

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	Master of Podiatry (MPod), Full time BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration), Full time Master of Physiotherapy (MPhys), Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Approval visit date	28-29 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15871-R0G5R0

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	5
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	6

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist
Wendy Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive (observer)

### Other groups involved in the virtual 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.

Brigid Daniel	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Queen Margaret University
Dawn Martin	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Queen Margaret University
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Janet Webber	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Dr Allan Wood	Professional body representative	College of Podiatry
James Coughtrey	Professional body representative	College of Podiatry

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Podiatry (MPod)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	POM – Administration, POM - Sale / Supply (CH)
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50 (shared with BSc (Hons) Podiatry and MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02206

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	POM – Administration, POM - Sale / Supply (CH)
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50 (shared with Master of Podiatry (MPod) and MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02207

Programme name	MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	POM – Administration, POM - Sale / Supply (CH)
First intake	01 September 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50 (shared with BSc (Hons) Podiatry and Master of Podiatry (MPod))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02238

Programme name	Master of Physiotherapy (MPhys)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 95 (shared with BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02208

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 95 (shared with Master of Physiotherapy (MPhys) and MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02209

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 95 (shared with BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02239

We undertook this assessment of new programmes proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involved consideration of documentary evidence and a virtual approval visit, to consider whether the programme 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 ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Type of evidence	Submitted
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements	Yes
Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning	Yes
Proficiency standards mapping	Yes
Information provided to applicants and learners	Yes
Information for those involved with practice-based learning	Yes
Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme	Yes

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

Group	Met	Comments
-------	-----	----------

Learners	Not Required	As the visit was virtual and the visitors were able to determine through the programme documentation, that many of the standards had been met, they decided it was unnecessary to meet with this group.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Not Required	As the visit was virtual and the visitors were able to determine through the programme documentation, that many of the standards had been met, they decided it was unnecessary to meet with this group.
Facilities and resources	Not Required	As the visit was virtual and the visitors were able to determine through the programme documentation, that many of the standards had been met, they decided it was unnecessary to have a tour of the facilities and resources.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

### Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider making it clearer in the documentation that practice educators must undertake regular training, relevant to the physiotherapy programmes.

**Reason:** For the physiotherapy programmes, the visitors noted on page 55 of the validation document that practice educators 'normally' undertake regular training. From querying this prior to the visit, the education provider had confirmed in their response that practice educators are encouraged to attend regular training and a record of this is maintained in a database, managed by the Practice Placement Support Team. During their meeting with practice educators at the visit, the visitors were convinced that practice educators are required to attend regular training which is appropriate to their role for the physiotherapy programmes and determined that this standard is met at threshold. However, the visitors could not see in the documentation explicitly saying that attending regular training is mandatory for these practice educators. Therefore, the visitors would like to suggest if the wording is made clear in the documentation to reflect practice educators 'must' attend regular training in line with the requirement of this standard.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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 is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met, and that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 2020 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	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	Master of Radiography: Diagnostic (MDRad), Full time BSc (Hons) Radiography: Diagnostic, Full time MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Full time Master of Radiography: Therapeutic (MTRad), Full time BSc (Hons) Radiography: Therapeutic, Full time MSc Therapeutic Radiography (Pre-registration), Full time
Approval visit date	28 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15884-V7W9R0

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	5
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	7

### 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:

Amy Taylor	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

### Other groups involved in the virtual approval visit

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

Brigid Daniel	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Queen Margaret University
Siobhan Mack	Deputy chair (supplied by the education provider)	Queen Margaret University
Dawn Martin	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Queen Margaret University
Kathy Burgess	College of Radiographers panel member	College of Radiographers – professional body



Ian Henderson	College of Radiographers panel member	College of Radiographers – professional body
---------------	---------------------------------------	--

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Radiography: Diagnostic (MDRad)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50 (Shared with BSc (Hons) Radiography: Diagnostic and MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02210

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography: Diagnostic
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50 (Shared with Master of Radiography: Diagnostic (MDRad) and MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) )
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02211

Programme name	MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50 (Shared with BSc (Hons) Radiography: Diagnostic and Master of Radiography: Diagnostic (MDRad))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02236

Programme name	Master of Radiography: Therapeutic (MTRad)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22 (Shared with BSc (Hons) Radiography: Therapeutic and MSc Therapeutic Radiography (Pre-registration))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02212

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography: Therapeutic
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22 (Shared with Master of Radiography: Therapeutic (MTRad) and MSc Therapeutic Radiography (Pre-registration))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02213

Programme name	MSc Therapeutic Radiography (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22 (Shared with BSc (Hons) Radiography: Therapeutic and Master of Radiography: Therapeutic (MTRad))
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02237

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involved consideration of documentary evidence and a virtual approval visit, to consider whether the programme 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 ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Type of evidence	Submitted	Comments
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements	Yes	
Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning	Yes	
Proficiency standards mapping	Yes	
Information provided to applicants and learners	Yes	

Information for those involved with practice-based learning	Yes	
Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme	Yes	
Internal quality monitoring documentation	Not Required	Only requested if the programme (or a previous version) is currently running

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	The panel met learners from the approved MSc Diagnostic Radiography (preregistration) programme.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	No	The visitors were able to determine that many of the standards were met prior to the visit. They determined it was not necessary to meet this group in order to understand how the other standards would be met.
Facilities and resources	No	The visitors were able to determine that many of the standards were met prior to the visit. They determined it was not necessary to meet this group in order to understand how the other standards would be met.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

### Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should seek wider feedback from practice education providers.

**Reason:** The visitors were able to see in the documentary submission that there was collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers. In the meeting with the practice educators the visitors explored the nature of this collaboration. The visitors were told that meetings mainly focused on the practice-based learning and did not necessarily relate to the content of the curriculum. The visitors considered that meetings were happening regularly and effectively enough for the standard to be met. However, they recommend that the scope of these meetings be expanded to include practice educators' regular feedback on other aspects of the course to enhance to ongoing improvement and quality.

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should ensure that the teaching team is provided with ongoing support and development opportunities.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentary submission that the radiography teaching team were relatively new to delivering radiography education. At the visit the visitors were able to determine that the education provider would ensure there were appropriate support mechanisms and development opportunities in place for the teaching team. The visitors were also told that the most experienced member of the teaching team would be leaving within the next 2 years. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider makes sure that all staff are appropriately supported and given ample opportunity for development, to ensure they can deliver the programme effectively on an ongoing basis.

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should ensure that information about exit awards is made clear and transparent for all learners.

**Reason:** Through the documentary submission the visitors were not aware of how exit awards and their relation to eligibility for registration would be communicated to learners. At the visit the programme team discussed that exit awards would generally be given out only in exceptional circumstances. Therefore information would be provided to learners about the exit award and how it relates to eligibility for registration. The visitors considered this rationale to be appropriate for the process to work in practice. However, to ensure that all learners are informed and to be completely transparent the visitors recommend making information around exit awards not leading to registration clear to all learners at the outset 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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider making it clearer in the documentation that practice educators must undertake regular training, relevant to the Radiography programmes.

**Reason:** For the Radiography programmes, the visitors noted on page 55 of the validation document that practice educators 'normally' undertake regular training. From querying this prior to the visit, the education provider had confirmed in their response that practice educators are encouraged to attend regular training and a record of this is maintained in a database, managed by the Practice Placement Support Team. During their meeting with practice educators at the visit, the visitors were convinced that practice educators are required to attend regular training which is appropriate to their role for the Radiography programmes and determined that this standard is met at threshold. However, the visitors could not see in the documentation any statement

explicitly saying that attending regular training is mandatory for these practice educators. Therefore, the visitors would like to suggest that the wording is made clear in the documentation to reflect practice educators 'must' attend regular training in line with the requirement of this standard.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).