

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences
Name of programme(s)	Sport and Exercise Psychology Accreditation Route, Part time
Approval visit date	14-15 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13221-R7G5Q1

### 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:

Ian Prince	Lay
Stephen Smith	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
Sandra Wolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
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.

Peter Mackreth	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Carnegie School of Sport, Leeds Beckett University
----------------	---	---

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Sport and Exercise Psychology Accreditation Route
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
Proposed first intake	01 April 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP01938

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 24 January 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 demonstrate that applicants will have access to sufficient information about the programme in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including information made available to applicants and the application form. From this evidence, and from discussions that took place at the visit, it was not clear to the visitors where all applicants would be able to access all the information they required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place. For example, the visitors could not see where applicants would be informed of the potential additional costs associated with the practice-based learning on the programme, or of how they would be able to work through the programme structure. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the education provider gave applicants sufficient information about the programme. They require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider will do so, including how learners will be enabled to understand exactly what will be required of them before they make a decision to come on to the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that their selection and entry criteria include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including the application form and the relevant sections of the qualification handbook. They also

discussed academic requirements for entry to the programme with the senior team and with the programme team. The visitors' understanding was that some learners coming on the programme would not have an undergraduate psychology degree, as this was not an absolute requirement for all learners. There was therefore a risk that they would not be sufficiently prepared, and that this would mean they were not suited to the level and content of the programme. The education provider stated in discussion that they had arrangements in place to ensure that all learners were appropriately prepared for study. However, the visitors were not clear about how these arrangements would be put into practice, and so were unable to determine whether the programme had appropriate academic and professional entry standards. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence clarifying the academic and professional entry standards for all learners.

### **2.3 The admissions process must ensure that applicants have a good command of English.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all applicants have a good command of English.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the qualification handbook provided to applicants. It was not clear from this documentation how the education provider would ensure that all applicants would have a good command of English. The stated policy, clarified in discussions with the senior team, was that since applicants would already have completed an undergraduate degree it could be presumed that they had an appropriate level of English, including academic writing. However, the visitors noted that the programme was open to applicants from overseas, and that such applicants would not necessarily have needed a good command of English to complete an undergraduate degree. They were therefore unable to determine how the education provider would ensure that all applicants had a good command of English. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all applicants, including those with undergraduate degrees from overseas universities, have a good command of English.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all applicants have undergone a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check, and must clarify what criteria will be used in judging whether to allow applicants with a criminal record to be admitted to the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were aware from their review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the senior team that they did not have a procedure in place to carry out Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks on applicants. The senior team stated that for the whole of the programme all learners would be in employment and practice-based learning settings that required their own DBS checks, and that therefore they did not need to carry out DBS checks themselves. However, the HCPC expects that education providers carry out DBS checks, and the visitors therefore considered that the standard was not met. Additionally, from discussion with the senior team and from review of the documentation, it was not clear to the visitors how the education provider would decide under what circumstances (if any) applicants with a criminal record would be admitted to the programme. In the discussions the senior team had

clarified that a criminal record would not necessarily disqualify an applicant, and that they would consider individual situations on a case by case basis. However, the visitors were not clear what guidelines would be applied in such situations, and so they could not determine that all applicants would be treated equitably. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that they will carry out DBS checks on applicants, and what principles will be applied in deciding whether to admit to the programme learners who have a criminal record.

## **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 ensure that they have equality and diversity policies in admissions and that they are appropriately monitored.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the application form and the qualification handbook. They were not clear from this review, or from discussions with the programme team and the senior team, that the education provider had a process for monitoring equality and diversity policies in admissions, and for ensuring that relevant data were collected. They could also not see how the feedback loop regarding equality and diversity in admissions was closed – for example, what action would be taken in the event that an issue was identified. The visitors were therefore unable to be clear that the standard was met, and require further evidence from the education provider demonstrating how they will ensure that equality and diversity policies in admissions are implemented and monitored.

## **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 will be monitored.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the practice placement handbook and the qualification handbook. They were not clear from this review, or from discussions with the programme team and the senior team, that the education provider had a process for monitoring equality and diversity policies in relation to learners, and for ensuring that relevant data was collected. They could also not see how the feedback loop regarding equality and diversity in relation to learners was closed – for example, what action would be taken in the event that an issue was identified. The visitors were therefore unable to be clear that the standard was met, and require further evidence from the education provider demonstrating how they will ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to learners are implemented and monitored.

## **3.15 There must be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that they have a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including guidelines for supervisors and the qualification handbook. From this initial review, they understood

that if complaints could not be resolved by programme staff in the first instance, the reviewer of last resort of learner complaints would be the Chair of the British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences (BASES). The visitors were not sure that this was an appropriate arrangement, as it was not clear how the person in this role would make decisions or what oversight was in place. In discussions with the senior team, however, it was clarified that oversight of this process would be provided by a committee at BASES. The visitors considered that this could be an appropriate arrangement, but they were not able to view terms of reference for this committee, or further detail about how the education provider would ensure that its processes were thorough and effective. They were also unclear about how the process would be communicated to learners, and considered that if a process was not well understood by learners then this might impede its thoroughness and effectiveness. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that their learner complaints process is thorough and effective.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that they have thorough and effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the candidate handbook and the practice placement handbook. It was not clear to them from the documentation how the education provider intended to ensure that in practice-based learning service users would always be aware if they were being treated by a learner, and that appropriate consent would be obtained. The programme team stated that they had confidence in their practice-based learning partners to do this, because of their existing relationships and the audit system that was in place for practice-based learning. However, the visitors could not see how what specific process was in place for ensuring that appropriate consent was obtained from service users during practice-based learning, and that learners understood the importance of this. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that appropriate consent is obtained from service users.

#### **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 appropriate arrangements are in place to ensure safe lone working for learners in practice-based learning.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including the practice placement handbook. They considered that the education provider's arrangements for auditing practice-based learning settings were generally appropriate. However, the visitors understood that some learners were likely to be undertaking lone working as part of their practice-based learning, for example meeting service users at sports clubs before or after the normal day in practice-based learning. It was not clear to the visitors how the education provider would ensure that all practice-based learning providers undertook risk assessments for lone working, where appropriate. The programme team stated that they had confidence in practice-based learning partners to deal with such situations, but the visitors could not see evidence of a process by which

this was done, for example by staff from the education provider visiting practice-based learning settings. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they will ensure that all practice-based learning settings are safe for learners.

#### **6.6 There must be an effective process in place for learners to make academic appeals.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that they have an effective process in place for learners to make academic appeals.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including the qualification handbook. From this evidence it was not clear how the process for academic appeals would work, and how it would be communicated to learners. The programme team were unable to clarify how this process would work, and so the visitors were unable to determine whether there was an effective process in place for learners to make academic appeals. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that they have an academic appeals process in place and that clear information about how to make use of the process will be available to learners.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Approval visit date	12 December 2018
Case reference	CAS-13352-H9K1L1

### 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:

James Pickard	Independent prescriber
Nicola Carey	Independent prescriber
Diane Whitlock	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.

David Bradshaw	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Canterbury Christ Church University
Elizabeth Welch	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Canterbury Christ Church University

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across both programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01966

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across both programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01967

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 programmes 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	Comments
Learners	Yes	This is a new programme, so the panel met with a learner from the Non-Medical Prescribing programme, which has been approved for nurses.
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 24 January 2019.

#### **A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and 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 correct and consistent information is available to applicants, 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, in the programme specification it states that the award of independent and / or supplementary prescriber 'must be recorded with the relevant regulatory body within 12 months of completing the programme'. The HCPC does not set such a requirement. The programme specification and student programme handbook also state learners will be able to apply to the HCPC to have their qualification recorded. It is the responsibility of the education provider to inform HCPC of successful graduates of the programmes.

As such, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure that the information is accurate and avoids any potential confusion for applicants.

## **C.2 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 that the programmes reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided to meet this standard, which included the programme's learning, teaching and assessment strategy, the programme learning outcomes and the module learning outcomes. The visitors understood that the programmes are to reflect the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS) competency framework for all prescribers. However, from the information provided, the visitors could not determine where the learning outcomes of the programmes identified how learners would meet these competencies. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about the effectiveness of the education provider's strategy for ensuring that future graduates would be able to practise in line with the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of independent and / or supplementary prescribing and need to see further evidence of this.

## **E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the HCPC standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider provided information on the learning, teaching and assessment strategy and a mapping document of module outcomes mapped to programme outcomes. The education provider also submitted module descriptors and a mapping document detailing module learning outcomes mapped to the HCPC standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. However, the documentation did not include information about where the module learning outcomes were assessed on the programmes. The visitors were unable to see the link between the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers, the programmes' learning outcomes, and the assessment of those learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to make a judgement that this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define how the assessment strategy and design ensures that learners who successfully complete the programmes meets the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribing.

## **E.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how assessments are thorough and effective and meets any relevant external reference frameworks.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided to meet this standard, which included the programme's learning, teaching and assessment strategy, the programme learning outcomes and the module learning outcomes. The visitors understood that the programmes are to reflect the RPS competency framework for all prescribers. However, the programmes' module specifications did not link their assessments to this framework. The visitors were unclear to identify how learners would be directed to ensure they are assessed to demonstrate they meet the framework. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment whether the assessment methods used by the programmes provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external reference frameworks can be measured. As such, the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

#### **E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide clarity as to how the assessment methods are linked to specific learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the education provider referred to the marking criteria and module descriptors. From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see how the assessment methods being used in the modules were linked to specific learning outcomes. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence showing how each method of assessment used in the programme is linked to a particular learning outcome. In this way they can be confident that all learners successfully completing the programme will have demonstrated the skills and knowledge needed to be safe and effective prescribers.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Derby
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Degree Apprenticeship, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Approval visit date	27-28 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13504-V8R7W7

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: 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 (Approved mental health professional)
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Ian Hughes	Lay
Rabie Sultan	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.

David McGravie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Derby
Helen Crooke	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Derby
Caroline Marshall	External panel member	University of Greenwich
Alan Mount	External panel member	Canterbury Christ Church University

Ian Whitehead	Internal panel member	University of Derby
Sarah Rawlinson	Internal panel member	University of Derby
Anne Danby	Internal panel member	University of Derby

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	Degree pprenticeship FT (Full time) Distance learning FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 May 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60 (Across both routes)
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP01993 APP01994

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
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 3: 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 January 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 the education provider which enables them to make an informed choice about whether to offer or take up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that the entry requirements, programme information and admissions procedure were contained within the programme handbook. However the visitors were unclear how applicants would have access to this document. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned that there is a referral process in place for the degree apprenticeship route, whereby the employer refers an employee to this programme. The applicant is then interviewed by both the employer and the education provider who jointly make a decision as to whether the applicant can be offered a place on the programme. The visitors could not see how learners and the education provider are made aware of this process. Additionally, it was not clear if the same process applies to the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme, which will be a distance learning route. At the visit, the visitors were told that the education provider intends to advertise pertinent information regarding the entry requirements, programme information and admissions procedures on the website, once this programme is approved by HCPC. As this content was not available for review by the visitors, they were unable to determine whether the information to be provided to applicants regarding the admissions process will be sufficient for them to make an informed decision about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. Therefore the education provider must provide evidence that

shows the information which is available to potential applicants to both routes and must demonstrate that it is sufficient for applicants and the education provider to make a considered choice about whether to offer or accept a place on 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 demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors understood there would be 30 learners per cohort with three intakes per year, as per the information on the visit request form. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that there would be a maximum of 60 learners per cohort with two intakes per academic year, across both BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Degree Apprenticeship and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programmes. The visitors viewed staff curricular vitae, the three job descriptors of staff yet to be recruited and a plan explaining the staffing and recruitment for the programme. However, the visitors were unable to see information that demonstrates what the staff-student ratio is for year one and the subsequent years. From discussions during the programme team meeting, the visitors understood that these three staff members will be part time, 1.6 full time equivalent (FTE). Based on the information provided, the visitors were unable to see how the programme will remain sufficiently staffed for years two and three considering the increase in learner numbers from 120 in year one, 240 in year two and 360 in year three. Therefore, the education provider will need to demonstrate how they will ensure that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme in the subsequent years.

### **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 or associate tutors have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise for their role in the programme.

**Reason:** From their review of staff curricular vitae and from discussions with the senior team and programme team at the visit, the visitors noted that the majority of staff on the programme team specialised in nursing and one staff member was an operating department practitioner. The visitors were not provided with a clear breakdown of which staff members would be teaching which parts of the programme. For instance, they could not determine who would teach content which is profession-specific within the programme. Therefore the visitors were unable to make a judgment about whether the subject areas would be delivered by educators with the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. As such the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates who will be responsible for delivering specific module content within the programme. In this way the visitors can determine whether subject areas are delivered by those with the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

**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 provide further evidence demonstrating how the resources to support learning in all setting is appropriate to the delivery of the programme and is accessible to all learners.

**Reason:** On the facilities tour, the visitors were shown the resources available to learners. During the facilities tour, the visitors were shown the teaching rooms, practical laboratories and newly refurbished rooms which will be used for delivery of the programme. However, the visitors did not see particular profession-specific physical resources such as an anaesthetic gas machine which they would expect to be used to deliver learning on this programme in the academic setting. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were told that the education provider was unable to purchase any equipment until the programme is approved by HCPC. The visitors could not determine what resources the education would purchase should they gain approval in order to ensure they have sufficient resources to deliver the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine how learners would have access to the resources required to support learning on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further details regarding what profession-specific equipment the education provider intends to purchase before the start of the programme. This information should demonstrate that the resources to support learning at the education provider, is effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme and is accessible to all learners. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

**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 revise programme documentation to clearly state, that an exit award does not confer eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register

**Reason:** The visitors noted that interim exit awards for this programme include a Certificate in Higher Education and Diploma of Higher Education, particularly mentioned in page 6 of the programme handbook. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors established that neither of the exit awards would confer eligibility for learners to apply for HCPC registration. However, from the documentation, it was not clear how learners, educators and the public is made aware that those exit awards will not lead to eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. As such, the education provider must revisit the programme documentation including module specifications and handbooks to make necessary amendments to clearly state that if an exit award is awarded to any learner, it does not confer eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

**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 operating department practitioners.

**Reason:** In their review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the SOPs mapping document made broad reference to the modules and their content rather than specific reference to learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the module learning outcomes linked to and delivered each of the SOPs, to ensure that learners completing the programme can meet the SOPs for operating department practitioners. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors queried this and the programme team acknowledged that the mapping document will need updating to clearly demonstrate how the SOPs are delivered through the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit revised documentation to clearly define the link between the learning outcomes throughout the programme and how they ensure that learners completing the programme can meet all of the SOPs for operating department practitioners.

#### **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 and what the learners will be able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

**Reason:** The standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document made reference to section 5.7 in the programme specification, which stated that learners will attend interprofessional learning conferences that takes place twice a year. However without seeing how the conference is delivered the visitors could not determine whether this is a shared learning or interprofessional learning opportunity. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that no formal plans have been put in place to ensure learners learn with, and from, other professionals and learners from other relevant professions. The visitors were unclear on where within the programme this is delivered or which professions will be involved. As such the visitors could not see how the education provider ensures that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. The education provider must therefore articulate what interprofessional learning will take place on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions. This should include a rationale as to why the other chosen professions are relevant to the operating department practitioner profession.

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors were directed to practice assessment documents 1, 2 and 3. In review of this documentation and discussions during the programme team meeting, the visitors were unable to locate information or evidence of the formal protocols in place to obtain consent from learners when they participate as service users, or for managing situations when learners decline from participating as service users in practical sessions. Therefore the visitors could not see how the education provider would obtain appropriate consent from service users and learners. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence of the formal protocols of how consent is obtained from learners before they participate as a service user in practical and clinical teaching and how records are maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. The visitors also

require evidence to show what alternative learning arrangements will be put in place to ensure equity of learning experience where learners decline to participate.

**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 operating department practitioners.

**Reason:** This relates to the condition on SET 4.1 which highlights the issue of the SOPs mapping document not clearly demonstrating how the learning outcomes will deliver the SOPs in the programme. For this standard, the visitors read the module descriptors, which outline the assessment strategy but the visitors could not determine how the assessment strategy ensures that learners meet all of the SOPs. Particularly, the visitors could not see which learning outcomes delivered the SOPs and consequently how the assessment of the learning outcomes ensure the SOPs are met by learners who successfully complete the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define how the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standard of proficiency by meeting the learning outcomes.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Gloucestershire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Approval visit date	16 - 17 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-13373-B9Z1X5

### 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:

John Donaghy	Paramedic
Tristan Henderson	Paramedic
Roseann Connolly	Lay
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.

Andrea Chalk	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Director of Quality and Academic Services, University of Gloucestershire
--------------	---	---

Debbie Jones	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Academic Services Administrator (Quality) University of Gloucestershire
Amanda Blaber	External panel member	Senior Lecturer and Honorary Fellow of the College of Paramedics, University of Brighton
Alex Masardo	Internal panel member	Academic Subject Leader: Early Years and Education, University of Gloucestershire
Fiona Curran	Internal panel member	Academic Subject Leader; Film and Television, University of Gloucestershire

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
Proposed First intake	28 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01969

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	No	The information about practice-based learning is contained within

		an online system, which is in the development stage.
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 we are considering approval of a new programme this document is not required.

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	The panel met with learners from the current nursing programme delivered by the education provider.
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 26 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 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 programme documentation, the visitors read that the learners will incur additional costs on the programme. However, no specific details were provided as to what these costs would be for, or how much the learner will be required to pay. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the applicants would incur costs for uniform, criminal conviction and occupational health checks. No final details were available about what information would be provided to applicants prior to taking up a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification to ensure that applicants for the programme have all the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on this programme. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they inform applicants about the additional costs associated with the programme, in particular the costs associated with criminal convictions checks and occupational health checks.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the selection and entry criteria include academic and professional entry standards, which are appropriate for the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors read that the entry criteria for A-level and BTEC entries states “preferably a science”. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to establish whether a science would be required and if this would include a formal science such as biology, chemistry or physics or whether social sciences such as psychology would be acceptable. As the visitors were unclear about the requirements for entry onto the programme, they were unable to establish how the education provider would make a decision on an applicant if the education provider does not have clear requirements set out. Therefore, the education provider must provide further information about the entry criteria for this programme, which demonstrates appropriate academic and professional entry standards, and how they ensure that successful applicants meet the education provider’s requirements.

## **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 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 agreed that the current staff member identified was appropriately qualified and experienced. In discussions with the senior team, the visitors learned that there are selection and recruitment processes in place to identify a suitable candidate for the role. However,

there were no details provided 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. Therefore, they could not determine how 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 will ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme will be 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 ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice education providers for non-ambulance practice-based learning.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with email communications between the education provider and the practice education providers for non-ambulance settings. The emails showed discussions of their plans to agree to support practice-based learning in the primary care settings. However, in the email communications the practice education providers stated, "There was no guarantee that the placements will be available". At the visit, the visitors did not meet with any representatives from the non-ambulance practice-based learning setting. While the visitors have seen email communications, the visitors have not heard from the non-ambulance practice education providers, or the education provider, about what plans are in place to have regular and effective collaboration. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether regular and effective collaboration was ongoing between the education provider and non-ambulance practice education providers. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and non-ambulance 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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability of non-ambulance practice-based learning for all learners on the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors understood that practice-based learning would consist of ambulance and non-ambulance settings. The education provider is in the process of agreeing where the non-ambulance practice-based learning will take place. As the visitors did not have sight of these agreements, they could not determine what arrangements are in place. As such, the visitors could not determine what non-ambulance practice-based learning will be available for learners on the programme. Therefore, they could not determine that an effective process is in place, which ensures the availability and capacity of non-ambulance practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors require further information regarding the process the education provider has in place 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 non-ambulance

practice education providers. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is 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 clarify what changes have been made, as a response to the internal validation event of the top-up programme and how, with those changes, the programme continues to ensure that resources are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

**Reason:** Through discussions at the visit and from the conclusions of the internal validation panel it was clear that the education provider was considering the internal validation of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (Level 6) on a full time and part time basis. As these programmes, are post registration programmes they are not required to be approved by the HCPC as the learners on this programme will already be registered paramedics. The visitors considered that the introduction of this new programme could impact upon the staff numbers and resources for the programme seeking approval. The visitors understood that the same staff would be teaching on both programmes, which would impact upon the teaching resources for the programme. In addition, there would be an increase in the number of learners on the site which could then impact upon the resources available to learners on the programme. As such, the education provider must provide evidence, which demonstrates that while there is an additional programme running, there will be sufficient resources to support learning, which are effective and appropriate to the delivery of 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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the resources to support learning in all settings effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** At the visit, the visitors had a tour of the practical teaching resources and study spaces. They were shown manikins, monitoring equipment and an extrication stimulator. The visitors did not see the full range of practical resources, such as cannulas and ambulance equipment, which they understood would be available for this programme. The education provider informed the visitors they were seeking approval for 40 learners for the first cohort increasing to 60 learners for the forthcoming years. From discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the education provider has plans in place to order more specialist equipment for the programme. However, as the visitors were not able to see the full range of practical resources, they were unable to determine how the resources would effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of all the resources that will be used for this programme in order to determine whether there will be sufficient resources to support the required learning and teaching activities for all learners on the programme.

**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 learners, educators and others are aware that exit awards do not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the Register.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that learners could attain exit awards for this programme. This included a “Higher Education Certificate in Emergency Care” and a “Diploma of Emergency Care”. From the information provided, it was not clear whether these exit awards would lead to eligibility to apply for admission onto the Register. From reviewing the documentation, the visitors could not determine whether learners would be aware of their eligibility to apply for admission to the Register if they did not complete the approved programme and received an exit award. As such, the visitors require the education provider to amend the documentation relating to exit awards to ensure learners, educators and others are aware that these exit awards do not lead to registration. In this way, the visitors can establish whether this standard is met.

**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 learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

**Reason:** For this standard, the visitors were provided with the following statement in the SET’s mapping document, “Interprofessional learning will be promoted by shared learning opportunities with paramedic, nursing, social work and social care students”. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine what the interprofessional learning sessions consisted of, or how the education provider will ensure that each learner will be able to learn with and from other professionals and learners in other relevant professions. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unclear on the rationale behind the design and delivery of interprofessional education, or how the education provider intends to ensure that it is relevant for learners on this programme. From the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the following:

- what interprofessional education will take place on the programme;
- why the professions and learners selected are relevant for this programme and;
- how learners will be able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions

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 and learners in other relevant professions.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that there is an effective process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners and service users.

**Reason:** In the SETs mapping document, the education provider referred to the Student Charter document to evidence this standard. From this document, the visitors were unable to locate information around obtaining appropriate consent from learners and service users on the programme. The visitors did not see evidence of the formal protocols to obtain consent from learners or service users. As such, the visitors were unclear, for example, how the education provider manages situations where learners decline from participating as service users in practical sessions. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence:

- of the formal protocols for obtaining consent from learners and service users, including how records are maintained;
- to demonstrate how learners and service users are informed about the requirement for them to participate,
- to show what alternative learning arrangements will be put in place where learners and service users do not consent to participating as a service user.

#### **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 clearly define the attendance requirements for the programme, the associated monitoring processes in place, and how this is communicated to learners.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors understood the requirement for attendance on the programme was 100 per cent. However, it was not clear exactly how this applies across the programme (for example, in the academic and / or practice setting), or how this is monitored. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned the requirement for attendance is 100 per cent in the practice-based learning setting, and 80 per cent for the academic part of the programme. The visitors were informed that plans were in place to monitor attendance through Moodle or a sign in sheet. However, there were no mechanisms currently in place to monitor attendance. From this information, the visitors could not determine how the education provider would apply this attendance requirement, or which parts of the programme could not be missed. Therefore, the education provider must amend the documentation to define the attendance requirements for the programme, the associated monitoring processes in place and demonstrate how this is communicated to 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 provide evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning in alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, and through discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that learners would have the opportunity to experience practice-based learning in alternative (non-ambulance) settings. The visitors were provided with a placement audit document for how ambulance practice is managed by South Western Ambulance Service (SWAS). However, the visitors did not see evidence to show how alternative (non-ambulance) practice-based learning areas will be approved or monitored. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

#### **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 a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users at alternative (non-ambulance) practice-based learning settings.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors understood that the majority of practice-based learning would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and practice educators. These discussions also clarified that learners would have the opportunity to experience practice-based learning in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The visitors were provided with a placement audit document for how ambulance practice is managed by South Western Ambulance Service (SWAS). The visitors were not clear what system the education provider has in place to approve and monitor non-ambulance practice-based learning settings, or how they will ensure that these settings provide a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to determine how the education provider ensures a safe and supportive environment at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

#### **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 there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in alternative (non-ambulance) practice-based learning.

**Reason:** At the visit, the programme team clarified that learners would have the opportunity to experience practice-based learning in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, in addition to practice-based learning that will take place in the ambulance service setting. The visitors were provided with agreements in principle for the ambulance based practice education providers. However, for the non-ambulance practice education providers there were initial emails, which mentioned an agreement in principle to support practice-based learning for primary care settings. However, in the email communication the practice education provider stated, "There was no guarantee that the placements will be available". At the visit, the visitors did not meet with any representatives from the non-ambulance setting. As there are no confirmed arrangements with the non-ambulance practice education providers, and because the visitors were unable to meet with them, the visitors were unable to determine what number of practice educators would be available for the number of learners on the programme, or how the education provider ensures the practice educators are

appropriately qualified and experienced. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in the non-ambulance practice-based learning settings.

**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 at alternative (non-ambulance) practice-based learning settings have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners on the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, and through discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that learners would have the opportunity to experience practice-based learning in alternative (non-ambulance) settings such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. For the non-ambulance practice-based learning there were initial emails, which mentioned an agreement in principle to support practice-based learning for the primary care settings. However, in the email communication the practice education provider stated, "There was no guarantee that the placements will be available". At the visit, the visitors did not meet with any representatives from the non-ambulance practice-based learning settings. The visitors were not provided with any information about the practice educators for the non-ambulance settings. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the practice educators in the non-ambulance settings have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners on this programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice educators at alternative (non-ambulance) settings have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support 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 in the non-ambulance setting undertake regular training appropriate to the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, and through discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that learners would have the opportunity to experience practice-based learning in alternative (non-ambulance) settings such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. For the non-ambulance placements there were initial emails, which mentioned an agreement in principle to support practice-based learning for the primary care settings. The visitors were not provided with information about the training that practice educators in the non-ambulance setting would undertake, and were unable to discuss this with them as there were no representatives at the visit. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice educators at alternative (non-ambulance) settings undertake training which is appropriate to their role.

## **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 provide learners and practice educators with the necessary information for them to be prepared for practice-based learning.

**Reason:** From the SET's mapping document, the visitors understood that information about practice-based learning would be shared electronically via the Practice Education Module. It states, "The Practice Assessment Document (PAD) is to be converted into an electronic system in 2019 and should be in use by the start of practice". The PAD would contain pertinent information about the practice-based learning element of the programme. The visitors were not provided with the draft version of the PAD, and due to time constraints at the visit, the visitors were unable to view the draft version of the PAD. As the PAD was not finalised, the visitors were unable to establish how the learners and practice educators would be prepared for practice based learning prior to them commencing this part of the programme. For example, whom they should contact in case of an emergency in the practice-based learning environment. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms used by the education provider to ensure that learners and practice educators receive the information they need in a timely manner in order to prepare for practice-based learning.

## **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 that the assessment strategy and design will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors understood that part of the assessment strategies included a 'Practice Assessment Document (PAD)' which is used to assess a learners clinical practice whilst in the practice-based learning environment, on a pass / fail mark. The PAD document was not provided during the initial submission as the education provider explained that it was an online system, which is still in development. The education provider explained that a demonstration would be provided at the visit. Due to time constraints at the visit, the visitors were unable to view a demonstration of the e-PAD. As the visitors have not seen the final version of the practice assessment document, the visitors were not clear how the learners would be assessed whilst in the practice-based learning setting. 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.

## **6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate assessment throughout the programme will ensure that learners demonstrate and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that part of the assessment strategies include a 'Practice Assessment Document (PAD)' which is used to assess a learners clinical practice while in the practice-based learning environment, on a pass / fail mark. The PAD document was not provided during the initial submission as the education provider explained that it was an online system, which is still in development. The education provider explained that a demonstration would be provided at the visit. Due to time constraints at the visit, the panel were unable to view a demonstration of the e-PAD. As the visitors have not seen the contents of the practice assessment document, they could not make a judgement on the assessment throughout the programme and how this will ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore, the visitors require further information in order 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 demonstrate how assessment will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that part of the assessment strategies include a 'Practice Assessment Document (PAD)', which is used to assess a learners clinical practice while in the practice-based learning environment, on a pass / fail mark. The PAD document was not provided during the initial submission as the education provider explained that it was an online system, which is still in development. The education provider explained that a demonstration would be provided at the visit. Due to time constraints at the visit, the panel were unable to view a demonstration of the e-PAD. As the visitors have not seen the contents of the clinical practice assessment document, they could not make a judgement that the assessment throughout the programme will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. Therefore, the visitors require further information in order to determine whether this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that assessment methods used are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that part of the assessment strategies include a 'Practice Assessment Document (PAD)', which is used to assess a learners clinical practice while in the practice-based learning environment, on a pass fail mark. The PAD document was not provided during the initial submission as the education provider explained that it was an online system, which is still in development. The education provider explained that a demonstration would be provided at the visit. Due to time constraints at the visit, the panel were unable to view a demonstration of the e-PAD. As the visitors have not seen the contents of the practice assessment document, they could not determine whether the assessment would be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes. As such, the visitors require further evidence, which demonstrates that the assessments methods used are appropriate and effective at measuring the learning outcomes.

## **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.

### **3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing how they make information about the process to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users readily available to learners.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there was an effective process in place for learners to raise a concern about service users and carers, which was contained on the website. As this information was provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors considered that currently the information about the process is not contained within the handbooks and there is no reference in the handbooks as to where the learner could find the relevant information provided on the website. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider ensure that the information regarding this process is easily accessible to learners regarding how to raise a concern about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Gloucestershire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work (Yeovil), Full time
Approval visit date	30 - 31 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-13515-X1G2P7

### 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
Dorothy Smith	Social worker
Ian Hughes	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.

Pat Denham	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Self-employed
Yvonne Metcalfe	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Gloucestershire

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work (Yeovil)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01997

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. We were told of the establishment of this new programme through our major change process. This programme was established out of existing social work provision at the education provider which is delivered at a different site.

## 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	Comments
Learners	Yes	This is a new programme, so the panel met with learners from the BA (Hons) Childhood Studies, Care and Education programme, who study at the same site as the proposed 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 12 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 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 to the programmes giving "eligibility to register as a qualified social worker" rather than graduates being "eligible to apply for registration". The documentation referred to the Health and Social Care Professions Council rather than the Health and Care Professions Council, and there was a reference to the 2012 version of the HCPC Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England, rather than to the most recent revised version from 2017. There was also reference to the HCPC having specified all social work degree programmes must ensure all learners spend 170 days in practice-based learning. The HCPC does not stipulate such a requirement. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants.

In addition, on the tour of resources, the visitors were told there was compulsory teaching at the education provider's Cheltenham campus for eight days, which was not reflected in the information to applicants. Therefore, the visitors were 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. They therefore require

the education provider to review all relevant materials to ensure accurate and complete information about the programme is provided to applicants.

### **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 there is sufficient practice-based learning available for all learners.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors saw a memorandum of understanding between the education provider and Somerset County Council for practice-based learning for all learners for the final year. However, the visitors did not see a process in place to ensure practice-based learning would be available to all learners in the second year of the programme. At the visit, the programme team explained to the visitors that there was no process in place at the moment and gave assurance that one was being developed. The visitors were also informed that the placement co-ordinator was identifying more agencies to work with. The education provider said they were confident they have the provision for the number of learners proposed for the programme. However, the visitors were not able to see whether there will be adequate practice-based learning opportunities in the second year and therefore need to see evidence to demonstrate there is an effective process in place that 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 provide evidence of how service users and carers will be involved throughout the programme.

**Reason:** To demonstrate how they meet this standard, the education provider provided the terms of reference for its programme management committee, which included information about service user involvement on this committee. At the visit, the visitors met two service users who, although they had been involved in the programme delivered at Cheltenham, had not been involved with the programme to be delivered at Yeovil. The programme team said they were at the discussion stage on how service users and carers would be involved in the programme, and how they would support service users and carers to be involved. The programme team said they were looking to work with local groups at Yeovil District Hospital and Somerset County Council, but added that they needed to formalise the involvement of service users and carers. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether service users and carers contributed to the programme. The visitors require the education provider to provide information as to the areas of the programme service users and carers are involved, and how will they be supported in their involvement. The education provider should also demonstrate how the involvement is appropriate to the programme and how it will contribute to the governance and continuous improvement 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 how they will ensure that all educators have access to resources to support learning in all settings.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the library resources learners and educators on the programme will have access to. However, at the meeting with the practice educators, the visitors were informed that practice educators did not have access to the academic resources available to learners through the library, in particular key texts used for teaching on the programme. The programme team assured the visitors that practice educators would be made associate members of the library and that this could be easily established. However, because the visitors were provided with verbal reassurances / plans, and have not seen this in documentation, the visitors could not determine that this standard would be met. As such, the visitors require evidence that the practice educators will be given access to all resources appropriate to their role in the delivery 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.**

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

**Reason:** For this standard, the visitors were directed to the course handbook which states “a variety of teaching methods designed to embrace students’ different learning styles are central to the programme”. The visitors were also made aware of different types of learning and teaching opportunities. At the visit, the programme team explained their intentions for learners to work together with registered paramedics, nurses and police to come up with a multi-agency approach to situations. Although the visitors were provided with verbal reassurances and plans, they have not seen evidence of how the programme will ensure learners learn with and from other relevant professionals and learners, and across professions. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates this is included in the programme in way that will ensure this standard is met.

#### **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 obtain appropriate consent from learners to participate in experiential learning on the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors were directed to the placement approval document which said consent from service users and carers must be gained before observation takes place. The visitors also saw the student contract, which set out the terms and conditions for learners to study on the programme. In the programme team meeting the education provider informed the visitors they expected learners to agree to engage with experiential learning through the signing of the student contract. The visitors saw that consent was implicit in the signing of the student contract, however, they were not able to see the information clearly in the documentation. The student contract did not explicitly gather consent from learners. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence which shows how they clearly obtain appropriate consent from learners in situations where they take part as participants in experiential learning.

### **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 learners and practice educators have the necessary information for them to be prepared for practice-based learning in non-statutory settings.

**Reason:** At the visit, practice educators from statutory practice education providers informed the visitors they received information about practice-based learning three months in advance. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence of how learners and practice educators were informed of any non-statutory practice-based learning opportunities. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine whether those learners and practice educators understand their roles and expectations for the practice-based learning in order for it to be safe and effective. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures learners and practice educators in non-statutory practice-based learning settings receive the information they need in a timely manner.

#### **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.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider keeping their staff planning under review to ensure educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of staff contributing to the programme. At the visit, the visitors were informed the education provider planned to recruit new staff to the programme. They also heard that staff based at the education provider's Cheltenham campus were going to be in attendance at Yeovil on a routine basis in order to support the staff based at Yeovil. As such, the visitors were satisfied this standard was met at threshold. However, the current levels of staffing provides only one qualified social worker based at the Yeovil campus, and that staff member has child care experience only. The visitors therefore consider the range of experience of staff based in Yeovil to be vulnerable if staff move away from Yeovil. They therefore suggest the education provider consider how best to ensure subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Speech and Language Therapy, FT (Full Time) MSc Speech and Language Therapy, PT (Part time)
Approval visit date	27-28 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13300-R3N4K1

### 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:

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Lucy Myers	Speech and language therapist
Ismeni Tsikaderi	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.

Chris Hudson	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Leeds Beckett University
Dominic Ramsden	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Leeds Beckett University
Jennie Vitkovitch	Academic external panel member	University of East Anglia
Kate Shobbrook	Professional body representative	Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy

Angela Murphy	School of Clinical and Applied Sciences reviewer	Leeds Beckett University
Natalia Gerodetti	School of Social Sciences reviewer	Leeds Beckett University

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01/09/2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01955

Programme name	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01/09/2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01956

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 programmes meet our standards for the first time. These new programmes will be delivered in addition to an existing speech and language therapy programme (BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (full time)) at the education provider, which was not assessed as part of this 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	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	As the assessed programme is new, these reports related to the existing HCPC approved programme BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Full time)

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	As the assessed programme is new, we met learners from the existing HCPC approved programme BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Full time)
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 25 January 2019.

### 3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate their commitment to future staffing plans, to enable the programme to remain sustainable.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted from the business plan that the education provider intends to source additional staff resources. The visitors also heard about the education provider being confident in providing the amount of staff resources according to the programme needs. However, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider would ensure that there would be appropriate staffing for the programme as the programme recruits each cohort of learners. From conversations, the visitors noted that they would expect to see an increase of staff resources to deliver the programme, to ensure that the programme will remain sustainable. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on future arrangements that the education provider would be committed to their business plan in regards to staffing.

### **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 the practice education providers.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that practice educators coordinate annually through a placement steering group. During discussions at the visit the visitors heard that this placement steering group is a coordination mechanism for the professions across the region having representatives from different trusts attending the group. Both at the senior and programme team meetings, the visitors also noted that there are strategic meetings taking place every 6 to 8 weeks between the school director, the placement director and deans from another two schools within the education provider. The education provider provided verbal reassurances that these senior management meetings coordinate plans around programme development, staffing and practice-based learning. However, the visitors were unclear how formal these meetings were, or what the terms of reference for these meetings is, and therefore whether they ensure regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers. As such, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how regular and effective collaboration is achieved between the education provider and practice education providers.

### **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 staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Reason:** This condition links to the condition for SET 3.1. From the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider has plans to increase staffing by recruiting one Full Time Equivalent (FTE) member of staff for the 2020-21 academic year. From discussions held at the visit, the visitors noted that this was due to an increase in overall learner numbers as future cohorts are recruited. However, the visitors were unclear from the information provided how formal the education provider's future plans are, to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately and qualified staff to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the education provider's plans in this area, which ensures that the programme is adequately staffed as it progresses.

#### **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 their approach to inter-professional learning ensures that learners will learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider intends that learners will learn from professionals and learners via an inter-professional learning (IPL) programme within the delivery of the programme. In the documentation it is noted that there is a dedicated conference and a workshop day in each year of study, together with learners on pre-registration courses. Learning at this event occurs through interaction with skilled service users and through simulation and is facilitated by a cross-section of professionally registered staff. From discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the delivery of the IPL programme constitutes of IPL days. The education provider clarified information in regards to which schools attend IPL days and that assessment is managed at the end of these days. In particular, dietetic, occupational therapy, physiotherapy and social work learners work together during the IPL day. However, from their review of the documentation and based on these discussions, the visitors were unclear of the content of the IPL days and therefore how they contribute to learners learning with and from other learners. From conversations, it also seemed that learners would work with other professions in practice-based learning settings. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider would ensure that these interactions were formalised to ensure learners learn from these professionals. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider's approach to IPL will ensure learners are able to learn with professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure there is an effective process in place for obtaining consent form from learners.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the process for obtaining consent from learners during practical sessions crosses over with the process for recording attendance. The education provider stated that during practical sessions a register is kept which also serves to record the learners' consent. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the education provider would require learners to register at each session in order to obtain their consent. However, the visitors were unclear what learners understood of this consent protocol, and therefore whether it will ensure an effective process for obtaining appropriate consent from learners in order to meet this standard. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider demonstrates the process for obtaining consent from learners is explicit.

#### **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 speech and language therapist practice educators are HCPC registered.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the placement handbook for the programme states that all practice educators in Speech and Language Therapy (SLT) services are “asked to be HCPC registered as a health and care professional”. Although the HCPC does not require that all practice educators are registered within the profession, this seemed like a reasonable approach for this programme. At the visit, the programme team showed the visitors what a practice educator’s profile looks like on the Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA) online tool on the Healthcare Placement Website. However, from this viewing, the visitors were not clear how the education provider monitors the ongoing HCPC registration status of the SLT practice educators. The visitors therefore require that the education provider demonstrates how they monitor HCPC registration status of SLT practice educators, and that their requirement for SLT practice educators to be HCPC registered is clearly reflected across relevant documentation.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Gibraltar), Full time
Approval visit date	21 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13478-H9L9V0

### 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
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	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.

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:

David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Roseann Connolly	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.

Roger Dalrymple	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Oxford Brookes University
Ailsa Clarke	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Oxford Brookes University
Joy Butcher	Internal panel member	Oxford Brookes University
Julia Winter	Internal panel member	Oxford Brookes University

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Gibraltar)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
Proposed First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 8
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01988

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 programme delivered overseas if they are run by a UK based institution. The education provider intends to deliver their operating department practice 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:

<b>Group</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Learners	Yes	We met with learners on the Nursing programme that is currently delivered by Kingston University in Gibraltar. We also had a discussion with learners over Skype, who are currently on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme delivered at the education provider in the UK.
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 04 January 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 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 submitted the programme specification, entry requirements and advertising material such as a programme brochure. From their review of the documentation the visitors could not find information relating to the costs of the programme, or whether applicants would be eligible for funding. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors understood that the aim is

to recruit applicants from the local population who would be eligible for funding (to be eligible you must be a resident in Gibraltar for the last five years). The programme team noted that preference would be given to applicants who were eligible for funding. The visitors noted these were suitable arrangements, however they have not seen any information regarding applicant's eligibility for funding in the information that is provided to potential applicants. As this information has not been made explicit in the information for applicants, the visitors could not determine that applicants will have the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up the offer of a place on the programme.

#### **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 practice educators undertake training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider explained that practice educators have undertaken preparation sessions and updates with the education provider. The programme team explained that the practice educators had undertaken the approved 'mentor training' offered by Kingston University (who are responsible for delivering the nursing programme in Gibraltar), and will continue to undergo regular update training days. In preparation for this programme, the practice educators have met with the education provider initially for an introduction to the programme, to look at the programme structure and modules, and were given the Practice Assessment Documents to look through. The programme team and practice educators noted that they have been waiting for the programme to undergo the approval process before having final preparation sessions in relation to practice educator's role in the delivery of this programme. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors were not clear that the practice educators have received specific training that will ensure they are able to support learners on this programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the content of training that practice educators will receive that will ensure this is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the 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(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 30 January 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](#).

### 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.

Through discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the education provider intends to recruit a maximum of eight learners to the programme for its entire three year duration. The education provider described this as a demand-led process, once the first cohort has graduated they will consider whether or not they recruit to the programme again. While the education provider has demonstrated that there is currently sufficient demand and that the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose for the next three years, they will need to consider the potential impact on how the programme will continue to meet the standards of education and training if they choose not to recruit again for some time. The education provider should consider updating the HCPC on the viability of the programme through future monitoring processes.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Approval visit date	28 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13238-F5P3G4

### 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:

Susanne Roff	Lay
Helen Best	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
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.

Tim O'Brien	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Plymouth University
Hannah Wisdom	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Plymouth University
Louise Coleman	Professional officer for Education and Accreditation	Society and College of Radiographers (SCoR)

Ruth Strudwick	Assessor, Society and College of Radiographers	Society and College of Radiographers
Kirsty Wood	Assessor, Society and College of Radiographers	Society and College of Radiographers

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Proposed first intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 32
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01937

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:

<b>Group</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Learners	Yes	As the programme has not yet started we met with learners from the medicine and dentistry programmes, who are in the same faculty as this 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 February 2019.

### 3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that partner organisations are committed to providing enough resources to deliver the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including letters of support from programme stakeholders and partners. They were also able to ask the senior team about how they were co-operating with providers of practice-based learning and other stakeholders. From this evidence, and from these discussions, the visitors were aware that there were regular tripartite meetings between the education provider, Exeter University and the local hospital trust, to enable effective co-operation, especially around practice-based learning. However, the visitors were not clear that this relationship was enabling an appropriate level of collaboration, or enabling the education provider's preparation to run the programme. From the meeting with the senior team and the meeting with the representatives of practice-based learning, the visitors were aware that there was no evidence that an agreement had yet been reached with regards to the placement tariff. A placement tariff is a payment to a provider of practice-based learning to cover the costs associated with having a learner

on placement. In the practice educators' meeting several of those present indicated that they had not been consulted about the new programme and were concerned by the education provider's lack of consultation. Additionally they told the visitors that the education provider had not been represented at some of the tripartite meetings. The visitors also noted that the letters of support from partners supplied in the documentation laid out certain expectations that the education provider had not yet met. These included working closely with Exeter University, finalising the placement tariff and co-operating with the tripartite group to reduce the administrative burden of dealing with learners from two institutions. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the programme was sustainable and fit for purpose, as it was unclear how they would work with partners whose co-operation was essential for the success of the programme. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure appropriate support from partner organisations.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that there is appropriate support in place for the programme leaders, and that their roles and responsibilities are clear to them and to colleagues and senior management.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, which set out the roles and responsibilities for various individuals on the programme. They also discussed with the senior team how management on the programme would work. The visitors considered that appropriate support for the programme leaders would be particularly important as the programme sits within the medical school and there were no radiographers and no members of allied health professions in the senior management team. The visitors understood that the education provider had chosen to have two co-programme leaders in place. They considered that this arrangement could be appropriate, but it was not clear from the documentation or the discussions how responsibilities would be divided between the two individuals. Both of the individuals were employed on a 0.5 FTE basis, and one of them was only going to be committing half of that time, that is 0.25 FTE, to the programme. In addition, the individual who was 0.5 FTE was an anatomist rather than a radiographer. These arrangements were not in themselves problematic, but the visitors were not clear how the programme leaders will be supported to deliver a radiography programme, as neither of the programme leaders are diagnostic radiographers, or had experience in radiography education. The visitors therefore require further evidence showing how the education provider will ensure that the programme can be effectively managed, including appropriate support for the co-programme leaders and a clear breakdown of roles and responsibilities and where radiographer education expertise will come from.

### **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 they ensure that they have an appropriately qualified and experienced person in place to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the programme specification and a curriculum vitae for the programme co-leads, and asked the senior

team about the relevant arrangements. From this evidence and from the discussions they were not clear that there was an appropriate process in place to identify suitable persons and appoint a replacement. They could not see in the documentation, for example, a job description or person specification which laid out clearly what would be required of a new appointee. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that they ensure that the person holding 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 demonstrate that they have ongoing relationships with practice education providers and that these arrangements will facilitate the programme being effectively delivered.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including descriptions of key roles in the relationships between education provider and practice-based learning providers. They also discussed collaboration with the senior team, the programme team and the practice-based learning providers. From these discussions the visitors were aware that there were a number of areas where collaboration did not appear to have been effective or regular, for example:

- The Clinical Liaison position, which would provide a key contact point between the education provider and practice educators, had not yet been filled.
- There did not seem to have been significant input into programme development from providers of practice-based learning, and a number of practice educators appeared to be concerned about the viability of the programme, especially in regard to practice-based learning capacity.
- With regards to capacity, practice educators stated that they were not sure how the education provider was planning to co-operate with partners to secure sufficient capacity. They did not seem to be aware of any plans by the education provider to develop capacity, and they noted that the diagnostic radiography programme at Exeter, which has 60 learners with scheduled placements, would create pressure on the education provider.

The visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider was working effectively in partnership with providers of practice-based learning, and so require further evidence to demonstrate their ongoing and effective working with their partners. They considered that there was a link between this condition and that set under SET 3.1 above.

### **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 for securing sufficient practice-based learning for all learners.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including letters of support from partners and documents relating to how practice-based learning was organised and developed at the education provider. They also discussed it with the senior team and the providers of practice-based learning. The visitors understood that the education provider was working towards having appropriate capacity, but they could

not see evidence that there was an effective process for ensuring this. For example, it was not clear from discussions with the senior team that the education provider had a clear idea of what practice-based learning capacity had currently been secured. The visitors were aware that this was a new programme not due to start until September 2019, meaning that some of the capacity would not need to be in place for some time. However, they considered that the apparent absence of a process for ensuring capacity and availability meant that this standard was not met. The letters of support noted in the mapping document were conditional and were not received from all the potential placement providers proposed, and therefore could not, in the visitors' judgment, be taken as evidence of secured practice-based learning capacity. In addition, the visitors noted that in the meeting of providers of practice-based learning, a number of representatives had expressed doubts about the education provider's ability to secure sufficient capacity. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that they have an appropriate process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. They consider that there is a link between this condition and those set above under SETs 3.1 and 3.5.

### **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 they have an adequate number of staff with educational experience to deliver an effective programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including staff curriculum vitae. They also discussed staffing with the senior team. From the documentation and these discussions, it was not clear what the total full time equivalent (FTE) staff were available for this programme. The visitors were unclear how the staff team in place would be able to deliver an effective programme, as they could not see any evidence suggesting how many total staff hours would be required for the programme and how many were available. For many parts of the programme it was not clear who would be teaching and how much time they would have committed to the programme. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they will have 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 demonstrate that subject areas will be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including curriculum vitae belonging to the university staff. They discussed staffing with the senior team, and also reviewed module descriptors in order to assess what kinds of knowledge and expertise would be needed for programme staff. It was not clear from the discussions or from the documentation which staff members were going to be teaching which programme components. For example, the education provider did not appear to have appointed module leads. This is not an HCPC requirement but it does assist visitors in understanding the structure and teaching responsibilities on the programme. The visitors were aware from discussions with the senior team that more recruitment was planned before the scheduled start date in September 2019. However, they were not able to see timescales for this recruitment, or evidence relating to what

kind of knowledge and expertise the education provider was seeking to acquire. This was especially important because the senior management team of the programme was from the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, and did not have backgrounds in radiography or in the allied health professions, so the specialist support available to teaching staff might be relatively limited. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence demonstrating that teaching and learning activities in the academic components of the programme will be carried out by appropriate staff.

### **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 how they will ensure that appropriate resources to support learning will be available and accessible to all learners.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including the programme specification and a draft service-level agreement addressing access to resources in practice-based learning. They were also able to discuss resourcing with the senior team and programme team, and view a presentation from one of the education provider's academic librarians. They were aware that the education provider had plans for resourcing the programme, for example by acquiring appropriate textbooks, appropriate clinical teaching equipment, and diagnostic radiography related simulation equipment. However, they considered that the standard was not met at this time. This was because, although they were able to view a financial plan, they were not able to see timescales and detailed plans for the education provider acquiring the necessary resources or enabling access to them for learners on the programme. They also noted that many of the module reading lists did not have the most up-to-date texts. The senior team did not appear to be certain what equipment would be available for learners on the programme. The visitors were aware that the education provider would not be able to finalise acquisition of resources until the programme had been approved, but they considered that the education provider should provide further evidence of resource planning. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that resources appropriate to the programme will be available to learners.

### **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 learning outcomes enable learners to meet the standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document and the programme specification. They also discussed curriculum with the programme team. From the documentation and from these discussions the visitors understood that some of the module descriptors were not yet complete, so they were unable to determine whether the learning outcomes in these modules would ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that the learning outcomes for all modules are finalised and that those learning outcomes will ensure that learners meet the SOPs.

#### **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 they will ensure that the programme reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of radiography as articulated in curriculum guidance from the Society and College of Radiographers.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping and a benchmarking document. They also discussed with the programme team how the programme was intended to reflect the expectations and guidance for radiography learners. From these documents and from the discussions the visitors understood that the education provider was seeking to ensure that the programme would reflect the curriculum guidance from the relevant professional body, the Society and College of Radiographers (SCoR). However, they noted that the module descriptors had not yet been completed, so it was unclear how the learning outcomes from particular modules would be aligned to the SCoR guidance, and how the education provider's way of meeting this standard would work. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence demonstrating that the programme will reflect the curriculum guidance from the SCoR, in line with the programme design.

#### **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice by enabling all learners to meet the standards of proficiency in all settings where a diagnostic radiographer might be required to work.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard including the programme and operational specification documents. They also discussed with the senior team and programme team how they would ensure that the programme remained in touch with current practice. In the documentation and in the discussions the education provider appeared to be strongly focused on preparing learners for work in the NHS, and the visitors understood that practice-based learning settings were planned for both the NHS and private sector. Diagnostic radiography learners should be prepared to practice in all settings, including private and independent institutions. The visitors noted that due to changes in healthcare organisation and procurement an increasing number of radiographers would be working in private and independent settings. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the education provider could ensure that their curriculum remained relevant to all current practice. Additionally the visitors noted that some of the language used in the documentation did not reflect the terminology normally used within the profession. For example, several references were made to "X-rays", a term which is inaccurate when referring to a radiographic image. The visitors were therefore not clear how much input there had been into the curriculum from experienced radiographers and radiography educators. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will prepare learners for all possible settings for radiography practice, and how they will ensure that the terminology used on the programme reflects current usage and understanding in the profession.

#### **4.5 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that integration of theory and practice is central to the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including handbooks and programme and operational specifications, and discussed integration of theory and practice with the programme team and senior team. They understood from this evidence and from the discussions that the programme used a spiral model of learning, where the same subject areas are revisited with increasing depth throughout the programme. However, the visitors were not clear about how this spiral model would work on the programme. A number of the module descriptors were still incomplete, so they were unable to make a judgment about how each module would integrate theory and practice. They were not able to see evidence showing how practice-based learning would be integrated with the theoretical parts of the programme. For example, it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that learners going into practice-based learning had acquired appropriate theoretical knowledge for each area of experience. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that integration of theory and practice is central to the programme, including how the spiral curriculum works, how learners would acquire appropriate knowledge before practice-based learning, and what clinical competencies will be required in practice-based learning.

#### **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 module records and the programme specification, which laid out “distinctive features” of the programme. They also asked the senior team about their plans for, and approach to, interprofessional education (IPE). In these discussions the senior team stated that they had plans for learners on the programme to take part in teaching and learning activities with learners and professionals from other professions. However, it was not clear to the visitors that these activities would involve learning with and from professionals and learners from other professions, as required by the standard. The visitors were not able to see in the documentation detailed evidence of how the education provider would approach IPE, and how they would ensure that all learners had appropriate access. The education provider did not, for example, appear to be seeking the involvement of other allied health professions, except paramedics. The visitors were not clear about how the education provider had made decisions about which other professions were most relevant to the programme. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, learners and professionals from 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 they will ensure that learners understand which parts of the programme are mandatory and what action learners will need to take if they miss compulsory parts of the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard including placement and learner handbooks and the draft learner – placement contract. They also discussed attendance requirements with the programme team. From the evidence and from the discussions it was not clear to the visitors what the attendance requirements for the programme were, and what learners would be expected to do if they missed compulsory parts of the programme. The draft learner – placement agreement mentioned compulsory sessions but there was no information about what would need to be done if these were missed. Similarly, it was not clear from the information about practice-based learning how learners would be enabled to make up lost time. The programme team were unable to clarify what arrangements would be in place for such situations. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that learners know which programme components are mandatory and what they will need to do if they miss compulsory components.

#### **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 the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning enables learners to meet the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including letters of support from possible practice-based learning partners and the placement handbook. The visitors heard from some providers of practice-based learning that, in those people's judgment, the programme was still some way from having appropriate practice-based learning in place. This meant that the visitors could not determine what range and duration of practice-based learning would be available for all learners, as it was not clear who the practice-based learning partners would be. Additionally, the visitors understood that the competencies for the practice-based learning modules had not been finalised. Therefore they could not understand how the structure of practice-based learning would ensure that learners could achieve the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for diagnostic radiographers. They require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning enables learners to meet the SOPs.

#### **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 will maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the placement handbook and a quality assurance document. They also discussed audit of practice-based learning with the programme team. It was not clear from this documentation, or

from the discussions, that the education provider had in place a clear system for ongoing quality monitoring of practice-based learning. They were given verbal assurances that an audit system would be in place, but they were not clear about the details of this system. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that a thorough and effective system will be in place to approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning.

#### **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 will ensure that practice-based learning will take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the placement handbook. They also discussed audit of practice-based learning with the programme team. As noted in the condition under SET 5.3 above, it was not clear from the documentation, or from the discussions, that the education provider had in place a clear system for auditing practice-based learning. This meant that the visitors could not determine how the education provider would ensure that all practice-based learning settings would be safe and supportive for learners and service users. The visitors received verbal assurances from the senior and programme teams that they had institutional experience of organising appropriate practice-based learning and that they would be able to finalise arrangements as necessary before the programme start date. However, the visitors were not clear about the processes, details or timescales involved in this. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that practice-based learning takes place in a safe and supportive environment for service users and 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 will ensure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are involved in practice-based learning.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the draft programme description. They also discussed with the programme team how they intended to ensure adequate numbers of appropriate staff in practice-based learning. As noted in the condition under SET 5.3 above, it was not clear from the documentation, or from the discussions, that the education provider had in place a clear system for audit of practice-based learning. This meant that the visitors could not determine how the education provider intended to ensure adequate numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in practice-based learning. The visitors received verbal assurances from the senior team and programme teams that they had institutional experience of organising appropriate practice-based learning and that they would be able to finalise arrangements as necessary before the programme start date. However, the visitors were not clear about the processes, details or timescales involved in this. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure adequate numbers 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 will ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the draft programme description and the placement handbook. They also discussed with the programme team how they intended to ensure that practice educators were appropriately qualified. As noted in the condition under SET 5.3 above, it was not clear from the documentation, or from the discussions, that the education provider had in place a clear system for audit of practice-based learning. This meant that the visitors could not determine how the education provider intended to ensure adequate numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in practice-based learning. The visitors received verbal assurances from the senior team and programme teams that they had institutional experience of organising appropriate practice-based learning and that they would be able to finalise arrangements as necessary before the programme start date. However, the visitors were not clear about the processes, details or timescales involved in this. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

## **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 undertake regular training appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the draft programme description and the placement handbook. They also discussed with the programme team how they intended to ensure that practice educators were appropriately qualified. As noted in the condition under SET 5.3 above, it was not clear from the documentation, or from the discussions, that the education provider had in place a clear system for audit of practice-based learning. This meant that the visitors could not determine how the education provider intended to ensure adequate numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in practice-based learning. The visitors received verbal assurances from the senior team and programme teams that they had institutional experience of organising appropriate practice-based learning and that they would be able to finalise arrangements as necessary before the programme start date. However, the visitors were not clear about the processes, details or timescales involved in this. Additionally they considered that as the learning outcomes for placement had not yet been finalised, and so it was uncertain what would be happening in practice-based learning, they could not determine whether educators were being appropriately prepared. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure practice-based learning staff undertake regular training appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes.

## **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 will ensure that learners and practice educators are appropriately prepared for practice-based learning.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the placement handbook and the programme and operational specifications. They also discussed with the programme team how they intended to ensure that learners and practice educators were appropriately prepared for practice-based learning. From the documentation, and from these discussions, it was not clear to the visitors how practice educators and learners would be prepared for practice-based learning. From discussions with the providers of practice-based learning and practice educators the visitors were aware that the practice educators were not clear about how they would be prepared for practice-based learning. In discussion with learners from the medicine and dentistry programmes, the visitors were told that these learners generally felt well-prepared for their practice-based learning. However, they considered that, due to the differences in practice-based learning settings and arrangements, this was not sufficient to be satisfied that such preparation would be sufficient on the radiography programme. The visitors received verbal assurances from the programme team that they had institutional experience of organising appropriate preparation for practice-based learning and that they would be able to finalise practice-based learning preparation. However, the visitors were not clear about how this would be done. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure appropriate preparation for learners and practice educators.

## **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 they will ensure that assessment throughout the programme aligns appropriately with the academic level.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including a standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping exercise and an assessment strategy document. They also discussed assessment with the programme team. From the evidence, and from the discussions, the visitors were not clear how the assessment strategy and design would ensure that assessment aligned appropriately with the level of the programme. The learning outcomes did not have level descriptors, aligning them to a particular year of the programme, so the visitors could not see how the learning outcomes would ensure that learners demonstrated a level of understanding and skill appropriate to the academic level being undertaken. For example, the SOPs often use concepts like understanding and being able to analyse and reflect, but the learning outcomes for the programme did not reflect this, and only used words like “know” and “describe”. This might mean that learners’ ability to meet the SOPs was not appropriately assessed, which could mean learners leaving the programme unable to practice safely and effectively. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that assessment strategy and design enables learners to meet all the standards of proficiency, including those which require higher levels of understanding and ability.

## **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 reviewing how they will ensure that learners submitting coursework have access to formative feedback before their work is submitted for summative assessment.

**Reason:** The visitors considered that this standard was met, as the education provider's assessment strategy was laid out and comprehensible for learners. However, the visitors did note that learners were required to submit a number of lengthy pieces of coursework during the programme and it was unclear whether learners would have access to any feedback and consultation with programme staff before they were required to submit the work for summative assessment. The programme team stated that learners might have access to informal discussions about work but there was not a formal process for learners to be able to do this. The visitors considered that this lack of access to formative assessment might create a risk that the standard was not met in future, if learners did not have an opportunity to ensure that they were working in the right direction and that their expectations were aligned with the staff who would be assessing their coursework. They therefore suggest that the education provider consider how they might include more formative assessment in coursework.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Salford
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration), University of Salford, Full time
Approval visit date	12-13 December 2018
Case reference	CAS-13507-Z9K7Y8

### 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:

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Laura Graham	Occupational therapist
Rabie Sultan	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.

Helen Matthews	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Salford
Julie Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Salford
Anne Longmore	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists - Representative

Nicola Spalding	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists - Representative
Clair Parkin	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education Manager

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01995

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:

<b>Group</b>	<b>Met</b>
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 February 2019.

### **2.6 There must be an appropriate and effective process for assessing applicants' prior learning and experience.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify whether applicant's prior leaning and experience will be considered for this programme and if so, what criteria and process would be applied and how this is made available to staff and applicants.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors noted, in section 17 of the programme specification, that APEL (accreditation of prior learning) will not be available for this programme. However, during the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were told that they will consider taking APEL and relevant prior learning experience into consideration when assessing learners' applications for this programme. From the disparity in the information provided, the visitors were not clear what criteria and policy would be used to make judgements about prior learning or how this policy would be made available to applicants and the staff who would apply it. As such, the education provider will need to clearly define the process for assessing applicants' prior learning, and how this information will be made available to staff and learners, in order for the visitors to make a judgement about whether this standard is met.

#### **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 is delivered on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions.

**Reason:** For this standard, the visitors were directed to the programme specification and programme handbook which made references to module outlines, real world scenarios and volunteering experience. From reviewing this, the visitors were unclear about how this ensured that interprofessional education will take place on this programme. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that opportunities for shared interprofessional learning will be undertaken along with a combination of different professions during planned practice based learning and major incidents simulations, similar to the one which currently takes place for the approved BSc occupational therapy programme. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine the full involvement of learners in interprofessional sessions or how interprofessional learning would be delivered to ensure that learners could learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.. Therefore, the education provider is required to articulate how the intended interprofessional learning which will be delivered on the programme ensures that learners are able to learn with and from other professionals and learners from other relevant professions. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this standard is met.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work Practice, PT (Part time)
Approval visit date	10 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-13064-C0N2M7

### 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:

Manoj Mistry	Lay
Beverley Blythe	Social worker
Robert Goemans	Social worker
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive
Jamie Hunt	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.

Lisa Reidy	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Linda Hall	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Colette Fegan	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Jean Harris-Evans	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work Practice
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01899

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	As the assessed programme is new, these reports related to –the existing HCPC approved programme BA (Hons) Social Work (Full time)

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	As the assessed programme is new, we met learners from the existing HCPC approved programme BA (Hons) Social Work (Full time)
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.

#### **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 provide clarity around how the admissions process is managed, specifically considering the roles of the education provider and employers in making selection decisions.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and the discussions held, the visitors noted that the admissions process will be a three-stage process with both the education provider and employers inputting. At the visit, the discussion around how the admissions process will be run explained the role of the education provider during the process by involving service users and carers in an initial activity with the applicant, followed by an interview, with the final decision made by the programme leader and recruitment lead. However, from this discussion, the visitors were unclear how the employers are involved with the recruitment stage of the admissions process. The visitors were also unclear how information about the admissions process would be communicated to potential applicants, as this information has not yet been produced. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which clearly documents how the admission process is managed in partnership with the employers and their involvement in the recruitment stage, and how admissions information will be communicated to potential applicants.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the eligible relevant experience and the required standard criteria which are communicated with the applicant.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that, amongst the standard entry requirements the education provider requires relevant experience in a social care setting. However, from reviewing this information, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were unclear what constitutes as relevant experience as an entry criteria for this programme. The visitors noted that clarity about what would constitute as relevant experience would be important for potential applicants when applying for the programme, so they were clear whether their experience could meet this entry criteria, and for the education provider, to ensure they are making consistent judgements against this criteria. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which clearly shows what the education provider will consider as 'relevant' experience for an applicant to be admitted to the programme.

## **2.5 The admissions process must ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.**

**Condition:** The education provider must update their admissions information so health requirements for applicants are clearly communicated.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that "Places are offered subject to successful clearance through... Occupational Health (OH) and the SHU Pre-admission declaration for health and social care courses." From their review of the documentation, the visitors were unclear what the requirements for the health checks are, how applicants are made aware of these requirements, and what would happen if a declaration was made, or something discovered through the health check. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider provide further information around what the health requirements are, and demonstrate that these requirements are appropriate to the programme.

## **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 the programme has sufficient capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider and the employers have not agreed the availability of practice-based learning for all learners on this programme. Whilst the visitors noted that the education provider is seeking to support up to 20 apprentices per cohort, the education provider expects that many of the apprentices will come from the Social Work Teaching Partnership (SWTP). The SWTP will then support each apprentice with appropriate practice-based learning experience. However, the SWTP has not yet begun the tender process for its social work degree apprenticeship scheme, and therefore the education provider does not know whether places on the programme (and associated practice based learning) will be filled by the SWTP. Additionally, from the practice based learning meeting, the visitors noted that a representative from the

SWTP who was responsible for sourcing practice-based learning was unclear of the proposed learner cohort for this programme, and noted that another programme in the region is also planning to take 20 apprentice learners.

Given the competitive environment within which degree apprenticeships operate, the visitors require further evidence to ensure the standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further documentary evidence which demonstrates that the education provider is able to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners on this programme. Evidence for this might include showing that partner organisations are committed to providing sufficient numbers of practice-based learning opportunities to support the planned cohort size. Any evidence provided should also clarify how any such capacity for this programme has been considered in the context of practice-based learning already in operation throughout the region.

### **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 ensure that online resources are in place before the programme starts, and they are accessible for learners at different sites.

**Reason:** From the discussions, the visitors understood that the education provider has several existing online resources to support learning for this programme, and is currently developing an additional online tool (Pebble Pad). In the resources presentation, the visitors were introduced to some of the features of Pebble Pad, to support learning in the academic and the practice-based learning environments. Pebble pad will be a portfolio tool for learners to use, and will be accessible to learners at different locations. In the programme team meeting the visitors noted that the education provider is still developing Pebble Pad to support the programme, and that other online resources have yet to be finalised for the programme. In the resources meeting, it was confirmed that the programme team would work with support staff to finalise these resources over the coming months. Therefore, to ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the online resources will be ready for the start of this programme, and will be accessible from all sites.

### **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 ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

**Reason:** From the discussions at the visit, the education provider noted that there will be inter-professional learning (IPL) at practice-based learning settings. They noted that in these environments, learners would work with those from other professions. In their mapping to evidence how they meet this standard, the education provider referenced module descriptors, the mapping of learning outcomes to various standards (including HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs)), “Skills development sessions and course handbook” and “Service user engagement”. The visitors were unclear how this information supports how the standard is met. From the information provided, and from the discussions, the visitors were unclear how the education provider would ensure learners on the programme would be able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions. It seemed from the conversations, that learners

will likely work with other professions while undertaking practice-based learning, but the visitors noted that this would not occur in a structured way consistently across the cohort with the current approach. Therefore, there is a risk that learners will not learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how they will ensure learners on this programme are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners of other relevant professions.

### **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:** From a review of the documentation, and from discussions, the visitors noted that the practice educators who will be supervising learners at the degree apprenticeship programme, will likely also support learners from other social work programmes at the education provider. The education provider therefore noted that they would be experienced practice educators, and have been trained through education provider policies as part of their existing roles. However, the visitors noted that the type of learners that will be admitted to this programme will likely be different to those on other social work programmes at the education provider. Specifically, they will likely have been out of education for some time, and will also be experienced in the workplace. Therefore, the visitors noted that the learners on this programme may have different learning needs than other social work learners from the education provider. They also noted that the requirements of this programme, including the structure and outcomes, are different to existing social work provision at the education provider. On this basis, the visitors were unclear how the practice educators (ie those that are involved with the supervising and assessing learners, which may include mentors, supervisors, and possibly apprentices' line managers) will be trained to be prepared to support learners on the programme, specific to this programme and their learning needs. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence on training for the practice educators which is specific to this programme and the learning needs of the learners.

### **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 will provide information to learners and practice educators, to prepare them for practice-based learning.

**Reason:** From the discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the education provider currently expects apprentices to come from the local Social Work Teaching Partnership (SWTP). Linked to the condition for SET 5.7, the visitors noted that the learners will be undertaking learning in their own work place, but also in different locations. From the information provided, the visitors were unclear how the education provider will prepare learners and practice educators (ie those that are involved with the supervising and assessing learners, which may include mentors, supervisors, and possibly apprentices' line managers) with the information they need for practice-based learning. This is partly due to the practice partners for the programme not yet having

been formally confirmed. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence that shows related to practice-based learning, including when it will be delivered to learners and practice educators, and that shows how the information will be appropriate to prepare all parties for practice-based 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.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should reconsider the application of their workload model to continue to assure themselves that there is an adequate number of staff to deliver the social work provision, once this programme is running.

**Reason:** From a review of the submission documentation and through discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider has a workload model in place to ensure an appropriate number of academic staff are in place to support the delivery of the degree apprenticeship programme, and the social work provision more broadly. Whilst the visitors are satisfied this standard is met, they recommend that the education provider reconsider the application of their workload model once the degree apprentice programme is running. In particular, the visitors recommend that the education provider reassess the workload of the staff team on an ongoing basis once the degree apprenticeship programme starts running, and make changes to staffing as appropriate. This will ensure that the programme remains sufficiently staffed and suitable to effectively support apprentice learning.

#### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should review information in the programme documentation, including online resources, to ensure accuracy and consistency in relation to the role of the HCPC, including terminology.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted inconsistencies in the submitted documents. For example, the visitors noted an inconsistency in regards to duration of placements in days. The submission document states that there are two blocks of 100 days of placement (page 21) but page 74 notes practice of 70 days in duration. There is also incorrect and inconsistent information throughout about the HCPC's role, remit and requirements. During the programme team meeting, the education provider clarified that the errors present in the documents submitted were due to typing errors. The visitors noted that the submission document was created for the purpose of this event, and therefore do not need to be amended by the education provider. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider checks to ensure these, and any other errors are not replicated elsewhere, for example in the documentation for learners, or on their website.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider broadening the availability of practice-based learning opportunities in the adult area.

**Reason:** From discussions, the visitors noted that there will be practice-based learning available in the children and family setting, assuming that the programme is able to meet the condition for SET 3.6. Whilst, they were satisfied that SET 5.2 is met, the education provider noted that there is currently a pressure point around practice based-learning in the adult area. As social work is regulated generically across roles and experience, the visitors noted that learners should experience a range of practice-based learning, in order to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England, and to be fit to practice in any setting at the point of completing a programme. The visitors noted that with this programme, there will be additional burden on these settings, and therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider broadens the availability of practice-based learning in the adult setting.

### **Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)**

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

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.

At the visit, the education provider noted that they intend the programme to be filled with apprentices from the local Social Work Teaching Partnership (SWTP). As yet, the SWTP has not gone out to tender for their Degree Apprenticeship scheme. The senior team noted that they planned to bid for this tender, but were not clear of the timescales for this process completing. If they do not win the tender, the senior team noted that they would attempt to fill the proposed learner numbers with apprentices from other organisations. The visitors noted that if places were filled from the SWTP, the programme would be sustainable. However, if the education provider does not win the tender, and needs to make other arrangements to fill the programme, the visitors note that the programme will rely on an entirely different set of partnership arrangements, with organisations in different settings. This will mean that the programme will meet several of the standards in SET 3 in a different way than proposed through this process, and therefore would constitute a change to the way the programme will run. If the education provider does not win the tender from the SWTP, they should engage with the major change process.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, PT (Part time) BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, PT (Part time)
Approval visit date	17 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-13211-R0T0H2

### 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:

Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Frances Ashworth	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.

Dr Rebecca Hodgson	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Linda Hall	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Sam Moorwood	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Rebecca Peake	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Jo Daley	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01930

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. We were told of the establishment of this new Degree Apprenticeship programme through our major change process. This programme was established out of existing occupational therapy provision at the education provider.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
Proposed First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01931

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. We were told of the establishment of this new Degree Apprenticeship programme through our major change process. This programme was established out of existing physiotherapy provision at the education provider.

## 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 20 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 ensure that appropriate, clear and consistent information is available to applicants and enables them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** From their review of the programmes' documentation, the visitors considered that some of the information available to applicants was not clear or was not correct. For example, reference was made to the programmes giving "eligibility for professional registration" with the HCPC rather than graduates being "eligible to apply for registration". There were also references to the Health Professions Council rather than the Health and Care Professions Council. The visitors also noted the webpages for applicants to the programmes were not yet live. Therefore they were not able to determine whether the information provided on those pages was sufficient to enable

applicants to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. They therefore require the education provider to review all relevant materials to ensure accurate and complete information about both programmes is provided to applicants. This includes making the website available for the visitors to review.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify the academic entry standards to the programme.

**Reason:** From their review of the programmes' documentation, the visitors were made aware that there may be an expectation amongst employers that the education provider will be flexible in their entry standards. This was to reflect the demographic for applicants being a mix of existing staff and school leavers, and some may have lower or less recent academic qualifications than others. In the meeting with the programme team at the visit, the visitors were informed there would not be flexibility in the entry standards and that the education provider would be looking for equivalency in regards to academic qualifications. The visitors consequently noted that the requirements were not clear and may result in applicants misunderstanding what the entry requirements are. The visitors therefore require the programme to clarify what the entry standards are, and that they will not go below the requirements of the education provider.

## **4.6 The learning and teaching methods used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** For the occupational therapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate what learning and teaching methods are used, and how these are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the blended learning approach to learning and teaching while on campus, in the workplace and in practice-based learning. In the meeting to give an overview of provision, the visitors were made aware the learner would work with their mentor in the workplace to complete tasks as set during teaching. However, the visitors did not receive information on how the education provider is going to manage these work-based tasks in order to provide equity of learning opportunity for all learners. Therefore, in order to ensure this standard is met, the visitors require more information on what the work-based tasks are and how they will support delivery of the learning outcomes for the occupational therapy programme.

## **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 their attendance requirements around when learners are able to take leave.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware all learners needed to attend all sessions of the programme. For practice-based learning, a 100% attendance was seen as the norm, but a minimum attendance of 80% was required. For occupational therapy learners, leave was to be negotiated during non-teaching weeks

and practice-based learning blocks. For physiotherapy learners, leave may only be taken during designated holiday periods. It was not possible to take leave during term-time. However, in the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were informed learners had to attend all sessions, unless the practice-based learning spanned Christmas holidays. The visitors were unable to see clearly whether learners were able to take leave, when they were able to do so and how much they were able to take. As there was discrepancy with the information provided, the visitors were not clear about the programme policy on attendance and therefore require the education provider to clarify their attendance policy.

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

**Condition:** For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must clarify what is required for progression within the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were aware that there were exemptions available for learners from normal progression within the programme. Retrieval of placement modules was allowed in the next year of study. At the visit, the visitors were made aware that as the programmes will run annually, learners are able to continue with a module if they miss one. However, the visitors did not see information regarding the number of credits needed for progression from one year to the next. The visitors therefore require evidence that shows what is expected of learners at each stage of the physiotherapy programme to ensure progression.

#### **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:** For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider should consider strengthening how they ensure service users and carers are involved in the programme.

**Reason:** From their review of the documentation for the physiotherapy programme, the visitors were made aware service users and carers had been engaged in the co-production of the programme. The education provider had also run a consultation where service users and carers had been invited to critique the course design and structure, and provide feedback prior to the final submission of the development document. In the meeting with service users and carers, the visitors heard there had been involvement with interviewing applicants. As such, the visitors knew how and which service users are involved in the programme, that this involvement is appropriate, and were satisfied the standard had been met. However, the visitors noted that the level of service user and carer involvement could be strengthened throughout the entire programme to ensure meaningful and ongoing contribution. This could include looking at which parts of the programme are most appropriate for their involvement.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of East Anglia
Name of programme(s)	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad, Part time Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad, University of East Anglia, Part time
Approval visit date	20 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13482-K8F2B4

### 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:

Ian Hughes	Lay
James Pickard	Independent prescriber
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Tamara Wasylec	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.

Susanne Lindqvist	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of East Anglia
Robbie Meehan	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of East Anglia

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
Proposed First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP01991

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
Proposed First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP01992

We undertook this assessment of 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.

## 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	This is a new programme so this document is not required.

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

<b>Group</b>	<b>Met</b>
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 January 2019.

### **B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the documentation available to learners is consistent and accurate.

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation the visitors noted some inconsistencies in the programme documentation. For instance, on page 6 of volume J the document refers to the professions on the programme as “nurses, midwives, paramedics, therapeutic radiographers and paramedics”. The visitors noted that physiotherapists were missing from the list of professions and that this may be misleading for learners from that profession. Additionally, some of the documentation contained a page footer which referenced a course title “V300: Independent and supplementary prescribing” or “HCPC V300 supervisor handbook”. The visitors noted that this too could be misleading for staff, Designated Medical Practitioners (DMPs) and learners as that is not the programme title. The education provider noted that these would be reviewed and amended. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to ensure that the information provided is consistent and reflective of the programme titles and the professions of the learners on the programmes.

## **D.7 The designated medical practitioner must undertake appropriate training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate what mandatory training designated medical practitioners (DMPs) must undertake, how it is appropriate for these programmes and how they ensure all DMPs undertake the training.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that designated medical practitioners (DMPs) are provided with a supervisor's handbook. In discussions at the visit the visitors were told that the education provider considered the information in the handbook to be sufficient training for the DMPs to prepare for their role as supervisor of learners on independent and supplementary prescribing modules. The visitors also heard from the learners, practice educators (DMPs) and programme team that DMPs do not tend to read the handbook and therefore the education provider cannot ensure that the supervisor's handbook is an effective training resource for DMPs. The visitors also noted that because the DMPs do not read the handbook they are not trained to supervise learners on this programme. Therefore the visitors could not determine how the the education provider checks that DMPs have completed the training prior to supervising learners on the programmes to ensure they are trained to perform their role in these programmes. Therefore, the visitors require additional information demonstrating that the training for DMPs is appropriate, easily accessible and the mechanisms for ensuring that all DMPs undertake the required training. In this way the visitors can ascertain whether this standard is met.

## **D.10 Students and designated medical practitioners must be fully prepared for the practice placement environment which will include information about:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of the experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the professional standards which students must meet;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures designated medical practitioners are fully prepared for placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that designated medical practitioners (DMPs) are provided with a supervisor's handbook and are involved in tripartite meetings with the education provider and learners at the start of the practice element of the programme. In discussions at the visit, the visitors were told that the education provider considered the information in the handbook to be sufficient to prepare the DMP for their role in the delivery of the practice element of the programmes. The visitors also heard from the learners, practice educators (DMPs) and programme team that DMPs do not read the handbook. Therefore the visitors could not see how DMPs who choose not to read the handbook are fully prepared for placement. Additionally, in their review of the supervisor handbook the visitors were unable to see how DMPs who read handbook would access information about the expectations of

professional conduct as described in the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As the visitors could not see how this information is communicated to DMPs or how the education provider ensures DMPs read the handbook, the visitors could not determine how DMPs are provided with information about the expectations of learners' professional conduct in the practice setting. Therefore, the visitors require additional information demonstrating how the education provider ensures that DMPs have the information they need about the expectations of professional conduct prior to the start of practice based learning to ensure that they are fully prepared for placement.

**E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide accurate information regarding compensation for these programmes.

**Reason:** In their reading of the university regulations regarding compensation, the visitors noted that where learners fail a 20 credit, non-core module, they may be able to progress on the programmes. In discussion with the programme team they clarified to the visitors that compensation is not applicable for these programmes and that modules on these programmes are exempt from those regulations. The visitors considered that learners may be misinformed by the information provided in the university regulations. As such, the visitors require the education provider to provide further information which clearly communicates to staff and learners that compensation is not applicable for any element of the programmes.