

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Salford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics, Full time
Approval visit date	26-27 January 2021
Case reference	CAS-16181-F2X8N2

### 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.....	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:

Hazel Anderson	Prosthetist / orthotist
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
John Archibald	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.

Helen Matthews	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Salford
Julie Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Salford

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Prosthetist / orthotist
First intake	01 January 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02270

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involved consideration of documentary evidence and virtual 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 major change submitted in 2020.

The education provider notified us of their intention to make changes across the programme. We considered the changes were likely to have a considerable impact on the way the programme meets a large number of our standards, and affect the way in which the programme delivers the standards of proficiency for prosthetists / orthotists. As well as increasing programme enrolment by 50%, the education provider made the following changes:

- rewriting learning outcomes across the whole programme;
- making significant amendments to module content;
- introducing new modules and changing the weighting of existing ones;
- changing the structure and duration of practice-based learning, including the introduction of a new three-week clinical assessment; and
- changes to assessment strategy across many of the modules, including all the Level 6 modules.

Given the different programme content, we considered the delivery of our standards would be different. The differing components of the programme will relate to each other in different ways. Staff would have to be redeployed and given different responsibilities, and the overall demands on staff time and resources will increase because of the increased recruitment of learners, from the current 30 to 45. The expectations on learners will change due to the restructuring of the programme and the new assessment approach across large parts of the programme.

## 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
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	Yes

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	Comments
Learners	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	No	Since the move to virtual visits, we do not ask to meet with service users and carers. We explored any areas with them through the submission of written statements.
Facilities and resources	No	Since the move to virtual visits, we do not ask for a session about facilities and resources. We explored areas relating to resourcing in other, appropriate meetings.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	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 virtual 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 03 March 2021.

### **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 record the training practice educators have undertaken, so the practice educators are appropriately prepared to support learning and assess learners effectively.

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware from the SETs mapping document that the education provider offers initial training and updates for practice educators. The visitors were informed in the meeting with the programme team that the education provider is in the process of creating a new system, which would have the potential to let the education provider record the training practice educators have completed. However, the visitors understood, and the programme team confirmed, that there is no system at present for the education provider to see the training records – initial and updates - practice educators have completed. The visitors therefore considered the education provider currently has no knowledge of who has done initial training and any updates, to ensure practice educators are prepared to support and assess learners. We expect that all new practice educators are trained and that this is followed up with regular refresher training and support. The visitors therefore require further information about how the education provider takes responsibility for recording the details of the training and updates practice educators have completed.

## 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 27 April 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](#).