

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, FT (Full time)
Approval visit date	22 – 24 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13574-B0C6Q7

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
Section 5: Outcome from second review.....	9
Section 6: Visitors’ recommendation.....	10

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:

Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Susanne Roff	Lay
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

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

- Panel 1 – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work
- Panel 2 – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
- Panel 3 – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science

For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and College of Occupational Therapists. For the paramedic and operating department

practice programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, College of Paramedics and College of Operating Department Practitioners. The education provider appointed an internal panel who reviewed each of the programmes.

Internal panel members		
Elaine Buckley	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Chloe Corbett	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
David Owen	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Claire Lockwood	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Mary Dawson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Jill LeBihan	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Lorraine Cookson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Professional body panel members		
Paul Townsend	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Bob Willis	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Barry Pryer	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Alison Hampson	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Suzie Boyd	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Mike Donnellon	Professional body representative	College of Operating Department Practitioners
HCPC Social work panel members		
Richard Barker	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Roseann Connolly	Lay	HCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive	HCPC – observer
HCPC Diagnostic Radiography and Therapeutic Radiography panel members		
Shaaron Pratt	Diagnostic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Burgess	Therapeutic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HCPC visitor
John Archibald	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
HCPC Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel members		
Bernadette Waters	Occupational therapist	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist	HCPC visitor
Joanne Watchman	Lay	HCPC visitor
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead

HCPC Operating Department Practice and Paramedic panel members		
Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner	HCPC visitor
John Donaghy	Paramedic	HCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HCPC visitor
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02005

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02006

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 through the major change process that they were making several changes to the programmes to accommodate further curriculum integration. From the information provided, the education provider's approach to the way the programmes will be managed, resourced, delivered and assessed will be significantly different from the currently approved programmes. We decided that the introduction of an integrated curricula could have significant impact on the way the standards will continue to be met. Therefore, we decided the most appropriate way to assess changes to the programmes was via the approval process.

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 28 March 2019.

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 is available to applicants and which enables them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: From their review of the programme documentation, the visitors considered that some of the information available to applicants was not clear or not correct. For example, reference was made in the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology student handbook to the programme “leads to professional registration” as a therapeutic radiographer. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation did not reflect the number of learners that were anticipated for this programme, as a lower number had been stated for both programmes. The visitors were therefore not able to determine whether the information provided was sufficient to enable applicants to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and education provider.

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 ensure that potential applicants to the programme are given full and clear information about how the foundation year works.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. In meetings, the senior team and the programme team gave some verbal assurances that applicants would be given information about this year. However, from these conversations, the visitors were not clear about what information would be provided, in what format, at what stage of the application process. The initial documentary submission had not included evidence relating to the information about the foundation year provided to applicants. In particular, it was not clear how the education provider would clarify for applicants that there were no credits, and no award, available at the completion of the foundation year, and that it was intended solely as a route on to the degree-level programmes. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit evidence showing how applicants will have access to all appropriate information about the foundation year.

2.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Condition: In relation to the proposed foundation year, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programmes have appropriate academic entry standards.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. Information about this had not been included in the initial documentary submission. It was therefore not clear to the visitors how the foundation year would be integrated into the programmes as a whole. During the visit, the programme team and the senior team gave verbal reassurances about how the foundation year would work. This included clarifying that the foundation year was intended to provide an access point to the programmes for learners who did not achieve the necessary grades but who were judged to have the potential to complete the programme. The visitors considered that

what they were told about the foundation year seemed appropriate, but as they had not been provided with documentary evidence relating to the foundation year they were unable to determine whether the standard was met. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating that learners coming on to the programmes via the foundation year will meet appropriate academic standards.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware the design of the programmes builds on pre-existing inter-professional education and moves towards an integrated care curricula (ICC). Under ICC there will be an integrated approach to the programmes' learning, teaching and assessment strategies. Themes which underpin the concept of the ICC will be threaded into the programmes. From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the responsibilities of the various roles within the programmes, such as course leader and clinical liaison officer, and the skills and expertise of those staff members involved in the programmes. However, from the information provided beforehand and discussions at the visit, the visitors could not determine whether there was a programme management structure in place with clear roles and responsibilities for the ICC constituents of the programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the programme was effectively managed. The visitors require more information about the lines of responsibility for decisions relating to ICC components of the programmes.

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 for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriate.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curricula vitae of the current programme leaders for the programmes. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility of the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the programme 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 selecting a programme leader from the current staff provision, and the role is recruited to on a rotating basis. 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.

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 information to demonstrate there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: Prior to the visit the education provider provided documentation which explained the staff roles which provide support for learners while on practice-based learning and the learning expectations of the various parties involved with practice-based learning, for example, clinical staff, learners, university staff and carers. From discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that the education provider ensures practice educators involved in practice-based learning would be appropriately qualified and experienced. However, from the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors were not clear how many staff would be involved in practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for the number of learners on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider justifies what they consider a suitable number of staff for the number of learners on practice-based learning to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates the assessment load for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module is a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: At this multi-professional visit, the social work panel from HCPC raised with the programme team for the social work programmes that they found the assessment load for some 40 credit modules, at level four and level five, were comparatively low to other modules on the programmes. One of the modules the visitors were referring to is the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module at level five, which is a shared module for all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula. This was not picked up at the visit by the other HCPC panels, and so it was not discussed at the visit for these programmes. However, on reflection, considering the broader impact of the condition required by the social work visitors, we found it appropriate to require a response relating to all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula.

For the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module, the social work visitors noted the assessment for this module was a poster presentation and an essay of 1500 words. The social work visitors discussed this with the social work programme team at the visit, who acknowledged they were unaware of the details of assessment load on the module and could not give a rationale without looking further into it. As such, from the information provided, the visitors could not determine what the rationale was for the assessment load on the module, which would ensure a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. By 'reliable' we mean that assessments are consistent and thorough enough to allow learners to demonstrate how far they have progressed during the course of the programme and achieve the learning outcomes. Without understanding the rationale for the assessment on this module, the visitors could not determine how the assessment load would ensure a thorough enough assessment. As

this is a shared module, we now require further evidence on this for these programmes. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the rationale for the assessment load for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module, which demonstrates that the assessment will provide a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Second response to conditions required

The education provider responded to the conditions set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were satisfied that the conditions for several of the standards were met. However, they were not satisfied that the following conditions were met, for the reasons detailed below. Therefore, in order for the visitors to be satisfied that the following conditions are met, they require further evidence.

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 is available to applicants and which enables them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason condition not met at this time: From reviewing the evidence provided as response to the condition for this standard, the visitors considered some of the information available to applicants remained not correct. For example, reference was made in the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology submission document to the programme conferring "eligibility to register with the HCPC" as a therapeutic radiographer. Programme approval does not automatically lead to HCPC registration for graduates. Rather, programme approval leads to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. The visitors were therefore not able to determine whether the information provided was sufficient to enable applicants to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and education provider.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and education provider.

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 information to demonstrate there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason condition not met at this time: From reviewing the evidence provided in response to the condition for this standard, the visitors were made aware the education

provider provides training and support for staff involved in practice-based learning. The visitors were made aware there are mechanisms for managing staffing numbers according to the department and the resources available, and in considering an appropriate number of learners allocated to each site. However, from the information provided, the visitors were still not clear how many staff would be involved in practice-based learning, or what the education provider considers to be an adequate number. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for the number of learners on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the number of staff involved in practice-based learning on both programmes and the number of learners at each placement site to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require further information about the number of staff involved in practice-based learning on both programmes and number of learners at each placement site.

Section 6: 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 programmes are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).