
Approval process report

University of Central Lancashire, physiotherapy, 2022-23

Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Degree apprenticeship). This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme(s) against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme(s) are fit to practice.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Reviewed the programme(s) against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities
- Recommended all standards are met, and that the programme should be approved

[if observations supplied] The education provider supplied observations which [will be / were] considered in decision making.

Through this assessment, we have noted the programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.

Previous consideration	Not applicable – this case has not emerged from any previous HCPC process.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: • whether the programme is approved.
Next steps	• The education provider's next performance review will be in the 2025-2026 academic year. • Subject to the Panel's decision, the programme will be approved and delivered by the education provider from September 2023.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment.....	3
About us	3
Our standards	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The approval process	3
How we make our decisions.....	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: Institution-level assessment.....	4
The education provider context.....	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider.....	5
Institution performance data.....	6
The route through stage 1	9
Admissions	9
Management and governance	10
Quality, monitoring, and evaluation	11
Learners	12
Outcomes from stage 1	14
Section 3: Programme-level assessment.....	14
Programmes considered through this assessment	14
Stage 2 assessment – provider submission	14
Quality themes identified for further exploration	14
Quality theme 1 – collaboration with stakeholders in development of the apprenticeship	15
Section 4: Findings.....	15
Conditions	16
Overall findings on how standards are met.....	16
Section 5: Referrals.....	19
Recommendations.....	19
Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes	19
Assessment panel recommendation	19
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution.....	20

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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

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

Our standards

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

Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

The approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:

- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)
- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

Jo Jackson	Lead visitor, physiotherapist
Fleur Kitsell	Lead visitor, physiotherapist
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

Executive-led assessment was appropriate for stage 1 in this case. There did not appear to be any unusual features of the proposed apprenticeship programme, and this is not a new provider or a non-traditional provider.

Physiotherapy is not new provision at UCLAN. The proposed apprenticeship builds on the structures and approaches of an existing undergraduate physiotherapy programme.

The approval request form (ARF) supplied by the education provider suggested that the institution-level standards were likely to be met in a similar way on the new programme as they are on the existing programmes, and on the HCPC-approved provision at UCLAN more broadly.

To judge by the information available, there were no plans to meet any institution-level standards in significantly different ways.

There was also no need to request further information to support stage 1. We had sufficient information to determine that the stage 1 standards were met.

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 18 HCPC-approved programmes across 8 professions, including 2 post registration programmes for two prescribing annotations. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2002.

They have expanded their offer significantly in recent years. The recent additions include dietetics, hearing aid dispenser, occupational therapy and speech and language therapy.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

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

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Biomedical scientist	☒ Undergraduate	☐ Postgraduate	2014
	Dietitian	☒ Undergraduate	☒ Postgraduate	2022
	Hearing Aid Dispenser	☒ Undergraduate	☐ Postgraduate	2022
	Occupational therapist	☒ Undergraduate	☒ Postgraduate	2019
	Operating Department Practitioner	☒ Undergraduate	☐ Postgraduate	2012
	Paramedic	☒ Undergraduate	☐ Postgraduate	2009
	Physiotherapist	☒ Undergraduate	☒ Postgraduate	2005

	Speech and language therapist	☒ Undergraduate	☒ Postgraduate	2020
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2006

Institution performance data

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

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	451	506	2022	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is proposing through the new provision. The visitors considered that the resourcing outlined in the submission and the capacity available was sufficient for the number of learners planned for the programme.

Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	5%	2019- 2020	This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because it did not have an impact on the SETs we were considering. The performance review completed by this education provider in February 2023 did not highlight any issues around learner retention.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	94%	98%	2019- 2020	This data was sourced from data – a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained. We did not explore this data point through this

				assessment because the figure did not suggest any issues in this area.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	Silver		June 2017	The definition of a Silver / Bronze] TEF award is “Provision is of high quality, and significantly and consistently exceeds the baseline quality threshold expected of UK Higher Education.” We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there were no concerns around teaching quality for the programme.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	74.0%	69.3%	2022	This data was sourced from the summary of provider-level public data The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has been maintained. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because we did not have any reason from this submission or from the education provider’s performance review that there were significant issues with learner involvement or satisfaction on the HCPC-approved programmes.

HCPC performance review cycle length	N / A	Four years	2025-26	The education provider is due to go through performance review again in the 2025-25 academic year. There were no serious issues raised through the PR, although the visitors noted that the education provider had a number of ongoing projects that were due to report over the next two years.
--------------------------------------	-------	------------	---------	--

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Information for applicants –**
 - Applicants will be provided with most of the same information for the new apprenticeship programme as on the education provider's existing undergraduate programmes. The relevant webpage will explain the nature of the programme and note the additional apprenticeship-related requirements. These include the need for applicants to be employed in a relevant physiotherapy role, with an employer able to engage with the apprenticeship.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider operates. The approach is institution-wide and will apply to the proposed new programme.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health –**
 - The approach for the apprenticeship set out in the approval request form is closely aligned to the approach already used at the education provider. It involves a specific proficiency test for English language skills, a Disclosure & Barring Service (DBS) check, and an occupational health assessment. We know that there is alignment with existing approaches based on a comparison with the baselining exercise and information received through the 2021-22 performance review.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L) –**

- There is an established mechanism at the education provider for assessing AP(E)L. They have developed a skills assessment which will form part of the process by which learners are brought on to the programme. If appropriate, this skills assessment will feed into a decision about whether learners should have considered AP(E)L.
- This is closely aligned with the provider's existing approach, which they have set out in the baseline document and the performance review portfolio.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)–**
 - The education provider state that they have an institutional approach to EDI based on “four pillars”. By this they mean they focus on fairness in the following areas:
 - recruitment of staff and learners;
 - learner outcomes;
 - community feeling; and
 - research into EDI.
 - This approach to EDI will be applied to admissions on the new programme. The proposed approach for his programme is therefore closely aligned with the overall institutional approach.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register¹ –**
 - There has been approved physiotherapy provision at the education provider for twenty years. They have existing undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in this curriculum area. The proposed new programme is closely based on this existing provision and will incorporate many of the same modules and assessments.
 - The education provider has the staff, and the institutional infrastructure and experience, to deliver Level 6 education in physiotherapy.
- **Sustainability of provision –**
 - The education provider state in their approval request form (ARF) they have won the tender to deliver apprenticeships until 2025. This means there will be three full cohorts of this programme starting in September 2023. If they are unsuccessful with their reapplication of the tender, they will consider not running the apprenticeship.
 - The funding secured should enable the programme to be sustainable for at least three full cohorts. If the education provider wish to admit further cohorts after 2025, the HCPC will make a separate decision at the appropriate time.

¹ This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

- The arrangements for maintaining programme sustainability are appropriate. We are confident of this based on the above information and on the recent performance review.
- **Effective programme delivery –**
 - The education provider has been delivering physiotherapy programmes at Level 6 or above for twenty years. This means there is a large amount of institutional experience and expertise available, as well as the facilities to enable effective delivery of the apprenticeship programme. From summer 2023, they will be recruiting a full-time “work-based educator” to support the apprenticeship by facilitating learners in the workplace. All programmes are expected to make annual reports to ensure their ongoing effectiveness and viability.
 - Considering this experience, we are confident that the new programme can be delivered effectively and align with existing approaches.
- **Effective staff management and development –**
 - Established development and management systems at the education provider will be used for the new programme as well. This assessment is based on the ARF.
 - These include quarterly appraisals and a university-level performance management and workload monitoring system.
 - We are already familiar with these systems from the education provider’s performance review. The visitors in that review found that performance in staff management and development was strong.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level –**
 - The education provider noted the key stakeholders for the apprenticeship will be the employer partners. The details of how these relationships will be managed and maintained are set out in the programme specification.
 - The education provider do not yet know who their employer partners will be. However, we can be satisfied from their recent performance review that the mechanisms in place for managing partnerships are strong and appropriate. The visitors agreed that the education provider was well-integrated with regional consortiums and working groups and had clear internal mechanisms for managing partnerships.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality –**
 - The proposed new programme will follow all the established procedures at the education provider for monitoring and enhancing quality. They have supplied relevant regulations and noted a specific external examiner will be appointed for the proposed programme. This in line with their established approach.
 - The new programme has already been approved internally using the education provider’s quality assurance processes.

- We can be confident in the education provider approach in this area as they have just completed performance review. The visitors concluded that their performance was good.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments –**
 - Audit of employer partners will be carried out via the existing arrangements as laid out in the documentation linked to via the approval request form. These arrangements include an initial audit when a placement comes on stream and regular subsequent audits. They confirmed there will be regular reviews of apprenticeships. One review mechanism is six-weekly meetings between the learner, the apprenticeships work based educator (the AWBE) and academic staff. Another is twelve-weekly tripartite reviews. Employers will also have feedback opportunities.
 - These arrangements are aligned with existing quality practice at the education provider which have recently been assessed as appropriate through performance review.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - Similar mechanisms will be used to gather and implement learner feedback on the new apprenticeship as on the existing HCPC-approved provision. These include formal mid and end of module feedback and ongoing informal feedback.
 - We can be satisfied with the alignment of the new programme and the existing arrangements at the education provider. Those arrangements are laid out in the baseline document and have been recently reviewed by the HCPC via performance review. Learners have regular opportunities to feedback, through both informal and formal mechanisms. These include regular meetings with supervisors and tutors, and termly written surveys.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
 - The education provider's established service user team will be used for the new programme.
 - The recent performance review considered that use of service users by the education provider was effective and appropriate. There is a University-level service user group which co-ordinates and quality assures service user involvement with all healthcare programmes. Specific individuals within faculties have responsibility for working with this group for their programmes. This includes the HCPC-approved provision. It is clear from the approval request form and the baseline document that the new programme will be aligned with these approaches.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support –**

- The ARF notes apprentices on the new programme will have access to all the normal pathways for support. These include study support, finance, and mental health.
- These arrangements are aligned with the existing arrangements at the provider which were considered appropriate and well-performing through performance review.
- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - As well as the meetings noted under ‘Practice quality’ above, learners on the apprenticeship will have access to the whole suite of support at the education provider if there are concerns about academic performance or professional suitability.
 - These arrangements have been considered as part of performance review and have also been considered through previous approval processes. The new programme will be appropriately aligned with them.
- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E) –**
 - The approval request form states the arrangements for IPL/E will be slightly different from those on the existing physiotherapy programme. This is because of timetabling challenges and different programme structure.
 - However, the education provider’s general approach to this area is appropriate, as shown through their recent performance review. The brief description of how the apprenticeship will handle IPL/E makes it clear that it will be aligned with this approach. Additionally, the apprenticeship format will give opportunities for multi-disciplinary learning that other programmes may not offer. This is because the learners on an apprenticeship spend longer in the workplace. They are also more closely integrated with a workplace because of their existing employment.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - As above, the new programme is intended to use the education provider’s four pillar approach. The recent performance review found that the programme had strong EDI policies in place, which were closely followed and informed the education provider’s actions.
 - We can therefore be confident that the proposed programme’s alignment will enable the relevant standards to be met.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity –**
 - As far as is practical, assessment on the apprenticeship will follow the same policies and approaches as on the existing provision. Assessments which take place in practice will not be carried out by those working directly with the apprentice, to ensure objectivity.
 - No concerns were raised around assessment in the recent performance review for the education provider. The information provided strongly suggests that the apprenticeship’s alignment with current practice will be appropriate, with changes made as necessary.
- **Progression and achievement –**

- Monitoring of learner progress will involve the normal mechanisms in place at the education provider. These were considered through performance review and found to be effective and appropriate.
- Certain mechanisms will be specific to the apprenticeship, notably the six- and twelve-weekly reviews noted in 'Practice quality' above. There will also be an End Point Assessment (EPA) as required by the apprenticeship format.
- The approach used for this area appears appropriate and is aligned closely with existing provision.
- **Appeals –**
 - Learners will have access to appeals through the normal pathways governed by appropriate policies. The apprenticeship will not use different approaches in this area and therefore we can be confident that there is alignment between the apprenticeship and the existing provision.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Degree Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist	40 learners, 1 cohort	04/09/2023

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider met our standards.

We have reported on how the provider meets standards, including the areas below, through the [Findings section](#).

Quality theme 1 – collaboration with stakeholders in development of the apprenticeship

Area for further exploration: We understood the education provider had many mechanisms in place for working with local partners, including local health Trusts. The visitors had a clear understanding of these processes and procedures. However, with specific regard to this apprenticeship programme, the education provider did not explain how they had collaborated with relevant local stakeholders in programme development. We were therefore unable to determine how the education provider had collaborated appropriately with local stakeholders in developing the programme.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We determined that an email exchange was the most appropriate way to explore this area in the first instance. This would enable us to gain additional information quickly and appropriately.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider submitted details of meetings and consultations held with local employer partners during the last four years. This evidence confirms the programme had been in development since 2019 and that numerous relevant stakeholders had opportunities to give input on the programme. The education provider explained in their response that local providers of physiotherapy had initially been sceptical about the proposed route. As a result, extensive discussion had taken place with regard to how to structure the programme in the most useful way. Stakeholders had given detailed feedback about the design of learning on the programme, and this had helped the education provider win the tender for the programme. Liaison with these stakeholders was ongoing.

In light of this additional evidence the visitors were satisfied that there had been effective collaboration with relevant partners in the preparation of the programme, and that such collaboration was ongoing. They therefore considered that the relevant standards were met.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

The visitors were satisfied that no conditions were required to satisfy them that all standards are met. The visitors' findings, including why no conditions were required, are presented below.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register –**
 - This standard is covered in stage 1, through the institutional assessment.
 - The education provider described their approach in the approval request form and baselining document.
- **SET 2: Programme admissions –**
 - The education provider laid out a comprehensive account of their approach to recruitment in their submission. This was to demonstrate their selection and entry criteria included appropriate academic and professional entry standards. The education provider's website contains detailed information about requirements for applicants and the application process.
 - We are therefore satisfied that the programme will be able to recruit appropriately and that they have a means of ensuring that all those who come on to the programme are likely to be able to complete it successfully.
 - The visitors considered all standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership –**
 - The education provider submitted evidence in the form of an employer handbook, and a briefing on workforce statistics, to address the SETs around collaboration with practice partners and arrangements for maintain capacity in practice-based learning. The new apprenticeship will make use of many of the same existing partnership arrangements that are used for the existing approved BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy. As this is an apprenticeship, employers will be responsible for finding practice-based learning for their trainees. The education provider has been working with NHS England (and before that its predecessor body

Health Education England) on a workforce redesign. This is the mechanism they are using to ensure appropriate capacity.

- We considered that these arrangements met the standards overall. This was because they provided a clear way of ensuring good ongoing relationships with the practice education providers / employers, and of ensuring access to clinical placements for the learners. We did however decide to explore through [quality activity 1](#) how the education provider had used partnerships specifically in the development of the apprenticeship. The education provider's response to this demonstrated that appropriate collaboration had taken place and we therefore determined the relevant standard was met.
- The education provider described how they would provide resources to support programme delivery to all learners and practice educators. They noted that they had recently opened a new immersive suite, and a new clinical environment practical room, alongside the other facilities available on the existing approved BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy.
- The visitors considered all standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - The proposed new apprenticeship programme, an, is closely based on the existing approved BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and uses the same module descriptors and learning outcomes. The education provider submitted as evidence their Programme Specification, which included summary module descriptors. A standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping exercise was also submitted.
 - The evidence submitted in the programme handbook and the programme specification demonstrated that the education provider had broadly appropriate and effective approaches in place, for ensuring that the programme curriculum was kept up to date. For example, there were regular review meetings and opportunities for practice educators to share clinical knowledge and expertise with the staff at the education provider.
 - The full module descriptors provided enabled the visitors to understand how the education provider planned to develop learners' autonomous working skills. They also outlined the wide range of learning and teaching methods that would be used on the programme. The visitors considered that the regular reviews of the programme and the wide range of learning and teaching methods would enable the standards to be met.
 - Through their review, the visitors determined the programme is designed and will be delivered in a way that will ensure learners who complete it meet our standards for their professional knowledge and skills and are fit to practise.
 - The visitors considered all standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider described in the Employer Handbook how practice-based learning would be integral to the programme, by giving an overview of the programme structure. By the nature of an

apprenticeship, the teaching and learning are closely intertwined with the clinical experience.

- The education provider cited the Employer Handbook with delivery plans as evidence to show they ensured an appropriate structure, duration and range of practice-based learning. They noted that their approach to practice-based learning for the new programme was closely modelled on that used in their existing HCPC-approved provision. They intend to use their strong relationships with local practice partners to ensure the standard is met.
- The education provider has a long-standing placement audit process in place to meet these standards. Practice educators must undergo training when they first start supervising learners and are required to undergo regular refresher training. Assessment of practice educator numbers and training status are also part of the practice-based learning audit process. Formal and informal pathways are available for learners to raise concerns about practice-based learning. The education provider stated that a new online placement audit system, Northwest (In-place), would be going live from September 2023.
- The visitors considered there is clear evidence of effective processes in place for overseeing practice-based learning. We are also satisfied that the processes would ensure practice educators are suitable and that there is adequate support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning.
- The visitors were satisfied all standards in this SET area are met.
- **SET 6: Assessment –**
 - The education provider cited the module summaries in the programme handbook and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping to demonstrate that they meet the programme-level standards in this area.
 - After The visitors did not highlight any specific issues in this area. However, based on the information available, they were not able to reach a conclusion about how the standards were met because of a lack of detail in the summary module descriptors.
 - The visitors therefore requested that the education provider submit more detailed module descriptors. This would enable them to understand the education provider's approach to alignment of learning outcomes and SOPs, and to assessing the learning outcomes.
 - When they had seen the module descriptors, the visitors considered that the standards in this area were met. This was because the learning outcomes were appropriately aligned with the standards of proficiency, and assessment was linked to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The range of assessment methods outlined in the descriptors were appropriate to measuring the learning outcomes.
 - The visitors were therefore satisfied that all standards within this SET area are met.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Section 5: Referrals

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

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

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

The visitors did not set any recommendations.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that all standards are met, and therefore the programme should be approved.

Education and Training Committee decision

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

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that the programmes are approved.

Reason for this decision: The Panel accepted the visitors' recommendation that the provider and its proposed programme have demonstrated they meet our standards and should receive approval.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science	FT (Full time)	Biomedical scientist			01/09/2014
MSc Dietetics (pre-registration)	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Dietitian			01/01/2022
FdSc Hearing Aid Audiology	DL (Distance learning)	Hearing aid dispenser			01/09/2022
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2019
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	PT (Part time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2019
MSc Occupational Therapy	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Occupational therapist			01/08/2018
BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2012
BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice	WBL (Work based learning)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2019
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2018
Dip HE Paramedic Practice	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2009
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2005
MSc Physiotherapy	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Physiotherapist			01/08/2018
MSc Speech and Language Therapy	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2020
Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/10/2006
Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/01/2014