. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing service user and carer involvement on the programme to obtain more input from users of dietetic services.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as service users and carers did have input. Their involvement was appropriate to the programme and was planned and systematic, helping learners to understand patient experiences and perspectives. However they were aware from the meeting with the service users and carers that there did not seem to be many service users and carers involved with the programme who had direct experience of accessing dietetics services. They considered that this might create a risk that in future the service user and carer involvement would no longer be appropriate and relevant to the programme, if those service users and carers who did have experience of dietetics could no longer work with the programme and were not replaced. The visitors suggest therefore that the service user and carer involvement be re-examined with a view to involving more dietetics service users and carers.

3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing their staffing needs if the programme expands as intended, and contact the HCPC if significant expansion is planned.

Reason: The visitors considered that the standard was met at threshold as the staff numbers were appropriate for the current cohort size (15). However, they were aware from discussions with the senior team that they were considering a significant expansion of the programme in future years, up to 25 or 30. The visitors considered that this increase, if taken forward, would require an increase in the number of programme staff to ensure that the programme could still be delivered effectively. If more staff were not recruited following such an increase, there was a risk that the standard would no longer be met. They therefore suggest that, in the event of a programme expansion, the education provider review staffing requirements. They also note that the HCPC usually expects education providers to notify us of increases in learner numbers that are likely to affect the programme's ability to meet all the standards of education and training.