

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Winchester
Name of programme(s)	PGDip in Occupational Therapy, Full time PGDip in Occupational Therapy, Part time MSc in Occupational Therapy, Full time MSc in Occupational Therapy, Part time
Approval visit date	21-22 April 2021
Case reference	CAS-16304-K8Y3G6

### 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.....	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:

Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

### Other groups involved in the virtual approval visit

There were other groups involved with the approval process as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Lisa Harding	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Winchester
Amy Day	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Winchester
Theresa Baxter	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Nicola Spalding	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists

Caroline Grant	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Carolyn Hay	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists.

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PGDip in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across the Occupational Therapy provision
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02289

Programme name	PGDip in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across the Occupational Therapy provision
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02290

Programme name	MSc in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across the Occupational Therapy provision
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02291

Programme name	MSc in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across the Occupational Therapy provision
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02292

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

The education provider proposes to deliver a full and part time MSc in Occupational Therapy programme, with up to a total of combined 25 learners per cohort. The PGDip in Occupational Therapy will be an exit award, that will confer eligibility for learners to apply to the HCPC Register.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for 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.

Type of evidence	Submitted	Comments
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements	Yes	
Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning	Yes	
Proficiency standards mapping	Yes	
Information provided to applicants and learners	Yes	
Information for those involved with practice-based learning	Yes	
Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme	Yes	
Internal quality monitoring documentation	No	As these programmes have not yet commenced, this was not required

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the education provider decided to move this event to a virtual (or remote) approval visit. In the table below, we have noted the meeting held, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

### **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.

#### **3.9 There must 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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should keep under review their staff planning to ensure there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that these standards were met at threshold level, considering the intention to use existing staff from other professions and timelines to recruit a further 2.6 work time equivalent staff (WTE) with occupational therapy expertise. Amongst these plans, the first step is to recruit 1.0 WTE staff by September 2021. Additionally, the visitors considered there is commitment for staff funding from the senior management along with interim measures to use hourly paid lecturers to meet the teaching responsibilities, to ensure all learners in year one will have the required support on the programme. As the proposed start date of the programme is not too far away, the visitors considered that there could be a risk to the effective future delivery of the programme should the staff recruitment plans, along with the interim measures not get actioned in a timely manner by September 2021. As such, the visitors considered that there was a potential risk that the standards may no longer be met at that time. Therefore the visitors suggest that, the education provider review and monitor staffing levels closely ahead of when applicants come onto the programme in year one, to ensure that their staff numbers continue to be appropriate, and with the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise, in line with the requirements of the programme.

#### **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 integrate learning opportunities for interprofessional learning consistently, to ensure learners are learning with and from other learners throughout the programme on both the pathways.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the plans to have some shared modules delivered on this proposed programme, with learners from other professions. Additionally, the visitors also noted intentions and examples to develop further interprofessional learning (IPL) on this programme, which includes joint teaching and activity sessions with the Nursing and Physiotherapy professions. The visitors considered this standard was met at threshold level. However the visitors noted that learners will be spending minimal time on campus per semester, with a majority of learning taking place online as part of the blended learning approach of this programme. The visitors considered that there might be a possibility that not all IPL activities could be covered on this programme within the two weeks learners will spend on campus, because other professions such as Nursing

or Physiotherapy will not be delivered with the same level of blended learning. This potentially means that some of the shared learning and activities will involve learners on this programme to participate more virtually online, with less consistency of face to face learning as with other profession programmes. Based on this, the education provider will have to ensure IPL activities conducted online will need to be embedded in such a way that it ensures it will develop learners' ability to communicate and work with learners outside their profession. As such, the visitors considered there is a risk in the standard falling below threshold level if online learning does not give sufficient opportunity for learners to interact and work with learners from other professions. Therefore the visitors recommend the education provider ensures there are regular IPL opportunities integrated onto the programme within the timetabling to ensure there is consistency in learners being prepared to learn from other learners, on both the part time and full time pathways. This is so that IPL remains relevant and meaningful, allowing learners to learn with and from learners in other relevant professions.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the virtual approval visit, the visitors recommend that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met, and that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 26 May 2021 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).