

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider | The University of Bolton |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time MA Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship), Full time |
| Approval visit date | 02 April 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-14170-H4R7C4 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Diane Whitlock | Lay |
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Christine Stogdon | Social worker |
| 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.

| | | |
|---------------|--|----------------------|
| Ged Clarke | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Bolton |
| Marina Kirby | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Bolton |
| Meksha Burrin | Student member of internal panel | University of Bolton |
| Chris Grant | Internal panel member | University of Bolton |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| Proposed first intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02035 |

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.

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| Proposed first intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02036 |

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.

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| Proposed first intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02037 |

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 | Not Required | As these programmes are new external examiner reports are not available |

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

| Group | Met | Comments |
|---|-----|--|
| Learners | Yes | As the programmes are new, we met with learners on existing health and social programmes, not regulated by the HCPC. |
| 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 11 June 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 how they will ensure that applicants understand the admissions requirements of the degree apprenticeship, and the impact that participation in the degree apprenticeship might have on employment status.

Reason: In the documentation, the visitors viewed individual handbooks for the three programmes. They considered that the handbooks were broadly appropriate. However, they could not see where in the handbook it was communicated to learners that the degree apprenticeship programme had significant differences in structure and expectations than the other programmes. The visitors were aware from the visit documentation and from discussions at the visit that learners coming on to the degree apprenticeship would already be employed in social work departments, and that taking part in the programme would likely lead to changes in their employment contracts. Additionally, the programme team confirmed in discussions that failure to complete the degree apprenticeship might affect these individuals' employment status. The visitors considered that this was not clearly explained to applicants in the available documentation. As a result the visitors could not see how applicants were being enabled to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place.

The visitors were also not clear at what stage of the application process handbooks giving such information would be accessible to applicants, which meant they could not determine whether the information was provided in a timely enough manner to make an informed choice for applicants possible.

They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will communicate to applicants for the degree apprenticeship, in a timely manner, the possible implications of failure to complete the programme.

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 clarify how data regarding equality and diversity in admissions will be collected, evaluated and used.

Reason: In the evidence for this standard, the education provider linked to university-wide equality and diversity policies. However, it was not clear to the visitors from this evidence how the proposed social work programmes will implement and monitor such policies specifically in relation to admissions. In discussions with the programme team

the visitors were informed that appropriate equality and diversity monitoring would take place during the admissions process, but the education provider did not provide detail about how this would be done and how the information would be used to take forward continuous improvement. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how equality and diversity monitoring will work on the programme.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have effective and appropriate relationships in place with partner organisations who will be supporting the delivery of the programme.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard the education provider submitted links to the university's guidelines for quality assurance of programmes. Based on this evidence, the visitors could not see evidence that there was an ongoing relationship between the education provider and partner organisations who would be providing practice-based learning for the programme. In discussions with the senior team, the visitors were given verbal assurances that there had been high-level strategic discussions with local councils. However, it was not clear that there was regular and appropriate co-operation and planning in place at the operational level. They did not see evidence relating to such relationships, for example minutes of meetings. There appeared to be some disagreement among different members of staff as to whether it would be possible for the visitors to view such minutes. The visitors also noted that no senior representatives of providers of practice-based learning attended the senior team meeting, meaning that they could not have discussions around these working relationships with these representatives. They were therefore unable to determine whether partner organisations were committed to providing the resources required to support the delivery the programme, or whether the education provider had access to feedback from stakeholders about the programme's fitness for purpose. They require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that their relationships with partner organisations will enable the programme to be sustainable and fit for purpose.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence showing

- lines of responsibility within the programmes' management structures, and
- how they have oversight of management systems in partner organisations.

Reason: For this standard the education provided evidence relating to the staff available for the programme, including curriculum vitae. However, the visitors were not given evidence relating to the management structures on the programmes. In discussions with the programme and senior teams, they were given verbal assurances that the programme would be managed in line with normal university procedures, but they were not able to view evidence laying out lines of responsibility. They also were not provided with evidence showing that the education provider would have appropriate oversight over management systems in practice education partners. They were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met, and require further evidence of how the education provider ensures effective management of the programme and provides clear lines of responsibility.

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 must demonstrate that there is an effective policy in place to identify a suitable person to have overall professional responsibility, and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard the education provider submitted a curriculum vitae for Martina Kirlew, whom the visitors understood would hold overall professional responsibility for all three programmes, although it was also communicated that each would have its own individual course leader. However, the visitors did not see evidence that the education provider have an appropriate means of ensuring that this individual in place is appropriate, and for replacing programme leaders if it becomes necessary. The visitors could not see evidence relating to how the education provider would do this. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that a suitable person will be in place.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

Reason: The evidence submitted for this standard included the programme and practice handbooks and feedback about the proposed programme received from practice-based learning partners. The visitors considered that this information was not evidence for effective collaboration between the education provider and their practice education partners. This was because the handbooks gave a narrative of how relationships between education provider and partners would be managed, but did not show regular and effective collaboration with practice partners. Similarly the visitors did not consider that the feedback about the new programmes was evidence of regular and effective collaboration, as it appeared to be part of a one-off exercise. The programme team stated that there had been some communication and meetings with practice education partners, but the visitors were not able to view evidence relating to these meetings, for example minutes or records of outcomes. It was not clear from the evidence provided or from the discussions at the visit that input into the new programmes from practice education partners had been sought in a structured or systematic way. As noted in the condition under SET 3.1, there has been high-level contact between the education provider and practice education partners, but the visitors did not see evidence of ongoing and regular operational co-operation. In the practice educators' meeting, the visitors were only able to meet with two representatives. One of them was from an organisations that would probably not be able to provide practice-based learning to social work learners. It was therefore very difficult for the visitors to understand the nature and extent of the collaboration between the education provider and practice education partners, and they could not determine whether it was regular and effective. They require further evidence demonstrating that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and their practice-based learning partners.

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 and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The visitors were able to view some evidence of contact with organisations that might provide practice-based learning for the programmes. There were samples of feedback forms giving these organisations' thoughts on the proposed programmes, and a letter from the Greater Manchester Social Work Academy (GMSWA) thanking the education provider for expressing their interest in involvement. However, the visitors considered that these documents did not provide evidence that there was a process in place to ensure that all learners would have access to appropriate practice-based learning. The feedback forms were not evidence of such a process and the letter was evidence of the beginning of a relationship not a process. The visitors asked the programme team about this issue and were given verbal assurances that placements were being sought and that they had had discussions with prospective partners in the region. The visitors were not able to view evidence of the outcomes of these discussions, or evidence that there were continuing discussions at the operational level. They were not able to view planning documentation, or schedules, for the practice-based learning. As noted in the condition under SET 3.5 above, they were not able to speak to senior staff from practice education partners, and only two representatives of any practice-based learning partners attended the visit. The visitors were not clear from the programme team meeting that the education provider had considered how the local social work education landscape might affect their ability to find enough practice-based learning. There are a number of HEIs in the region with established social work programmes, which may make it harder for the education provider to secure placements. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence showing that the education provider has an effective process for securing sufficient appropriate practice-based learning.

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 will be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider submitted staff CVs and referred to part of the programme handbook. From this evidence, the visitors were aware that the programme would be able to draw on a number of members of staff with various backgrounds. However, it was not clear from the evidence which parts of the programme would be taught by which staff members, so the visitors were not able to determine that there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The visitors were also not given information, either in the documentation or verbally, which would clarify how much time each of these staff would be able to commit to the programmes. They did not, for example, have access to a timetable or schedule which would show how the team would deliver the programme. They were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met, and require further evidence showing that an adequate number of staff are in place to deliver the 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 staff who have appropriate knowledge and expertise.

Reason: For this standard the education provider submitted staff curriculum vitae. From this evidence, the visitors were aware that the programme would be able to draw on a number of members of staff with various backgrounds. However, it was not clear from the evidence which parts of the programme would be taught by which staff members, so the visitors were not able to determine that subject areas would be appropriately covered. The visitors were also not given information, either in the documentation or verbally, which would clarify how much time each of these staff would be able to commit to the programmes. They did not, for example, have access to a timetable or schedule which would show how the team would deliver the programme. They were not informed what use, if any, would be made of temporary staff. They were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met, and require further evidence showing that the expertise and knowledge available to the programme is sufficient.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure the continuing professional development of non-permanent staff who deliver parts of the programme.

Reason: The visitors were able to view a university-wide policy on staff development, and question the senior team and programme team about the approach to professional and academic development of staff. They considered that there were appropriate opportunities for university staff to access development and progression opportunities and to improve their skills in programme delivery. However, they were unclear how the university policy would be applied to non-permanent staff. They were unable to determine that the standard was met, and require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure access to development opportunities for staff in practice-based 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.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they will ensure that learners have access to appropriate resources while in practice-based learning.

Reason: In their evidence the education provider directed the visitors to information relating to their virtual learning environment (VLE). The visitors were also given an introduction to this VLE as part of the visit. They considered that it was an appropriate means of allowing learners access to resources while away from the university. However, as the education provider had not yet finalised their practice-based learning settings, and could not provide information to the visitors concerning the kind of environments in which learners would be placed, the visitors could not be sure that all learners on the programme would have appropriate access to resources while in

practice-based learning, because they had only limited information about what these settings would be. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence relating to how the education provider will ensure that all learners have access to resources to support their learning in practice-based learning.

3.13 There must be effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they will ensure that there will be effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in practice-based learning.

Reason: In their evidence the education provider directed the visitors to information provided to learners about wellbeing and learning needs support that would be available, and to information relating to their virtual learning environment (VLE). The information for learners about services available at the education provider was appropriate, and the VLE was an appropriate means of allowing learners access to support for wellbeing and learning needs. The visitors understood that the education provider had not yet finalised their practice-based learning settings, and could not provide information to the visitors concerning the kind of environments in which learners would be placed. Therefore, the visitors were not clear how the education provider would ensure that learners in practice-based learning had access to effective support for their wellbeing and learning needs. They could not be sure that all learners on the programme would have appropriate access to wellbeing and learning needs support, because they had only limited information about what these settings would be. They require further evidence relating to how the education provider will ensure that all learners have access to resources to support their wellbeing and learning needs while in practice-based learning.

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 monitor equality and diversity policies on the programmes.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard, the education provider referred to university-wide equality and diversity policies. However, the visitors could not see from this evidence how equality and diversity monitoring would work in the context of this particular programme. It was not clear to them, for example, what data would be collected, how it would be analysed, and how the data generated would be used to drive continuous improvement. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that appropriate equality and diversity monitoring would take place on the programmes, but the education provider did not provide detail about how this would be done and how the information would be used to take forward continuous improvement. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence demonstrating how equality and diversity monitoring would work on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify for learners on the degree apprenticeship programme which complaints process should be used if problems arise in practice-based learning.

Reason: For this standard, the mapping document referred the visitors to a university-wide complaints process and to information given to learners about how to raise complaints. These were appropriate for the BA (Hons) and MA programmes. The visitors were aware, however, that learners on the degree apprenticeships would be spending much more time in practice-based learning than learners on the other programmes, and would remain employed by their sponsoring organisations. They had not seen information relating to what complaint policy would be applicable in these situations. In discussions the programme team were unable to clarify this. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met for the degree apprenticeship, and require further evidence clarifying how learners on the degree apprenticeship will be expected to raise complaints while 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: For this standard the visitors were referred to the staff curriculum vitae, and to a part of the programme handbook which outlined how inter-professional education (IPE) would work on the programme. However, there was no detail about how exactly IPE would work. It was not clear what kind of activities or events would be used to deliver appropriate IPE. It was also not clear how the education provider had designed IPE to make it as relevant as possible for learners, or how they had determined which were the most appropriate other professions to involve. The programme team informed the visitors that they did have plans for inter-professional learning that involved police officers, nurses and other professions that social workers would need to work with. However the visitors were not able to see evidence relating to this element of the programme and how it would be delivered. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence showing how learners will be enabled to 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 they have effective processes in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

Reason: From the evidence provided, which included relevant sections of the programme handbook and a Statement of Confidentiality, the visitors were satisfied that there were processes in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users where necessary. However, they were not able to view evidence relating to how learners would give consent where necessary, for example, when they were taking part

in activities that involved roleplay or sharing personal information. In discussion the programme team were not able to clarify this, and the visitors were not clear that the education provider would be able to ensure that learners were giving appropriate consent. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that learners give appropriate consent where necessary.

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 the attendance requirements of the programmes, including the necessity for full attendance of practice-based learning.

Reason: In the evidence for this standard the visitors viewed information supplied to learners which referred to a university-wide policy stating that 80% attendance was required. The visitors were not able to clarify from the evidence or from discussions with the programme team whether this would apply to the programmes. The visitors understood that full attendance of practice-based learning was required, and that absences or missed components of practice-based learning would have to be made up. This superseded generic university attendance policies. However, they considered that the requirement to attend all practice-based learning was not made clear to learners in the information supplied to them, for example, in the programme handbook. They were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met, and require further evidence showing that learners will be made fully aware of the attendance requirements for the programmes, including the necessity for full attendance of practice-based learning.

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 will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard, the education provider referred to a section in the programme handbook which laid out some of the expectations around practice-based learning and the framework in which it would take place. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence relating to what practice-based learning had been secured for the programme. As noted in the conditions above under SETs 3.1, 3.5 and 3.6, they had not seen information about the organisations which would be accepting learners, or to which areas of practice those learners would be exposed. Only two representatives of potential providers of practice-based learning had attended the practice educators' meeting, and one of these was a representative of an organisation that was unlikely to be able to take social work learners. The visitors were not clear that the attendees at the practice educators' meeting understood what would be involved in accepting learners from the programmes. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were told that they were in touch with other potential providers, and that they had good relationships with local authorities. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence showing what practice-based learning had been secured and agreed so far. They were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met and require further evidence showing that an appropriate structure, duration and range of practice-based learning is in place.

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: In their evidence for this standard, the education provider referred to a section in the programme handbook giving a narrative of issues relating to practice-based learning, and the Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) form. The visitors considered that the QAPL form could be an appropriate part of monitoring practice-based learning. However, they did not have enough information about the nature of the programme's practice-based learning to make a judgment about whether the education provider would be able to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. The visitors did not know who the practice-based learning partners would be, or what kind of placements they would be delivering, or where these placements would be located, as noted in the condition under SET 5.2 above. They were also not clear whether the education provider had ongoing relationships with practice-based learning partners, as noted under SET 3.5 above. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating that the education provider can maintain a thorough and effective system of quality monitoring in 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 takes place in an environment that is safe and secure for learners and service users.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard, the education provider referred to their Social Work Placement Learning Agreement. This was a document agreed between learners, the education provider, and practice education partners, to complete before learners went into practice-based learning. The visitors considered that they did not have enough information about the nature of the programme's practice-based learning to make a judgment about whether the education provider would be able to ensure a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users during practice-based learning. They did not know who the practice-based learning partners would be, or what kind of placements they would be delivering, or where these placements would be located, as noted in the condition under SET 5.2 above. They were also not clear whether the education provider had ongoing relationships with practice-based learning partners, as noted under SET 3.5 above. In discussions with the programme team and the practice-based learning partners they were not able to clarify these matters. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating that the education partner can ensure a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users.

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 an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in practice-based learning.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard, the education provider referred to their Social Work Placement Learning Agreement. This was a document agreed between learners, the education provider and practice partners, completed collaboratively by those parties before learners went into practice-based learning. The visitors considered that they did not have enough information about the nature of the programme's practice-based learning to make a judgment about whether the education provider would be able to ensure that there were adequate numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. They did not know who the practice-based learning partners would be, or what kind of placements they would be delivering, or where these placements would be located, as noted in the condition under SET 5.2 above. They were also not clear that the education provider had ongoing relationships with practice-based learning partners, as noted under SET 3.5 above. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating that the education partner can ensure an adequate number 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 and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, are registered social workers in England.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard, the education provider referred to their Social Work Placement Learning Agreement. This was a document agreed between learners, the education provider, and practice partners, completed collaboratively by those parties before learners went into practice-based learning. The visitors considered that they did not have enough information about the nature of the programme's practice-based learning to make a judgment about whether the education provider would be able to ensure that staff in practice-based learning had appropriate knowledge, skills and experience. They did not know who the practice-based learning partners would be, or what kind of placements they would be delivering, or where these placements would be located, as noted in the condition under SET 5.2 above. They were also not clear that the education provider had ongoing relationships with practice-based learning partners, as noted under SET 3.5 above. The document submitted in evidence did not explain how, and under what circumstances, the education provider would determine when it was acceptable for practice educators to not be registered social workers. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating

- that the education partner can ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in practice-based learning; and
- under what circumstances it will be deemed appropriate for practice educators to not be registered social workers.

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 which is appropriate to their role, to learners' needs and the delivery of the programmes' learning outcomes.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard, the education provider referred to a paragraph in their practice learning handbook, which gave a narrative of expectations around training of staff involved with practice-based learning. The visitors were not clear from this narrative how the education provider would ensure that all practice-based learning staff undertook regular training, or how they would ensure that all staff did update training as appropriate. They could also not see how the education provider would ensure that the training content was appropriate. The visitors considered that they did not have enough information about the nature of the programme's practice-based learning to make a judgment about whether the education provider would be able to ensure that staff in practice-based learning had regular and appropriate training. They did not know who the practice-based learning partners would be, or what kind of placements they would be delivering, or where these placements would be located, as noted in the condition under SET 5.2 above. They were also not clear that the education provider had ongoing relationships with practice-based learning partners, as noted under SET 3.5 above. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence showing how the education provider will ensure that practice educators undertake regular training appropriate to their role, to learners' needs and the learning outcomes.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Essex |
| Name of programme(s) | PgDip Social Work (exit route), Full time MA Social Work, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 21-22 May 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-13642-J5F0H2 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|----------------|
| Anne Gribbens | Social worker |
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Ismini 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.

| | | |
|----------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Guy Shennan | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Independent Trainer in Social Work |
| Sophie Walters | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Essex |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | PgDip Social Work (exit route) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 October 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 across both programmes |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02020 |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 October 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 across both programmes |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02021 |

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 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 | No |

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

| Group | Met | Comments |
|----------|-----|--|
| Learners | Yes | The programmes are new, so we met with learners on the currently approved BA (Hons) Social Work 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 18 July 2019.

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 they have secured partnership agreements, to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the memoranda of cooperation, which demonstrate partnerships with three local authorities and the British Red Cross for the provision of practice-based learning (PBL). During discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there are ongoing partnership arrangements with three local authorities within the region, which provide the majority of PBL for learners. However, the visitors noted that the memorandum of cooperation with the Essex County Council is only valid until June 2019. The visitors were unclear whether the current partnership agreements ensure availability and capacity of PBL going forward. As the visitors have not seen up to date arrangements, they could not determine whether there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of PBL for all learners. The visitors require further evidence about how the education provider will ensure they have up to date or renewed partnership arrangement, which will ensure learners have access to PBL on the proposed programmes.

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

Reason: In the submission, the education provider referred to two modules through which shared learning with other professions takes place. During discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that interprofessional learning (IPL) for learners on the proposed programmes is planned to occur with other learners and professionals in the School of Law. However, the visitors were unclear what the structure and elements of IPL is, or how the education provider intends to deliver IPL. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. The visitors require further evidence about the structure and delivery of IPL to determine whether this standard is met.

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.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider providing clarity on the information provided to applicants in relation to the optional pathways on the proposed MA Social Work programme.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as all the appropriate information about admission to the proposed programmes are detailed during an open day event and on the programme's webpage. However, the visitors considered it was unclear for applicants about when they would have to choose which pathway to follow between the two optional pathways on the MA Social Work programme. Although the documentation highlights to learners that they will be required to choose among optional modules on the programme, the visitors note that is unclear to applicants and learners when they will be required to make their choice in relation to the pathway. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider informs applicants about when they are required to choose which pathway to follow.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Education provider | University of Gloucestershire |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 25-26 April 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-14308-J6Z4J0 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Carol Rowe | Physiotherapist |
| 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.

| | | |
|----------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Caroline Mills | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Gloucestershire |
| Debbie Jones | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Gloucestershire |
| Dan Ramsay | Internal panel member | University of Gloucestershire |
| Stuart Porter | External panel member | University of Salford |
| Nina Paterson | Head of Education | Chartered Society of Physiotherapists |

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Graham Copnell | Education representative | Chartered Society of Physiotherapists |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| Proposed first intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02042 |

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 | Not Required | The programme is not approved and has not run so is unable to provide external examiners' reports. |

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

| Group | Met | Comments |
|---|-----|--|
| Learners | Yes | The programme is not approved and has not run, so we met with learners from BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Nursing and BSc (Hons) Sports and Exercise Sciences programmes. |
| 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 21 June 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 applicants are given appropriate, clear and consistent information about any English language requirements set at the point of admission.

Reason: From their review of the programme documentation, the visitors were made aware applicants could access the programme specification. The visitors considered information available to applicants about the programme's English language requirements was not clear or not correct. The programme specification gave incomplete reference to requirements for applicants whose first language is not English. The visitors were not able to determine whether the information provided was accurate 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 that accurate and complete information about the programme's English language requirements is available 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 ensure learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

Reason: From their review of the programme documentation, the visitors were made aware the programme has a placement education strategy in which capacity is agreed through the Strategic Workforce Development Partnership Board. The visitors were also made aware of the placement agreement template document, which would be used between the education provider and the local Trust. The visitors were made aware in the meeting with practice educators of their commitment to the programme. However, the visitors did not receive any evidence to demonstrate that the practice-based learning providers had formally committed to provide the amount and range of practice-based learning required to deliver the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear whether the education provider has secured the required number of placements for the programme. The visitors require further evidence of the formal arrangements in place with all practice education providers, and that these arrangements can support the maximum number of learners 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 provide further evidence to demonstrate they have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware the academic course leader is in post. The visitors were also made aware the process to recruit a senior lecturer is ongoing. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were informed shortlisting for this position had been completed, and interviews were scheduled for the following week. As such, the visitors were unable to determine at this point whether there are an appropriate number of staff whose qualifications and experience is appropriate to deliver the programme effectively. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is, or will be, an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme throughout the whole length of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that subject areas will be taught by staff with the specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware the academic course leader is in post. The visitors were also made aware the process to recruit a senior lecturer is ongoing. The visitors were informed the education provider planned to recruit this individual to have knowledge and experience in the field of the musculoskeletal system. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were

informed shortlisting for this position had been completed, and interviews were scheduled for the following week. As such, the visitors were unable to determine at this point whether educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively. The visitors therefore require information as to how the education provider will ensure educators are suitable and well equipped to take part in teaching and to support learning in the subject areas they are involved in.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Education provider | Glyndwr University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 23 - 24 May 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-14379-N7R4M3 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Carol Rowe | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Susanne Roff | Lay |
| Patrick Armsby | 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.

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| Colin Heron | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Glyndwr University – Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts, Science and Technology |
| Naomi Saunders | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | Glyndwr University – Senior Quality Officer |
| Amy Rattenbury | Internal Assessor | Glyndwr University – Faculty of Arts, Science and Technology |

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Kelly Smith | Internal Assessor | Glyndwr University – Faculty of Social and Life Sciences |
| Thomas Hindle | Student Representative on the panel | Glyndwr University – Level 4 BA (Hons) Theatre, Television and Performance |
| Anne Wallace | External Assessor | Chartered Society of Physiotherapists (CSP) – Academic Representative, University of Aberdeen |
| Nina Paterson | External Assessor | CSP – Education Advisor |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 26 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02066 |

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 | Comments |
|---|-----|---|
| Learners | Yes | The HCPC panel met with learners on the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy course, which is HCPC approved. |
| 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 02 August 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 suitably informs learners so that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were able to access the Glyndwr webpage that provided information about the course for potential applicants. The visitors found the information to be limited, and considered that it did not cover all aspects required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme. The visitors also noted from the webpage that applicants were not provided with specific information about the different funding structures and potential additional costs. The documentation confirmed that information regarding funding arrangements and settings of placements would be delivered to applicants at the interview stage. In the programme and senior team meeting, it was confirmed that there would be commissioned and

privately funded places on the programme. The senior team stated that commissioned places would be awarded on a “first come, first served basis”, however the programme team stated that commissioned places were to be awarded based on performance at interview. The programme team also confirmed that the different funding routes would have differing additional costs for learners. The visitors noted that this information had not been provided on the official Glyndwr webpage for prospective learners and could not see the funding broken down in this way within the documentation. The visitors considered this information to be important for potential applicants and could affect their decision to apply or take up a place with the education provider. In order to meet the standard the education provider must ensure the information provided to applicants prior to interview is clear and thorough to allow informed decision-making.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate their commitment to the future of the programme irrespective of external funding, to enable the programme to remain sustainable.

Reason: The visitors noted from the meetings with the senior and programme team that the programme has been driven by the Welsh government which has led to commissioning of some of the learner places on the programme, with the rest of the cohort being made up of privately funded learners. The visitors were confident of the current provision for places and commitment from the relevant stakeholders to ensure the programme will run effectively as things stand. However, the visitors could not see a formal commitment from the university to the future of the programme irrespective of the external funding. This sustainability element of this standard is related to the support from senior management within education providers. The visitors need to view evidence demonstrating that the programme is not solely reliant on external funding and that there is relevant support from senior management irrespective of external stakeholder funding.

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 their process for ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning is effective.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were guided to the practice education handbook, programme validation document and a template of a local level agreement in order to evidence this standard. From these documents the visitors could not determine if the process was effective at ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were told that the education provider has confirmed practice-based learning placements for 26 learners and had a placement database in place. Similarly, in the practice educators meeting the educators were clear about their capacity to take learners from the programme. The visitors were confident in the communication between the practice education providers and the education provider, however they were not clear on the process for securing practice-based learning for all learners. From the documentation and meetings the visitors understood the process of ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning to be informal and so could not judge that the process is effective. The education provider must show that the process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners is effective.

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.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate what effective and formal process is in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the formal process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about safety and wellbeing of service users. At the visit, the visitors were told there are healthcare organisation whistleblowing policies that would allow learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. However, the visitors were unable to determine which policies learners would be expected to adhere to and how this will be communicated to them. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether there is a clear, definitive, formal process which supports and enables learners to raise such concerns. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about safety and wellbeing of service users.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will make learners and applicants aware of the exit awards, and that exit awards will not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the Register.

Reason: The visitors observed from the programme validation document that the education provider intends to offer two exit awards: the Certificate of Higher Education in Health Studies and the Diploma of Higher Education in Health Studies. In the same document the education provider stated that completing the full 360 credit BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme would mean learners are “able to register with the HCPC”. This wording contradicts the standard as learners are only eligible to apply for admission to the register upon completion of an approved programme. The education provider must ensure that the correct terminology is used throughout their documentation when referring to the HCPC. Furthermore, they must ensure that applicants and learners are made aware of the different awards and how they lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the register or not.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the formal process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners and service users and carers.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors could see the education provider state there would be a consent process for learners in specific activities, however the visitors were unable to see this process so could not judge its effectiveness. On the visit the programme lead confirmed to the visitors there would be a consent process to ensure learners’ personal circumstances are taken into consideration when completing the course. However, the visitors were not able to view

this process and so could not judge that it was effective. The education provider must show that there is an effective process in place for obtaining consent from learners and service users and carers.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Education provider | University of Huddersfield |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Paramedic Science, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 26 March 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-14148-K6G7B8 |

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..... | 5 |

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

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

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| David Whitmore | Paramedic |
| Matthew Catterall | Paramedic |
| Ian Hughes | Lay |
| Lawrence Martin | HCPC executive |
| Tracey Samuel-Smith | 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.

| | | |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Stephen White | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Huddersfield University |
| Michelle Cookson | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | Huddersfield University |
| Chris Moat | College of Paramedics | |
| Paul Eyre | College of Paramedics | |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Paramedic Science |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| Proposed first intake | 01 January 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02034 |

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 | Reasons for non-submission |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Programme specification | Yes | |
| Module descriptor(s) | Yes | |
| Handbook for learners | «Student_ handbook» | |
| 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 | No | The programme is new and therefore these are not available |

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

| Group | Met | Comments |
|---|------------|--|
| Learners | Yes | One learner met due to unexpected absence. |
| 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 05 June 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 they give the applicant the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on a programme.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors noted information about the admissions process within the Programme specification and in an MSc Paramedic Science (Pre-registration) Question and Answers document. The programme team explained it is university policy to only advertise programmes once they are approved by the regulator and the Programme specification and Question and Answer document would not be available to potential applicants. They also confirmed that draft advertising material was currently unavailable, though they had plans to develop an online prospectus following a similar style as the other health programmes within the university. From this, the visitors were unclear what information would be available to potential applicants to ensure they had all the information they required to make an informed choice about the programme. While the programme has not yet started advertising, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates the information which applicants will be given to make an informed choice about taking up the offer of a place on the programme.

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 entry standards, which are appropriate for the programme.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors noted information about the academic and professional entry standards within the Programme specification and

in an MSc Paramedic Science (Pre-registration) Question and Answers document. The programme team outlined that one audience for this programme were graduates with a first degree (or equivalent) in a relevant human or health related subject (such as health and social care). Within the Question and Answers document, the visitors noted the programme was partially aimed at graduates of a health science degree. This document went on to outline that relevant degrees would be considered if they were in a relevant human or health related subject. From the discussions and documents, the visitors noted differing information relating to the degree subject required for entry to the programme and which would be provided to potential applicants. The programme team explained it is university policy to only advertise programmes once they are approved by the regulator and that draft advertising material was currently unavailable. The visitors were therefore unclear of the academic entry standards, how these were applicable to the programme and how they were made available to potential applicants. The visitors require evidence that demonstrates how the academic entry standards are appropriate for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide up to date information about how the admissions process assesses the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Reason: In their review of the documentation, the visitors noted the Procedure for screening health and social care students (home, EU and international) with any previous and/or pending police involvement. During the final meeting, this was discussed with the education provider as this document had last been updated in March 2014 and the visitors noted out of date information relating to the relevant criminal conviction checks for applicants and information relating to the HCPC. The visitors also noted, in the appendix, lists of offences that would normally be incompatible with a health and social care programme, or which the School of Human & Health Sciences Criminal Records Disclosure Review Group would need to take into consideration. The visitors were unclear whether the revised HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics were reflected within this appendix and would be taken into consideration as part of the decision about whether to accept an applicant on the programme. The visitors therefore require up to date information which demonstrates how the admissions process assesses the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what health requirements applicants are expected to meet, how they are appropriate for the programme, and how applicants are made aware of these requirements.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors noted the Occupational Health Service Standards document which was applicable to the School of Human and Health Services. The visitors noted this was last updated in December 2012. During the visit, the visitors were provided with an updated version entitled 4.3 Occupational Health Policy (January 2018) which they were unable to review due to time constraints. The programme team explained it is university policy to only advertise programmes once

they are approved by the regulator and that draft advertising materials were currently unavailable. From this information the visitors were unclear whether the updated policy clearly outlined the health requirements to ensure a potential applicant could safely and effectively take part in the programme. In addition the visitors were unclear about how potential applicants were made aware of this policy and how this may impact them. For example about things which they would need to do before starting on the programme or aspects of the programme which may affect applicants with certain health conditions or disabilities in a different way. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates the health requirements applicants are expected to meet, how they are appropriate for the programme, and how applicants are made aware of these requirements.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the teaching and learning facilities available to the programme are sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors noted the Resource statements provided from the Dean of the School of Human and Health Service and Computer and library services outlining the materials / support available to the programme and learners. In addition, the Senior team confirmed their commitment to the programme and to the delivery of the appropriate resources. During the tour, the visitors saw the potential teaching space and learnt about plans for the refurbishment of this to create a bigger resource, which would be ready for the start of the programme in September 2019. The visitors were also informed about the current developments of a simulation suite in the Creative Arts Building. During the tour, the visitors learnt the programme would have access to these new rooms in 18 months. However, during the programme team meeting, the visitors were told architects were currently in the process of creating the simulation suite in the Creative Arts Building and this would be completed by September 2019. The visitors did not receive information about possible contingency plans should the teaching and simulation suites not be available for September 2019. From this information, the visitors were unclear about when appropriate and sufficient resources would be in place to deliver the programme. The visitors considered that if suitable teaching and simulation suites were not available for the start of the programme, there would be implications, including insufficient physical resources to be able to deliver the various aspects of the programme, including preparation for practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates the teaching and learning facilities are available for the start of the programme are sustainable and fit for purpose.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the commitment from all partner organisations to demonstrate the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider discussed the development of the programme and how stakeholders were engaged at an early stage. The Senior team explained how the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the provider and the main practice education provider, Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS), was in the process of being finalised. This would ensure the delivery of the ambulance practice-based learning and elements of the taught aspect of the programme. The representative from YAS explained how the YAS Academy works to ensure that

sufficient numbers of practice educators and visiting / seconded lecturers are available to the programme. The visitors did not receive a copy of the draft MOU or an indication of when it would be finalised. They were therefore unable to determine whether the agreement would ensure the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose around practice-based learning and delivery of teaching on the programme.

During the visit, the visitors were provided with a list of the non-ambulance practice education providers which would provide practice-based learning as part of the programme. The visitors did not meet with any representatives from these locations during the Practice education provider meeting and did not receive any further information about any agreements with these organisations to ensure availability.

Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the commitment from all partner organisations to deliver a programme which is sustainable and fit for purpose.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the structure for the day-to-day management of the programme, including the lines of responsibility of the teaching team.

Reason: Upon their review of the documentation, the visitors noted the Course handbook 2020 was draft and the sections to outline the programme team were to be updated. The visitors also noted a draft Governance Structure which outlined who / the roles which would be teaching each of the modules and the individual they reported to. At the visit, the visitors received an updated Course handbook 2020 which included details of the Lecturer Practitioners for the programme but not the programme leader. From this documentation, the visitors noted that two members of staff were currently responsible for all aspects of teaching on the programme. The Senior team confirmed the two Lecturer Practitioners had very recently been appointed full time Lecturers while the programme team, informed the visitors no programme leader was appointed at that time. The visitors were also informed there were vacancies within the programme team for two full time and two 0.5fte members of staff. The education provider had not commenced the recruitment process for these positions. Towards the end of the visit, the visitors received a role description for a Lecturer but due to time constraints, they were unable to review this and they were uncertain whether this was applicable to all four new roles, and / or the existing Lecturer positions. From this information, the visitors were unclear which roles would be responsible for aspects of the programme management, and for delivering the specific areas of the programme. This includes the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors therefore require further information regarding the day to day management of the programme including the lines of responsibility for the teaching team.

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 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.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider directed the visitors to the curricula vitae of the Lecturer Practitioners for the programme. However, the programme team informed the visitors a programme leader had not been appointed at that time and discussed some of the requirements of the programme leader role. Towards the end of the visit, the visitors received a role description for a lecturer but the visitors were unclear whether this was intended for the person with overall professional responsibility. However, due to time constraints, there was insufficient time to review this. Therefore the visitors were unclear of the skills and experience required by the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme and the actions which will be undertaken by the education provider to ensure they are appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

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 with all practice education providers.

Reason: When reviewing the initial documentation, the visitors noted that local agreements would include bi-annual meetings between the education provider and practice education providers. The Senior team explained how the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the education provider and the main practice education provider, Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS), was in the process of being finalised. The visitors did not receive a copy of the draft MOU or an indication of when it would be finalised. They were therefore unclear how the agreement will ensure regular collaboration between the two parties takes place and how the effectiveness of this collaboration will be monitored.

The visitors did not meet with any representatives from non-ambulance settings during the Practice education provider meeting. The Programme team explained there would be regular communication with non-ambulance settings, however, the visitors did not receive any evidence of how frequently meetings would occur and how their effectiveness will be monitored.

The visitors recognise that collaboration between the education provider and ambulance / non-ambulance settings may take many forms and inform strategy and operational aspects of the programme delivery differently. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how there will be regular and effective collaboration with all 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 ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors noted the draft Course handbook 2020 and the sections about the programme team were to be updated. At the

visit, the visitors received an updated Course handbook which included details of the Lecturer Practitioners for the programme but not the programme leader. From this documentation, the visitors noted that two members of staff were currently responsible for all aspects of the teaching on the programme. The Senior team confirmed that the two Lecturer Practitioners had very recently been appointed full time Lecturers. The programme team, informed the visitors a programme leader had not been appointed at that time. It was also discussed there were vacancies which would mean recruiting two full time and two 0.5fte members of staff. The latter of these would undertake some of the support activities, such as ensuring regular audits of practice-based learning. The education provider had not commenced the recruitment process for these positions and the visitors were unclear when this would commence.

Towards the end of the visit, the visitors received a role description for a Lecturer but due to time constraints, they were unable to review this and they were uncertain whether this was applicable to all four new roles, and / or the existing Lecturer positions. From this information, the visitors were unclear which roles would be responsible for aspects of programme management, and for delivering the specific areas of the programme. This includes the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme.

As there are only two Lecturers for the programme, the visitors considered it is important that appropriately qualified and experienced staff are in place for the start of the programme. The visitors considered that if for any reason this recruitment did not happen, there would be implications for the programme, including a strain on staff resources. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place for the start of the programme to deliver an effective 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 ensure the teaching and learning facilities to support learning in all settings are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and are accessible to all learners and educators.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors noted the Resource statements provided from the Dean of the School of Human and Health Service and Computer and library services outlining the materials / support available to the programme / learners. In addition, the Senior team confirmed their commitment to the programme and to the delivery of the appropriate resources. During the tour, the visitors saw the potential teaching space and learnt about plans for the refurbishment of this to create a bigger resource, which would be ready for the start of the programme in September 2019. The visitors were also informed about the development of a simulation suite in the Creative Arts Building which would be available in 18 months. However, during the programme team meeting, the visitors were told architects were currently in the process of creating the simulation suite in the Creative Arts Building and this would be completed by September 2019. The visitors did not hear about possible contingency plans should the teaching and simulation suites be unavailable in September 2019. From this information, the visitors were unclear about when effective and appropriate teaching and learning facilities will be in place to deliver the programme and how they will be available to learners and educators. The visitors considered that if

effective and appropriate teaching and simulation suites were not available for the start of the programme, there would be implications, including insufficient physical resources to be able to deliver the various aspects of the programme, including preparation for practice-based learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the teaching and learning facilities, when they will be in place and how they will be effectively used by learners and educators so they are appropriate to 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 ensure learners are able to learn with, and from learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: In the mapping, the education provider referenced the guest lecturers who will be teaching practice-based learning material. This was also discussed during the Practice education provider and Programme team meetings. The visitors were satisfied the learners would be able to learn from professionals from other professions. However, upon reviewing the documentation provided by the education provider, the visitors were unclear on the level of inter professional learning between learners from different professions. The programme team outlined that both year groups of the MSc programme would work together within simulated groups. The visitors noted this would mean learners would be learning from their peers rather than other professions. The programme team confirmed they were considering integrating sessions with nurses and operating department practitioners to simulate the full patient journey. From this information, the visitors were unclear how learners will be able to learn with, and from, other learners from relevant professions. The education provider must provide evidence about what inter professional learning is included within the programme, specifying how this ensures learners are able to learn with, and from, other 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 for obtaining appropriate consent throughout the programme for learners, including the impact of opting out.

Reason: In their mapping, the education provider noted that learners were expected to participate in simulation and consent to this. The programme team outlined that learners will be provided with the terms and conditions at the beginning of the programme and they would have an opportunity to opt out without detriment to their continuation on the programme. The programme team also confirmed they do not have a process in place for learners to confirm their consent (or not) and what happens when a learner opts out to ensure the appropriate learning is acquired. The visitors were therefore unclear how the education provider ensures the rights of individuals will be respected, and the risk of harm reduced, while ensuring that learners understand what will be expected of them as a health and care professional. The visitors require further clarity on the process for obtaining appropriate consent throughout the programme, including the impacts of opting out.

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 the structure, duration and range of non-ambulance practice-based learning supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency for all learners.

Reason: Upon reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted the ambulance practice-based learning would be provided by Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS) and that non-ambulance practice-based learning would be available. However, limited further information regarding the non-ambulance practice education providers was provided. During the visit, the visitors received a Practice Placement Profile – Audit Action Plan document detailing the locations of the non-ambulance placement-based learning. In the Practice education provider meeting, the visitors heard how practice-based learning will work with YAS, however, they were unable to hear from any practice education providers for the non-ambulance settings. The programme team confirmed that all learners will attend non-ambulance settings but these settings could be different for each learner. This may mean one learner attends a maternity setting while another attends a hospice. The visitors recognised this possibility, however, they were unclear about how this would work in practice to ensure all learners were able to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how non-ambulance placements will be incorporated into the programme to support the achievement of learning outcomes. In particular, the visitors require further clarity of the range of experiences provided, the minimum amount of non-ambulance settings a learner will be placed in, and how the variation in experiences gained amongst learners will still ensure all meet the learning outcomes set for this part of 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 how they ensure practice educators in all settings undertake regular training which is 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 both ambulance and non-ambulance settings. Ambulance placements would be completed through Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS) and non-ambulance placements would be through various settings organised via the education providers' placement team. The Practice education providers from YAS informed the visitors about the two hour workshop which they undertake for all their practice educators to ensure they are appropriately prepared to effectively support the learning and assessment of learners. They currently run this workshop for practice educators supervising learners from a number of other education providers within the region and will start to deliver this to individuals who will be supervising University of Huddersfield learners. In addition, the programme team outlined that refresher training was currently in development. From the Senior Team, the visitors learnt that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the education provider and YAS was in the process of being finalised. The visitors did not receive a copy of this and were unclear whether it covered the delivery of practice educator training by YAS, the content of the training and how frequently it was to be delivered. From this information, the visitors were unclear about

how the education provider ensured appropriate programme specific information was delivered to the practice educators in a timely and regular manner.

The visitors did not meet with any representatives from non-ambulance settings during the Practice education provider meeting. The visitors received no further information about how practice educators within non-ambulance practice-based learning received programme specific training in a regular and timely manner.

Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures that all practice educators receive regular training appropriate to the programme.

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: In the mapping document, the education provider referenced Practice Assessment Document (PAD) 1. The draft PADs for stages 2 and 3 were provided following confirmation the HCPC Panel would be reviewing the full programme, not just the first year. The visitors also noted the Practice Placement Handbook 2020 was also draft. The programme team confirmed these documents were being finalised.

As the PADs for stages 2 and 3 and the Practice Placement Handbook were 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, it was unclear who can sign off the competences (whether this could happen in both ambulance and non-ambulance practice-based learning), when a competence can be signed off and what mechanisms are in place for a failing learner. 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 how the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider referenced the Practice Assessment Document (PAD) 1. The draft PADs for stages 2 and 3 were provided following confirmation the HCPC Panel would be reviewing the full programme, not just the first year. The visitors also noted the Practice Placement Handbook 2020 was also draft. The programme team confirmed these documents were being finalised. As the PADs for stages 2 and 3 and the Practice Placement Handbook were not finalised, the visitors were unable to establish the assessment strategy and design for practice-based learning. For example, it was unclear what mechanisms are in place for a failing learner.

In the mapping document, the visitors learnt that failed modules could not be trailed into a subsequent stage. However, in the programme team meeting the visitors heard that learners could trail one module and that a course assessment board meets at the end of each stage to determine if a learner can progress to the next stage. From this information, the visitors were unclear of the number of resits learners are allowed (and within what time period) to ensure they meet the standards of proficiency.

The visitors therefore require further information which demonstrates how the assessment strategy, across the programme, ensures that those who successfully complete the programme, meet the standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider referenced Practice Assessment Document (PAD) 1. The draft PADs for stages 2 and 3 were provided following confirmation the HCPC Panel would be reviewing the full programme, not just the first year. The visitors also noted the Practice Placement Handbook 2020 was also draft. The programme team confirmed these documents were being finalised.

As the PADs for stages 2 and 3 and the Practice Placement Handbook were not finalised, the visitors were unable to establish the assessments within practice-based learning are consistently applied, fair to all and are an objective assessment of a learner's progression and achievement. For example, it was unclear who can sign off the competences (whether this could happen in both ambulance and non-ambulance practice-based learning) and what mechanisms are in place for a failing learner. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms used by the education provider to ensure assessments provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of a learners' progression and achievement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme and how these are communicated to learners.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider referenced Practice Assessment Document (PAD) 1. The draft PADs for stages 2 and 3 were provided following confirmation the HCPC Panel would be reviewing the full programme, not just the first year. The visitors also noted the Practice Placement Handbook 2020 was also draft. The programme team confirmed these documents were being finalised. As the PADs for stages 2 and 3 and the Practice Placement Handbook were not finalised, the visitors were unable to establish how learners and practice educators would be informed about what was expected of them during practice-based learning. For example, it was unclear who can sign off the summative and formative competences (whether this could happen in both ambulance and non-ambulance practice-based learning) and what mechanisms are in place for a failing learner.

In the mapping document, the visitors learnt that failed modules could not be trailed into a subsequent stage. However, in the programme team meeting the visitors heard that learners could trail one module with a course assessment board meeting at the end of each stage to determine if a learner can progress to the next stage. From this information, the visitors were unclear about when a learner can progress and how they will understand what is expected of them when moving between stages in the programme.

The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates how the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme and how these are communicated to learners.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the assessment methods relating to practice-based learning are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider referenced Practice Assessment Document (PAD) 1. The draft PADs for stages 2 and 3 were provided following confirmation the HCPC Panel would be reviewing the full programme, not just the first year. The visitors also noted the Practice Placement Handbook 2020 was also draft. The programme team confirmed these documents were being finalised. As the PADs for stages 2 and 3 and the Practice Placement Handbook were not finalised, the visitors were unable to confirm how these would be used to ensure the appropriate and effective measurement of learning outcomes. For example, it was unclear who can sign off the summative and formative competences (whether this could happen in both ambulance and non-ambulance practice-based learning) and what mechanisms are in place for a failing learner. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates how the assessment methods used in practice-based learning are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Education provider | Queen Margaret University |
| Name of programme(s) | Non Medical Prescribing, Part time |
| Approval visit date | 30 April 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-13746-J5Y7P2 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contents | |
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| 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:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Roseann Connolly | Lay |
| Janet Lawrence | Physiotherapist (Independent prescriber) |
| David Packwood | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| 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.

| | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|
| John Docherty-Hughes | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Queen Margaret University |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------|
| Programme name | Non Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | APP02033 |

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 | Comments |
|------------------------------|-----|---|
| Learners | Yes | This a new programme, so we met with learners on the education provider's prescribing module which is approved by the Nursing and Midwifery Council. |
| Senior staff | Yes | |
| Practice education providers | No | The education provider said that practice educators / designated medical practitioners are identified by the learners themselves prior to applying for the programme. As the programme has not yet been approved for allied health professionals (AHPs) they have not been able to identify any AHP practice educators who could contribute to this approval event. |

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| 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 June 2019.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors understood that the programme will be delivered by a range of staff including physiotherapists, podiatrists, independent nurse prescribers, pharmacists and pharmacologists. The education provider said they would make use of visiting lecturers to provide specialist allied health professions (AHP) expertise in prescribing. The education provider provided the details of five AHP staff members who will be contributing to the programme. Of those five staff, three of them have non-medical prescribing qualifications. The documentation stated that these three AHP staff with prescribing qualifications will have 'visiting lecturer hours as required'. The visitors were not clear how much contribution the AHP staff with prescribing qualifications will have on the programme. For example, in the Indicative Content NMP Contact Days document, the three AHP prescribers appeared to be included as a 'facilitator' on only a few of the sessions. The visitors noted that the legal / ethical / professional issues on prescribing was led by AHP staff members, however those staff did not have prescribing qualifications. The visitors considered this session may require specialist expertise and knowledge from a staff member with a prescribing qualification.

At the visit, the programme team discussed ways in which they aim to involve a range of practitioner colleagues in the programme to ensure specialist expertise and knowledge. The programme team said that the documentation provided was indicative,

and there is room for some changes. The programme team said that their AHP staff have close links to the visiting lecturers with prescribing qualifications, and so have the ability to call on their relevant knowledge and skills where required. The programme team also mentioned the nursing colleagues with prescribing rights, as well as the Designated Medical Professionals (DMPs) in practice, who they will be liaising with to draw on their expertise. The visitors agreed that there were sufficient AHP staff with prescribing qualifications who have involvement with the programme. However, it was not clear to the visitors how much these staff members will be contributing to the programme, which would ensure that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Therefore, the visitors require more evidence about the involvement of AHP prescribers on the delivery on the programme to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to ensure it contains relevant information and references for allied health professionals.

Reason: On reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that the documentation did not include many references to allied health professionals (AHPs) or the HCPC. The education provider currently offers a prescribing programme for nurses and midwives, which is approved by the Nursing and Midwifery Council. Some of the documentation provided for the proposed new programme, such as the Programme Specification and the 'NMP DMP Handbook' contained little reference to HCPC and AHPs throughout. Within the DMP Handbook, the visitor's noted that the reading list is predominantly nursing focused. In order to determine that AHPs on the new programme will effectively use resources to support learning in all settings, the visitors require evidence of updated programme documentation which contains up to date and relevant references to AHPs and HCPC where appropriate.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately identified and addressed.

Reason: The visitors understood that the proposed programme will allow admission of physiotherapists, podiatrists, dietitians, therapeutic radiographers and paramedics. The teaching staff for the programme includes physiotherapists and podiatrists, as well as staff from other professions such as nurses and pharmacologists. The visitors noted that there was no provision within the teaching team for dietitians, therapeutic radiographers or paramedics. The education provider currently does not have any paramedic programmes, and therefore learners from this profession will be new to the education provider. At the visit, the programme team discussed ways in which they intend to support paramedic learners. The programme team said there is potential to draw in other staff depending on the needs of the programme as it develops. The programme team also said that nursing colleagues have close relationships with paramedic teams, and if paramedic learners come onto the programme then they will be able to draw on that expertise.

From discussions at the visit, the visitors understood the programme team has had some discussions about how to support paramedic learners, however it was not clear to the visitors that there was a plan in place for when the programme is due to commence. At the visit, the visitors heard about how the AHP staff members from the professions of physiotherapy and podiatry will support the AHP professions on the programme. However, the visitors were not clear how the education provider plans to support learners on the programme who will not have input from teaching staff specific to their profession. As such, the visitors require further information about how the education provider will ensure the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately identified and addressed.

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.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider strengthens and develops the involvement of service users and carers in the programme, to ensure ongoing and meaningful involvement.

Reason: The visitors heard of the plans the education provider has in place to involve service users and carers once the programme is running. The visitors met with service users and carers who are currently involved with other allied health professions (AHP) programmes at the education provider, including physiotherapy and podiatry programmes. The programme team said they plan to involve these service users and carers in the delivery of the programme, through inviting them to speak to learners about their experiences. The service users and carers also told the visitors about these plans, and expressed some interest in being involved in other areas of the programme, such as the development stages.

The programme team spoke about ways in which they plan to develop service user and carer involvement on the programme, such as opportunities of involvement at the programme development stage. From the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors considered this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that this is still in the planning stage, and at this stage the education provider has plans to involve service users and carers only in the delivery of this programme. The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to develop and strengthen the involvement of service users and carers in other areas of the programme, such as within the ongoing development of the programme. In this way, the education provider can ensure ongoing and meaningful involvement in the programme to ensure this standard continues to be met.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider revises the DMP handbook to include clear requirements about the training for new designated medical practitioners.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider said that designated medical practitioners (DMPs) are provided with a specific handbook for their role. Individual discussion will take place between the programme team and DMP to ensure that their role is clear and they understand their responsibilities. From considering the information and through discussions at the visit, the visitors consider this standard is met. At this visit, the programme team clarified that any new DMP would have individual, face-to-face discussion with the programme team before starting their role. The visitors considered that this was not clearly reflected in the DMP handbook. As such, the visitors considered that as the initial discussion between DMP and programme team is only implied, there is a risk in future that this will no longer happen and DMPs may no longer receive appropriate training. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider ensures the requirements of training for the new DMPs are more clearly reflected in the DMP handbook, to ensure there continues to be appropriate training for all new DMPs.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Suffolk |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree apprenticeship), WBL (Work based learning) BA (Hons) Social Work, FT (Full time) BA (Hons) Social Work, PT (Part time) |
| Approval visit date | 30 April - 1 May 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-13316-L0J3L0 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 4 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review | 5 |

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:

| | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Diane Whitlock | Lay |
| Christine Stogdon | Social worker |
| Anne Mackay | Social worker |
| Tracey Samuel-Smith | 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.

| | | |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Mark Lyne | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Suffolk |
| Alison McQuin | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Suffolk |
| Kay Richards | Internal panel member | University of Suffolk |
| Chris Smith | Internal panel member | University of Suffolk |
| Angela Cobbold | Internal panel member | University of Suffolk |

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Mark Wheeler | Internal panel member | University of East London |
|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree apprenticeship) |
| Mode of study | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| Proposed First intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 52 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP01972 |

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.

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 July 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | 24 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02099 |

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provided informed us they intended to make changes to their BA (Hons) Social Work programmes alongside introducing a BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree apprenticeship) programme. The education provider confirmed learners from all three programmes would learn alongside each other until year 3. We therefore decided to re-approve the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes at the same visit.

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 July 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | 22 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02100 |

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider informed us they intended to make changes to their BA (Hons) Social Work programmes alongside introducing a BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree apprenticeship) programme. The education provider confirmed learners from all three programmes would learn alongside each other until year 3. We therefore decided to re-approve the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes at the same visit.

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 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 | External examiner reports were not received for the WBL programme as this is a new 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 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 June 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: For the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes, the education provider must ensure any information relating to costs for assessing the suitability of applicants is clearly outlined, to allow applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on a programme.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the Course Handbook from which they learnt that all learners would be required to complete an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Scheme (DBS) application. However, the visitors were unclear about whether applicants to the programmes would have access to this document and therefore this information. The programme team informed the visitors it was a requirement that learners undertake a yearly DBS check and that learners were responsible for covering any associated costs. The visitors were unclear about how potential applicants to the programmes would be aware of this process and the cost implication.

The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the information provided to applicants provides sufficient information for an individual to make an informed decision about costs prior to the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence that shows how potential applicants are made fully aware of the costs associated with the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes and demonstrate it is sufficient for applicants to make a considered choice about whether to accept a place on either programme.

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: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must ensure appropriate, clear 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 the documentation and website, the visitors could not find any information specifically relating to the admissions process for the degree apprenticeship programme. From the senior and programme team meetings, the visitors learnt the admissions process had been co-produced between the education provider and the employer. As part of this, the employer created a specific role brief for apprentices and sought expressions of interest from potential applicants. In conjunction with the education provider, the employer held information sessions that outlined the commitment necessary and expectations required of the programme. Once applicants had been identified by the employer, the education provider's standard application process applied. While the visitors received clear information about the education provider's process, they did not receive information relating to the full apprenticeship admissions process, including the information provided to applicants, within the employer setting.

The visitors also learnt the admissions process for assessing the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks, differs for the degree apprenticeship programme. As these applicants are employees, the employer has a specific process in place. However, the visitors did not receive information about this or how potential applicants would be made aware of this requirement and, for example, who would be required to pay for these checks.

As the content relating to the employer setting 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 the degree apprenticeship programme. This evidence must demonstrate it is sufficient for applicants to make a considered choice about whether to accept a place on the programme.

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

Condition: For the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes, the education provider must demonstrate the process for assessing the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the Course Handbook from which they learnt all learners would be required to complete an enhanced Disclosure and Baring Service (DBS) application. However, the visitors were unclear about whether applicants to the programmes would have access to this document and therefore this information. The programme team informed the visitors that it was a requirement that learners undertake this yearly and the process is currently moving from a paper exercise to an automatic

update. In addition the visitors learnt these checks must have been completed within the first fortnight of the programme. The visitors were unclear what the process was to ensure this occurred and if any changes to the process would be required with the move to the yearly automatic update. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification as to the process in place for assessing the suitability of applicants regarding criminal conviction checks.

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

Condition: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate the process in place for assessing the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks, and who is responsible for ensuring the process is completed.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were referred to the Course Handbook from which they learnt all learners would be required to complete an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) application. However, the visitors were unclear about whether applicants to the programme would have access to this document and therefore this information. In addition, the Course Handbook covers all three programmes, and the visitors were aware that a different process might be applicable to the degree apprenticeship programme as the applicant is an employee and hence, the employer's process might be applicable. From the practice educators, the visitors learnt this would be the situation, however, the visitors did not receive any further information relating to the employer's process for assessing the suitability of applicants or how the education provider ensures this is appropriate.

Due to the lack of clarity, the visitors were unsure of the process for dealing with applicants' criminal convictions checks and who would be responsible for assessing an applicants' suitability. Nor how the education provider retains overall responsibility for this area. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification as to the process in place for assessing the suitability of applicants regarding criminal conviction checks, and who is responsible for ensuring that the process is completed.

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

Condition: For the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes, the education provider must demonstrate how applicants are made aware of and comply with any health requirements, including the process to manage health related issues.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the Course Handbook from which they learnt an Occupational Health screening takes place prior to admission on the programme. However, the visitors were unclear about whether applicants to the programmes would have access to this document and therefore this information. The programme team confirmed applicants were consulted about additional needs which might be required and if necessary, the applicant would be asked to attend an Occupational Health screening. From the documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors were unclear about how the admissions process deals with any information provided through the Occupational Health screening, including how any issues are dealt with and how applicants are made aware of this process. The visitors therefore require further information which demonstrates how applicants are made aware of and comply with

any health requirements, and the education provider's process undertaken through Occupational Health screening to manage health related issues.

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

Condition: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate how applicants are made aware of and comply with any health requirements, and who is responsible for ensuring this occurs.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were referred to the Course Handbook from which they learnt an Occupational Health Screening takes place prior to admission on the programme. However, the visitors were unclear about whether applicants to the programmes would have access to this document and therefore this information. In addition, the Course Handbook covers all three programmes. The visitors were aware that a different process might be applicable to the degree apprenticeship programme as the applicant is an employee and hence, the employer's process might be applicable. From the practice educators, the visitors learnt this would be the situation, however, the visitors did not receive any further information relating to how the apprentice applicants were made aware of and complied with any health requirements of the programme. Due to the lack of clarity, the visitors were unsure what the process for this was. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification as to how applicants are made aware of and comply with any health requirements of the programme, and who is responsible for ensuring this occurs.

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 there is a process in place to identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for each of the programmes.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the three programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced and, on the relevant part of the Register. The senior team also informed the visitors there was an appraisal process in place to develop an individuals' responsibilities. However, the visitors did not receive any further information about this. They were therefore unable to determine whether it was appropriate to ensure the appointment of a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for each of the programmes is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must update the programme documentation to clearly outline the relevant policies and processes to ensure the effective and appropriate delivery of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the Course Handbook was applicable to all three programmes. The senior team confirmed the handbook had been designed in such a way because the learning outcomes were similar across all three and learners would be taught together for elements of the programmes. They therefore did not want to create separateness between the programmes.

The visitors were aware that different processes might be applicable to the degree apprenticeship programme as the learner is an employee and hence, the employer's processes might be applicable. From the practice educators, the visitors learnt this would be the situation. However, from their review of the Course Handbook, the visitors were unable to determine the specific information relating to the degree apprenticeship programme about:

- The process for receiving and responding to learner complaints;
- The process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learner conduct, character and health;
- The attendance policy and associated monitoring mechanisms; and
- The assessment policies surrounding progression and achievement, specifically surrounding the failing learner.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to update the programme documentation to clearly outline the relevant policies and processes for the degree apprenticeship programme to ensure the effective and appropriate delivery of the programme.

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

Condition: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate the process / processes for receiving and responding to learner complaints, including:

- Who is responsible for these; and
- How they work together to ensure they are thorough and effective.

Reason: From the Standards of education and training mapping document, the visitors identified that learner complaints would be dealt with in accordance with the university complaints procedure, which were received as an appendix. The visitors were also referred to the Course Handbook and Placement Handbook for the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes. The sections referred to in these documents focussed on the actions a learner should take if they witness an incident in practice rather than if they have a complaint about the programme. In addition, the visitors were aware that different processes might be applicable to the degree apprenticeship programme as the learner is an employee and hence, the employer's processes might be applicable. From the practice educators, the visitors learnt this would be the situation, however, it was unclear what the process was. In addition, the visitors were unclear about when the

education provider and employer policies would be applicable and how these processes worked together to ensure all complaints were dealt with appropriately. This meant the visitors were unclear about how apprentice learners would be informed of their rights, how and who to raise a concern with, and what possible outcomes there may be. The visitors therefore require further evidence about the process for receiving and responding to apprentice learner complaints, who is responsible for these, and how they work together to ensure they are thorough and effective.

3.16 There must be thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

Condition: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate the process / processes for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health, including:

- Who is responsible for this; and
- How they work together to ensure they are thorough and effective.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the Fitness to Practise Procedure which they identified applies to all learners enrolled on courses at the education provider which lead to professional registration. In addition, the visitors were referred to the Course Handbook and Placement Handbook for the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes. However, the visitors were aware that different processes might be applicable to the degree apprenticeship programme as the applicant is an employee and hence, the employer's processes might be applicable. From the practice educators, the visitors learnt this would be the situation, however, they did not receive further information about the process in place at the employer. It was therefore unclear whose process would be enacted and when, should there be a need to reassess the suitability of an apprentice learner. In addition, the visitors were unclear about how any employer and education provider processes work together to ensure the reassessment is undertaken appropriately. This meant the visitors were unclear about how apprentice learners would be informed of their rights, what support was available and what possible outcomes there might be. The visitors therefore require further evidence about the process / processes for assessing the ongoing suitability of apprentice learners' conduct, character and outline, who is responsible for this, and how they work together to ensure they are 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 the formal processes to obtain consent from learners when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching and for managing situations when learners decline from participating.

Reason: From the Standards of education and training mapping document, the visitors discovered that learners are asked to complete a Learners Consent Form in the first few weeks of commencing the programmes. From this, the visitors identified that any consent given was time limited, usually for 12 months. The programme team confirmed the Learners Consent Form had been omitted from the Course Handbook for this year. From learners, the visitors heard about recent experiences from some who had undertaken a large role play, were not asked for their consent beforehand and did not feel fully informed about the activity. The learners did not appear to be aware of the policy in place.

The Learners Consent Form includes the statement 'I understand that not giving consent now or in the future will deem that I have decided not to continue in these studies'. The programme team confirmed the key modules when consent from learners is required as it is necessary for assessment against the learning outcomes. The visitors were unclear about this as the statement and discussions did not take into account factors such as cultural differences nor a learner's physical or mental health and how that may change over the course of a programme or year. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence, which demonstrates the following:

- the formal protocols in place for obtaining consent from learners;
- how learners are informed about the requirement for them to participate; and
- the circumstances under which alternative learning arrangements can be put in place where learners do not consent to participation as a service user and what such arrangements would usually be.

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: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must identify to learners the relevant policies, including the consequences of non-attendance on the programme.

Reason: From the Course Handbook, the visitors discovered that learners are expected to fully attend all scheduled sessions and engage with all other learning activities. The visitors were clear about the monitoring aspects for the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes. However, the visitors were aware that different processes might be applicable to the degree apprenticeship programme as the learner is an employee and hence, the employer's processes might be applicable. From the practice educators, the visitors learnt this would be the situation. However, it was unclear about whose process would be applicable to an apprentice learner and when. The programme team confirmed that the attendance policy, including monitoring, would be the same for all three programmes. However, there would be further consequences if an apprentice learner did not attend due to the nature of their employment contract. The visitors did not receive any further information relating to the employer policies about these differing consequences. They were therefore unsure how apprentice learners would be made aware of the requirements and any consequences of missing compulsory parts of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence applicable to the degree apprenticeship programme, including the possible consequences of non-attendance.

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: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate how the structure and range of practice-based learning supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the Employment Based Practice Learning (Route 2) module descriptor. In this they discovered all learners must have assessed practice based learning in at least two contrasting settings in years 2 and 3. The senior team outlined a rotational structure to deliver practice based learning. For example, in year 1, apprentice learners undertake practice-based learning in the same directorate as their

employment, though in a different team. In year 2, apprentice learners move services and undertake practice-based learning outside their employment directorate. In year 3, they return to their employment directorate, though to a different team. However, the visitors were unable to locate this level of detail within the documentation to apprentice learners, practice educators or the employer. In addition they were unable to locate a rationale for this model. They were therefore unsure about how the structure and range of practice-based learning supports the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers. As such the visitors require further documented evidence of the structure and range of practice based learning for apprentice learners, and how it is appropriate to support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs for social workers.

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: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design for the End Point Assessment (EPA) ensures those who successfully complete the programme meet the relevant standards of proficiency.

Reason: In the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Definitive Course Record for the degree apprenticeship programme. In this, the visitors identified all learners on the course undertake the EPA to complete their degree. The Course Handbook outlines how gaining 300 credits on the programme acts as a gateway to the EPA. The programme team confirmed this and clarified that the employer makes a decision about whether an apprentice learner proceeds to the EPA once they have reached the gateway. If the employee decides the apprentice should not continue, they are offered an exit award which is not approved and means they will be ineligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, the visitors could not locate the level of detail provided by the programme team within the documentation. As such, they were unsure about the rationale for the gateway decision as it appeared to be in addition to the standard education provider assessment strategy. In addition, the visitors were unclear about the circumstances in which the employer might decide whether the learner proceeds onto the EPA or not. From this, they were unclear of the assessment strategy for progression onto the EPA and what criteria are considered when making this decision. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the assessment strategy and design for the EPA ensures those who successfully complete the programme meet the relevant standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate how they intend to deliver the assessment of the End Point Assessment (EPA) to ensure an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: In the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Framework and the External Examiners Policy. From their review of these documents, the visitors were clearly able to see the University regulations around assessment and the programme team discussed the arrangements in place for the End

Point Assessment (EPA). Their intention is to engage with local education providers running degree apprenticeship programmes so each can review another providers EPA modules. This will ensure the independence required by the Institute for Apprenticeships (IFA). The programme team also confirmed they are currently considering how this will work as they are not registered as an EPA assessment organisation and need to build relationships with local providers. The programme team also confirmed there was sufficient time to develop this as the EPA was in year 3 of the programme. No further information was provided about the discussions to date or provisional plans which demonstrated how the education provider intends to work with other local providers, including who will be making the decisions and how is this managed to ensure the assessments are objective, fair and reliable.

The visitors noted that the standards of education and training (SETs) do not require an education provider to be an EPA assessment organisation or ensure independence through this assessment. Rather the SETs require all assessments within a programme to be an objective, fair and reliable measure of progression and achievement. They also noted that the approval process requires programmes to be able to meet all the SETs before a programme can gain approval and that there are many different ways in which to meet them. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider intends to deliver the assessment of the EPA to ensure it is an objective, fair and reliable measure of a learners' progression and achievement.

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

Condition: For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate clear requirements for progression and achievement, specifically around the failing learner, and how these are communicated to all relevant stakeholders.

Reason: In the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Course Handbook and Placement Handbook for the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes. From these documents, the visitors could clearly see the assessment policies for the BA (Hons) Social Work programmes but not for the degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors were aware that different processes might be applicable to the degree apprenticeship programme as the learner is an employee and hence, the employer's processes might be applicable. From the senior team, the visitors heard about the three way meeting between the apprentice learner, education provider and employer and about the capacity within the programme, to retake modules if necessary. The practice educators talked through possible options which may be applicable to a failing apprentice learner depending on different circumstances. However they also confirmed there was a need to finalise this process. From this information, the visitors were unclear of the policies surrounding a failing apprentice learner and how they, and practice educators, are made aware of these. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates clear requirements for progression and achievement, specifically around the failing apprentice learner, and how these are communicated to all relevant stakeholders.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of East Anglia |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Degree Apprenticeship, Flexible |
| Approval visit date | 01 – 02 May 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-14341-H3Y1N5 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 4 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation..... | 5 |

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

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

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Rebecca Khanna | Occupational therapist |
| Joanna Goodwin | Occupational therapist |
| Manoj Mistry | Lay |
| Patrick Armsby | 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 – Professor of Interprofessional Practice, Norwich Medical School |
| Dawn Goff | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of East Anglia |

| | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| Marnie Smith | Royal College of Occupational Therapy (RCOT) Panel Member | Plymouth University – Programme Lead for BSc in Occupational Therapy |
| Ruth Heames | Royal College of Occupational Therapy (RCOT) Panel Member | Coventry University – Principal Lead, Post Graduate Strategy Unit, Vice-Chancellor’s Office |
| Suzie Boyd | Royal College of Occupational Therapy (RCOT) Panel Member | RCOT – Education officer |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Degree Apprenticeship |
| Mode of study | FLX (Flexible) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | APP02052 |

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:

| Group | Met | Comments |
|---|-----|--|
| Learners | Yes | The panel met learners from the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme that is delivered by the education provider and approved by the HCPC. |
| 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 27 June 2019.

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 that they have an effective process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme.

Reason: In order to evidence this standard before the visit, the education provider directed the visitors to the CV of the current programme lead. From this the visitors were able to confirm that the current programme lead is appropriately qualified and experienced. However they were unable to confirm how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall is appropriately qualified and experienced on a continuous basis. The CV provided only allowed the visitors to make a judgement on an individual basis. In the senior and programme team meeting the visitors questioned

about how a potential replacement for programme lead would be made and how the education provider would ensure they were appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors were told that should a replacement be required, members of staff on the teaching team would share work duties between themselves and various members would “step up” to ensure the work would be carried out. While this approach may work in practice, the visitors found it to be heavily based on personal relationships rather than an established process and so could not confirm that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme will consistently be appropriately qualified and experienced. In particular, the visitors did not receive any evidence which articulates the requirements for fulfilling this role, or what the appointment process for this role would be. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to demonstrate that policies and procedures are in place which ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified, experienced and from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are appropriate.

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.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider have their own process to assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Reason: In the documentary submission prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear on the how the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check was being monitored by the education provider. The documentation highlighted that the DBS check was carried out by the employer and the education provider would have access to this information. However, the documentation also suggested that the education provider would carry out their own DBS check as part of the admissions process. The visitors were able to clarify in the programme team meeting that the DBS check would be carried out by the employer and would in turn “assure” the university of the status of learners. The visitors were comfortable that this did meet the standard at threshold level but were unsure of the exact process how the employer “assures” the education provider. The visitors recommend that the education formalises the exact mechanism for ensuring that all applicants are suitable and have completed the relevant criminal conviction checks.

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Education provider | Wiltshire College & University Centre |
| Validating body | Oxford Brookes University |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Honours) Social Work, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 25-26 April 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-14338-X9X3B3 |

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..... | 9 |

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:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| David Childs | Social worker |
| Luke Tibbits | Social worker |
| Joanne Watchman | Lay |
| 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.

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------------|
| Dominic Corrywright | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Wiltshire College |
| Ailsa Clarke | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | Wiltshire College |
| Maxine Fletcher | Internal panel member | Wiltshire College |
| Lucy Turner | Internal panel member | Wiltshire College |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Honours) Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| Proposed first intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02048 |

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 | Not Required | The programme is new so external examiner reports were not available. |

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

| Group | Met | Comments |
|----------|-----|---|
| Learners | Yes | The programme is new so we met with learners from the education provider's previous HCPC-approved social work programme, which is no longer admitting learners. |

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Senior staff | Yes | |
| Practice education providers | Yes | |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | Yes | |
| Programme team | Yes | |
| Facilities and resources | Yes | |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 28 June 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 how they will ensure that applicants understand that they will be required to pay for their own DBS check.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including information about the admissions process and materials that would be available to applicants. From this information the visitors were aware that applicants would be expected to pay for their own Disclosure & Barring Service (DBS) check. However, it was not clear to the visitors where this would be communicated to applicants. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that this would be communicated at an induction day, by means of a slide in a PowerPoint presentation. However, they considered that this might not ensure that all applicants were fully aware of the arrangements around funding of DBS checks, and that the information was not being provided early enough in the process to ensure that applicants were able to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all applicants have access to information about the funding of DBS checking as early as possible in the process.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they define relevant experience in their entry requirements, and how such experience is assessed.

Reason: The visitors were aware from their review of documentation that the entry criteria for the programme included a requirement for “relevant experience”. The visitors were not clear from the documentation how the education provider would determine what would constitute relevant experience for an applicant to the programme, and how they would ensure that all applicants were treated equitably in this process. In discussions with the programme team they were informed that this would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, if necessary in consultation with practice-based learning partners, but the visitors were not able to view evidence demonstrating that there was a clear process which could ensure equity. They were therefore unable to determine whether the selection and entry criteria included appropriate academic and professional entry standards, and require further evidence demonstrating that the education provider meets this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they will proceed if an applicant is found to have a criminal record, and must demonstrate that this process is suitable.

Reason: The visitors were aware from their review of documentation that the education provider required criminal conviction checks for all learners coming on to the programme. It was not clear from this documentation what steps the education provider would take if a DBS check highlighted past criminal convictions. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that such cases would be dealt with via a discussion among the programme team, and if necessary liaison with local authorities. However, the visitors considered that the arrangements appeared to be informal, and were not set out anywhere. As a result, they could not determine that an appropriate process was in place, and require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider will assess the suitability of applicants with criminal convictions, including how they will ensure that this is done equitably.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they will proceed if an applicant has a health issue that may affect their participation in the programme, and must demonstrate that this process is suitable.

Reason: The visitors were aware from their review of documentation that the education provider required health and wellbeing checks for all learners coming on to the programme. It was not clear from this documentation what steps the education provider would take if these checks flagged issues that may affect participation in the programme. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that such cases would be dealt with via a discussion among the programme team, and if necessary, liaison with local authorities. However, the visitors considered that the arrangements appeared to be informal, and were not set out anywhere. As a result,

they could not determine that an appropriate process was in place, and require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider will proceed if health checks raise issues that may affect participation in the programme, including how they will ensure that this is done equitably.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programme is sustainable.

Reason: From their documentary review, the visitors were aware that there was a strategic plan in place for Wiltshire College. From this document and from discussions at the visit they understood that the education provider had plans to expand its higher education (HE) provision, and that this programme was one of the first parts of that planning. However, they were not provided with evidence showing that there were measures in place specifically to ensure the sustainability of the BA (Hons) Social Work. They were therefore unable to make a judgment about the sustainability of the programme. They were given verbal reassurances in the senior team meeting that the programme would be supported at a high level but were not shown specific evidence relating to this. They require the education provider to demonstrate that the programme would be sustainable.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriate.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leader for the programme, and her HCPC registration details. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individual who will have overall professional responsibility of the programme. The visitors noted that the staff member identified was appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, the visitors did not see documentary evidence of the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that appropriate agreements are in place with their practice education partners.

Reason: The visitors viewed documents relating to the Programme Management Committee (PMC), which gives programme stakeholders the opportunity to feed into the programme. They considered that this was a useful and appropriate mechanism for collaboration between the education provider and the stakeholders. However, they also noted that the education provider used Memoranda of Co-operation (MoCs) to define their relationships with the local authorities in Somerset and Wiltshire. The MoCs they had seen in the documentation dated from 2012, when the education provider was running a different social work programme validated by Bath Spa University. In discussions with the senior team the visitors heard about high-level discussions with local authorities, but considered that they needed to see further evidence relating to the outcomes of such discussions. The visitors considered that given the time that had elapsed, and the fact that a new programme was being approved, there was a risk that these MoCs were no longer fit for purpose, and that therefore the collaboration between the education provider and practice-based learning partners would no longer be regular and effective. They require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure regular and effective collaboration.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including curriculum vitae for the Programme Leader and a Lecturer, who are planned to deliver the programme for its first two years. They understood that further recruitment of staff would take place in time for the third year of the new programme, that is, for the 2021-22 academic year. From the documentation the visitors noted that Lorraine Simpson, the programme leader, was scheduled to be the module lead for eight modules. This appeared to them to be a lot for one person to cover, especially if that individual also had programme leader responsibilities. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were given assurances that other individuals would be given the responsibility for some of the modules, but these individuals had not yet been confirmed. They were therefore not able to determine whether subject areas would be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise and require further evidence demonstrating that this will be the case.

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 there is adequate appropriate teaching space available for the programme.

Reason: During a tour of the education provider's facilities, the visitors viewed a number of rooms and spaces that would be available for teaching and learning. However, it was not clear to the visitors from the conversations they had with staff that there would be sufficient space set aside for the exclusive use of social work learners to ensure that the programme was fit for purpose. By the time of the third year of this programme there might be as many as sixty learners needing space and it was not clear to the visitors that this number could be accommodated. They were given

conflicting information on how often one room was used by other staff and learners. The visitors were shown another space that was open to the college's main reception and stairway and so was likely to be very noisy for large parts of the working day. The programme team gave the visitors assurances that there had been discussions with the college leadership about acquiring more teaching and learning spaces, but the visitors were not shown records or outcomes of these discussions. They therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that sufficient learning and teaching spaces would be available for the programme.

3.16 There must be thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have a process in place for ensuring that learners on the programme retain their fitness to practice.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard and asked the programme team about how they would ensure that learners on the programme met HCPC standards for registration and expectations of professional behaviour. From the documentation it was not clear that there was a process for ensuring that learners' conduct, character and health continued to be suitable. The visitors saw a generic fitness to study policy, but this did not cover the same areas as the standard requires. It did not, for example, cover learners' understanding of their professional responsibilities or of the specific conduct requirements of their profession. The programme team informed the visitors that there was a fitness to practice policy, but the visitors did not see a copy. In the meeting with learners, the learners did not appear to be aware of this policy. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence to demonstrate that there are thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring learners' conduct, character and health.

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 provided for this standard, and asked the programme team about their plans for interprofessional education (IPE). The documentation supplied a very brief narrative of the kind of IPE activities that the education provider anticipated providing in various modules. However, the visitors could not see evidence of how the education provider would ensure that all learners had appropriate opportunities to learn with, and from, other learners and professionals. They could also not determine how the education provider had made decisions about designing and delivering IPE to make it as relevant as possible. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were told about some IPE activities that had previously taken place, but it was not clear whether these activities were routine and whether all learners had access to them. They were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met and require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider will ensure access to appropriate IPE for all learners.

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 will ensure that both learners and service users give informed consent where it is appropriate that they do so.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including the Practice Education Handbook (PEH). In this document it states to learners that appropriate consent must be obtained before their practice is observed. However, the visitors were not clear how the education provider could ensure that such consent was obtained. For example, it was not clear whether there was a mechanism for recording that consent had been given. It was also unclear how the education provider would ensure that this consent was fully informed. In discussions, the practice educators appeared to be unclear about how this process worked. The visitors therefore could not be satisfied that the process was effective. In addition they were not provided with evidence about how learners were enabled to give consent where appropriate, and the programme team were not able to clarify this in discussion. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how learners and service users are enabled to give informed consent where appropriate.

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

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Winchester |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work (Apprenticeship), Full time |
| Approval visit date | 30 April – 1 May 2019 |
| Case reference | CAS-13327-L7G8B1 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Gary Dicken | Social worker in England |
| Kate Johnson | Social worker in England |
| Mohammed Jeewa | 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.

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------|
| Gary Jones | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Winchester |
| Sabrina Higgins | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Winchester |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work (Apprenticeship) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP01984 |

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 June 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: The visitors noted that the entry requirements, programme information and admissions procedure for the BA (Hons) Social Work (Apprenticeship) were contained within the submission document. The visitors also reviewed the weblink provided in the mapping document leading to the education provider's website. However, the content was related to the current BSc (Hons) Social Work programme only and there was no information available regarding the proposed BA (Hons) Social Work (Apprenticeship) programme. The visitors were unclear how applicants would have access to the submission 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 a social work employee to the programme. The nominated applicant is then screened by the education provider and referred to the assessment centre for a written test and interview. The visitors were told that the information regarding this process is available on the intranet portal of the local authorities with whom they have a partnership. The visitors could not see how learners and the education provider are made aware of this process. As this content was not available for review by the visitors, they were unable to determine whether the information 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 that is available to potential applicants 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

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 for the BA (Hons) Social Work (Apprenticeship) programme.

Reason: From their review of the programme's documentation, the visitors were made aware of the academic and professional entry criteria requirements for the BA (Hons) Social Work (Apprenticeship). However, at the visit during the senior team meeting, the visitors were made aware that the academic criteria requirements did not exist and are yet to be agreed. The visitors were therefore not clear what the academic entry criteria requirements will be for this programme and how will this be clearly demonstrated to the applicants. The education provider must provide evidence of the academic entry requirements agreed between them and the employer, and demonstrate how they will this information be conveyed to learners.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is a process in place for assessing the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Reason: From the information provided in the programme handbook, the visitors understood that as part of the admissions process, all learners must complete the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) paperwork prior to the commencement of the programme. It was also noted in the programme handbook that the education provider cannot accept a previous DBS Disclosure form from learners; no matter how recent it was, as it is not applicable to the programme the learners will enrol onto. However, in discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that the education provider will not need a new DBS as it is done through the employer, and any learners without a DBS will not necessarily have to provide one until the end of year one on the programme. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors were unclear what the process is for dealing with applicants' criminal convictions checks and who would be responsible for assessing applicants' suitability. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification as to the process in place for assessing the suitability of applicants regarding criminal conviction checks, and who is responsible for ensuring that the process is completed.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide information regarding the partnership board structure clarifying the roles and responsibilities including the working relationship between them and the local authorities.

Reason: The visitors were aware from programme documentation that the proposed BA (Hons) Social Work (Apprenticeship) programme will be a partnership between the education provider and their local authority partners. The visitors noted that the documentation demonstrated sufficient information about university management structures and lines of responsibility that exist internally. However, from reviewing the documentation, the visitors were unclear about who will manage what aspects of the programme in the collaborative partnership between the education provider and local authorities.

At the visit, the education provider explained that a partnership board structure would be constituted with representatives from the education provider and local authorities. This board would provide strategic oversight and direction to the management and further development of the programme. However, whilst the visitors understood its importance, they received no evidence regarding how the board will be established and governed, and how it fits into the overall management of the programme. The education provider acknowledged that further detail in this area was still to be determined. Given these findings, the visitors require further evidence regarding the partnership board structure and how it will operate. In particular, the visitors require evidence that clearly explains the role and remit of the board members, how it will be formally operated and who will control what aspects 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 clarifying what information will be contained in the final version of the programme and practice learning handbook.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme handbook and practice-based learning handbook submitted as part of the visit documentation. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that both the handbooks seen by the visitors were draft versions and the final content had not yet been finalised. The programme team also confirmed that the final version of both handbooks would be finalised in collaboration with the practice educators. The visitors considered that both these handbooks were an important resource to support learning, and the lack of clarity about their contents meant that it was not possible to determine if this standard has been met. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing what information will be provided in the programme handbook and practice-based learning handbook, and how this information effectively supports learning in all settings for educators and learners.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must provide up-to-date module descriptors and programme handbook to demonstrate how the curriculum remains relevant to current practice.

Reason: On review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted some of the module descriptors were not up-to-date and contained some inaccuracies. For example, the indicative reading section of module SW1004 contains no published updates since 2015, and there is a reference to the College of Social Work, which does not currently exist, on page 160. The programme team said that the module descriptors will need updating and are currently work in progress. Additionally, as mentioned above under standard 3.12, the programme team confirmed that the programme handbook provided is not the final version and will need updating as the final content is yet to be finalised. As the visitors have not seen the final version of the module descriptors and programme handbook for the proposed programme, the visitors could not determine if the programme curriculum is relevant to current practice. Therefore, the education provider must provide updated module descriptors and programme handbook in order for the visitors to determine if the 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 provide evidence of the formal process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, the education provider referred to the consent form for student/service user participation document, under appendix 1 to evidence this standard. The title of the form does suggest it is for service users and learners, but the content and wording of the form refers to learners only. In a review of the evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how the form constitutes as a consent form for service users. The form spoke about how learners are encouraged to engage in all aspects of the programme and the option of them opting out, should they wish to but there was no guidance or relevant information regarding service users. As such, the visitors were not clear how service users would be enabled to give appropriate consent and noted that having the word 'service users' in the title of the form could be misleading. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate the process regarding how they will get appropriate consent from service users who interact with learners, including consent gained in practice-based learning environments.

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 clarify the structure of practice-based learning, to demonstrate that it supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to see information regarding the structure of the programme. At the visit, the programme team informed the visitors that the final version of the practice-learning handbook is yet to be finalised. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how learners would have access to the practice-based learning element of the programme, which supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers. Additionally, the visitors could also not determine what the structure of the practice based learning for this programme will be, in particular in relation to the placement in the first year and how will learners progress during year one and the following years. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating the structure of practice-based learning, how learners will progress during practice-based learning and how will this support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

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: The evidence provided for this standard was a weblink to the practice partners information portal consisting electronic handbooks, assessment templates and practice timetables for various programmes. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors could not find any information regarding the BA (Hons) Social Work (Apprenticeship) programme.

Linked to the condition for SET 3.12, the visitors were informed that the practice learning handbook final version is yet to be finalised in collaboration with the practice educators. Due to this, the visitors were unclear how the education provider will prepare learners and practice educators with the information they need for practice-based learning. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence demonstrating when practice-based learning will be delivered to learners and practice educators, and how the information will be appropriate to prepare all parties for practice-based learning.

6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner 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 clarify the process and criteria for appointing an external examiner.

Reason: The visitors were not able to find any relevant information regarding external examiner appointments, as there was no mention of this standard nor any evidence found in the documentation provided. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that an external examiner has been recruited, but cannot formally be offered the position until the programme is validated by the university in May. They also explained that the person being nominated for the external examiner position is an experienced social work academic at Kingston University and is on the HCPC register. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence relating to the process of appointing a suitable external examiner for the programme, for example a person specification or job description, and so were not able to be certain that the standard was met. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the policy in place to appoint an external examiner and how the education provider can ensure that an appropriate person is selected for this position.

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.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening how they ensure learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors noted that there were examples of interprofessional learning where learners can learn with and from others and therefore this standard was met at threshold level. However, to ensure that the programme continues to ensure learners benefit from learning with and from others in relevant professions, the visitors recommend that the education provider consider how they can develop and explore further opportunities for interprofessional learning.