

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (High Wycombe), Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (Uxbridge), Full time
Approval visit date	13 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16817-J5S4F3

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:

Gemma Howlett	Paramedic
Anthony Hoswell	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	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.

Julie Irwin	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Buckinghamshire New University
Leah Hill	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Buckinghamshire New University
Mark Carroll	External panel member	College of Paramedics
Gordon Pollard	External panel member	College of Paramedics

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (High Wycombe)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02307

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (Uxbridge)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 February 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02308

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	No	As these programmes have not yet commenced, this was not required
---	----	---

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	Visitors met learners from adult nursing and operating department practitioner programmes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Not Required	Visitors were able to determine through the programme documentation, that standards related to service users and carers had been met
Facilities and resources	Not Required	As the visit was virtual and the visitors were able to determine through the programme documentation, that standards related to resources had been met, they decided it was unnecessary to have a virtual tour of the facilities and resources.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 22 June 2021.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved, to contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Reason: It was stated in the mapping document that The Institute of Health and Social Care, where the proposed programme will be based, are developing a future strategy for the involvement of service users and carers. From reviewing the evidence submitted, visitors noted that the programme team intends to establish a stakeholder forum, who will meet twice yearly with one meeting in each semester. This meeting will be chaired by the programme leader to gather feedback from all stakeholders. The visitors were clear that stakeholders will involve patients, carers, clinicians, established service user groups within practice education providers and practice educators. There was also mention of intending to involve stakeholders during the recruitment and selection process, along with input to teaching and learning activities across the programme. However, the visitors could not see any information stating how exactly service users and carers will be involved within the stated activities. Additionally, it was not clear what aspects of feedback will be sought from service users related to the proposed programmes as part of the stakeholder meetings. From discussions held with the programme team, the visitors learnt again about the proposals to have service users and carers' involvement at the programme level, without articulation of specific details on how they will be involved in the programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine how service users and carers' contribution will add to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how and in what aspects of the programme service users and carers will be involved, along with how feedback gathered from them during stakeholder meetings, will contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	The University of Bolton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice, Full time
Approval visit date	08-09 April 2021
Case reference	CAS-16306-K5T2T0

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:

Susan Boardman	Paramedic
Andrew Jones	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the virtual approval visit

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

Gill Waugh	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Bolton
Angela Nuttall	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Bolton
Louise Ashby	Internal panel member	University of Bolton
Andrew Williamson	External panel member	St George's, University of London
Andrew Bateson	Student panel member	University of Bolton

Graham Harris	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Bob Fellows	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Paul Mayze	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
Proposed first intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02293

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	No	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	As we do not currently approve the programme and has not run yet, we met with learners from the MSc Physician Associate programme.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	No	Since the move to virtual visits, we do not ask to meet with service users and carers. The visitors explored areas relating to service users and carers by the submission of written statements and at other, appropriate meetings.
Facilities and resources	Yes	
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 28 May 2021.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the information made available in the admissions process to determine it is comprehensive and means that applicants are able to make an informed decision.

Reason: To meet this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to the webpage for the programme. From the webpage, the visitors were able to access some information about the programme. However, the visitors could not find information about the programme model and structure, the number of hours spent on the programme, leave allocation for learners, when applicants would be required to process criminal conviction and health checks, and funding.

The visitors considered applicants needed to be fully aware of these areas when making a decision about whether to apply for, and take up, an offer of a place on the programme. The visitors considered that the education provider did not provide the full information applicants need so they can come to an appropriate decision about their suitability for the programme. The visitors therefore were unsure that information provided throughout the admissions process allows for informed decision-making. The education provider must submit further evidence of the admissions process to demonstrate it is comprehensive and means that applicants are able to make for an informed decision.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there is an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively, and that educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively.

Reason: To evidence these standards, the education provider informed the visitors the programme lead has a paramedic background and that they were recruiting further lecturers. In the meeting with the senior team, the education provider informed the visitors they had recently recruited two new lecturers, 1.5 FTE, to the programme. The visitors had not seen details of the recently recruited lecturers, and could not be sure that:

- the number of staff in place - as well as the proportion of their time spent working on the programme, in relation to the practical requirements of the programme, the number of learners, their needs and the learning outcomes to be achieved - is appropriate to the programme; and
- educators are suitable and well equipped to take part in teaching and to support learning in the subject areas they are involved in.

The education provider must provide further evidence there is an appropriate number of staff able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively, and that educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively.

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 the design of practice-based learning allows learners to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider informed the visitors that the majority of practice-based learning would be with North West Ambulance Service (NWAS), the main practice partner. In response to the visitors request for further evidence, the education provider informed the visitors that they intended on sourcing different clinical settings for their learners alongside the NWAS placements. At the visit, the visitors received an additional piece of evidence, which detailed the organisations outside of NWAS who would provide practice-based learning, and the learning environment of the placement. These organisations were local NHS trusts, care homes and private healthcare facilities. The visitors were however unclear what was involved in these non-ambulance placements and how they related to the learning outcomes of the programme.

The education provider gave an overview of the Practice Assessment Document (PAD), which is for learners to record and document skills, competencies, and hours completed in practice. The education provider also provided an example of how the PAD will work.

However, the visitors could not find specific details of the competencies, such as details of assessments, the level of assessment, and what learners needed to complete in order to meet the competencies, related to practice-based learning. The visitors were therefore unable to see the competencies to be assessed in practice-based learning, and their link to the learning outcomes of the programme. The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate that the way practice-based learning is designed allows learners to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and the SOPs.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must ensure there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning in non-ambulance practice-based settings.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider informed the visitors there would be a member of the paramedic team designated as a link tutor for all practice-based learning. Also as part of the programme documentation, the education provider said that although the majority of practice-based learning would be with North West Ambulance Service (NWAS), the main practice partner, they intended on sourcing different clinical settings for their learners alongside the NWAS placements. At the visit, the visitors received an additional piece of evidence, which detailed the organisations outside of NWAS who would provide practice-based learning, and the learning environment of the placement. These organisations were local NHS trusts, care homes and private healthcare facilities.

The visitors were made aware that NWAS adopts a 'team' approach to practice-based learning where each learner is allocated to a senior paramedic team lead who manages a team. Each team will contain a maximum of five learners. However, the visitors did not receive information about how the education provider makes sure there is a suitable

number of practice educators in non-ambulance practice-based learning. They also did not receive information about others working in this setting, taking into account the number of learners and the level of support specific learners need. The visitors did not receive any information from the education provider about what they consider to be an adequate number of staff in non-ambulance placement settings nor why this was the case.

The meeting with practice educators did not include representatives from a non-ambulance setting. The visitors therefore require further information which explains how the education provider justifies there is a suitable number of staff for the number of learners. This is to ensure there is enough support the learners need within the non-ambulance practice-based learning environment.

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 submit further information about the competencies within practice-based learning, so learners who complete the programme have demonstrated the threshold level of knowledge, skills and understanding to practise their profession safely and effectively.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider informed the visitors that each module specification states the marks required, the breakdown of the total mark for each assessment and the requirements to have successfully completed the module. The education provider made the visitors aware of the Practice Assessment Document (PAD), for learners to record and document skills, competencies, and hours completed in practice. The education provider also provided an example of how the PAD will work but this was not for the proposed programme. The example PAD contained information about the first year only and referred to both compulsory and desirable competencies. From this, the visitors were unclear about how a competence would be assessed and demonstrated. For example, what level of assessment (i.e. observation, supervision, independent working) would be associated with a compulsory competence, in module HLT4095, Introducing Practical Capabilities. The visitors were therefore unclear about what learners needed to achieve during the programme to ensure they met the standards of proficiency upon completion.

The visitors considered that as they had not seen the full version of the PAD for the proposed programme, they were unclear about the details of assessments, the level of assessment, and what learners needed to complete in order to meet the competencies. The visitors were not able to see this level of information in other documentation, such as module descriptors or handbooks, submitted by the education provider.

The visitors considered it was unclear what learners needed to demonstrate within practice-based learning in order to meet competencies at each stage of the programme. The visitors therefore need further information to clarify the competencies, and their associated level of assessment, so learners understand the programme's expectations of them at each stage of the programme and educators can apply assessment criteria consistently.

The education provider must therefore submit further information about the competencies within practice-based learning, so learners who complete the programme have demonstrated the threshold level of knowledge, skills and understanding to practise their profession safely and effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further information about when assessments take place so they are effective at deciding whether a learner is fit to practise by the end of the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider informed the visitors that each module specification states the marks required, the breakdown of the total mark for each assessment and the requirements to have successfully completed the module. The visitors were able to see this information when reviewing the module specifications and the assessment map. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were informed that there would be one or two assessments per month. Due to the number of potential assessments each month, the visitors considered there was not an effective retrieval period for learners to try to pass assessments towards the end of the first year, if necessary. The visitors were therefore unsure whether the schedule of assessments meant they were realistic at providing a valid and accurate picture of a learners' progression and, ultimately, whether a learner was fit to practise by the end of the programme. The visitors require further information about when assessments take place and the system for retrieval and retakes so they can be sure they are effective at deciding whether a learner is fit to practice by the end of the programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	MSc (Pre-registration) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time MSc (Pre-registration) Diagnostic Radiography, Part time
Approval visit date	11-12 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16821-L5L1R5

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:

Rachel Picton	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the virtual approval visit

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

Alexis Barlow	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Glasgow Caledonian University
Morven Gillies	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Glasgow Caledonian University
Deborah Clark	External panel member	NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde

Julie de Witt	External panel member and Society and College of Radiographers representative	University of Derby and Society and College of Radiographers
Janet Greenlees	Internal panel member	Glasgow Caledonian University
Ares Gomez	Internal panel member	Glasgow Caledonian University
Sarina Vlaytchev	Student panel member	Glasgow Caledonian University
Angela Miller	Support to secretary	Glasgow Caledonian University
Marysia Bednarek	Observer	Glasgow Caledonian University
Karen Ward	Observer	Glasgow Caledonian University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc (Pre-registration) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Proposed first intake	01 January 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15, across both the full time and part time programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02309

Programme name	MSc (Pre-registration) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Proposed first intake	01 January 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15, across both the full time and part time programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02351

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	As the programmes under assessment are not currently running, we met with learners from the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging programme.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	No	Since the move to virtual visits, we do not ask to meet with service users and carers. The visitors explored areas relating to service users and carers by the submission of written statements and at other, appropriate meetings.
Facilities and resources	No	Since the move to virtual visits, we do not ask to have a meeting related specifically to facilities and resources. The visitors explored areas relating to facilities and resources at other, appropriate meetings.
Senior staff	Yes	

Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 22 June 2021.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are taught and assessed so learners demonstrate how they understand and are able to meet the SCPEs.

Reason: From a review of the documentation to meet this standard, the education provider informed the visitors the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs, were taught in module MMB826763 Preparation for Radiographic Practice. The visitors were informed the teaching and assessment of the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs were contained within learning outcome four of that module: 'Develop understanding in a range of appropriate principles, legislation and techniques required to maintain a safe practice environment for staff and patients'. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were reassured the expectations of professional behaviour and the SCPEs were taught in the second week of the aforementioned module, and that learners received a copy of the SCPEs during their induction onto the programme.

The visitors however could not see references to the SCPEs in the learning outcomes, nor in details of the assessments of the Preparation for Radiographic Practice module descriptor. The visitors were therefore unable to clearly determine how the education provider ensures the SCPEs are taught on the programme explicitly through the

learning outcomes, and how they are assessed so learners are able to demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. The visitors require further evidence which shows the learning outcomes being explicitly linked to the SCPEs on the programme, and how assessment of the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs, are carried out through the programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Hull
Name of programme(s)	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time
Approval visit date	11 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16828-L4D0C0

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:

Tracy Clephan	Dietitian
Sarah Illingworth	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	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.

Deborah Robinson	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Hull
Claire Hairsine	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Hull
Charlotte Pettitt	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Hull
Menna Wyn-Wright	Professional body executive	British Dietetic Association (BDA)

Pauline Douglas	Professional body representative	BDA
Jane Wilson	Professional body representative	BDA

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
Proposed First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02311

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	No	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	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Not Required	As this was a virtual visit and, because the visitors did not have areas to address with this group, we decided that it was unnecessary to meet with them.
Facilities and resources	Yes	Facilities and resources were covered in a presentation by the programme team.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 18 June 2021.

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 the process in place to ensure the availability of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme is effective.

Reason: From reviewing documentation submitted prior to the visit and discussions at the visit, the visitors identified that practice education providers were committed to

taking learners from this programme. The visitors understood that practice education providers are also committed to supporting Dietetics learners from other education providers in the region. At the visit, the education provider discussed how they would ensure all learners have access to practice-based learning. For example, they explained their intention to use the pairing system (2 to 1 model) to ensure practice-based learning capacity. However, there were no clear processes or policies to indicate how this model would be sustained in the long term. In addition, due to lack of detail, the visitors were unclear about the level of commitment from practice education providers, given their commitment to other education providers in the region. As such, the visitors could not determine that the education provider has an effective process in place to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme. They therefore require further evidence to demonstrate this standard is met.

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 that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: In their review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors identified that practice education providers were committed to taking learners from this programme. However, it was unclear as to whether staffing levels could sufficiently support learners from this education provider in addition to the other learners in the region because such information was not provided in the submission. As the education provider had not demonstrated there was an effective process in place for ensuring staff involvement in practice-based learning, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider will have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to assure them that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver practice-based learning to all learners on this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it clearly specifies the requirements for progression and achievement in practice-based learning.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the Taught Masters handbook and the Student Handbook where they saw the three exit awards that will be awarded to learners who are ineligible to receive the MSc Nutrition and Dietetics award. The visitors were clear that the exit awards would not give eligibility to apply on to the Register.

The visitors also reviewed the programme specification and the individual module specifications. From their review, the visitors noted that the practice-based learning elements of the programme are embedded within The Professional Dietitian and Reflection and Consolidation of Practice modules. The visitors also noted that the requirements of practice-based learning components were a pass / fail. However, it was not clear what would happen in the event where a learner failed the practice-based

learning component of a module. Through discussions with the programme team, the visitors understood that learners would get a second attempt at a placement assessment. However, if learners failed on the second attempt, they would not be eligible to receive the MSc Nutrition and Dietetics award but would receive the credit for the module. This means they could be eligible for one of the exit awards depending on the number of credits. The visitors noted that this information was not explicit in the programme handbook, programme specification or the individual module specifications. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how learners will be aware of the requirements for progression in practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that the programme documentation clearly reflects the requirements for progression and achievement and how this will be communicated to learners. In this way, the visitors can determine whether the programme meets this standard.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Keele University
Name of programme(s)	MSci Paramedic Science, Full time
Approval visit date	27 - 28 April 2021
Case reference	CAS-16783-H1K6S4

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 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:

Tristan Henderson	ParamedicParamedic
Kenneth Street	ParamedicParamedic
Niall Gooch	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.

Katie Maddock	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Keele University
Claire Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Keele University
Lara McMurtry	Internal panel member	Keele University
Eliot Rees	Internal panel member	Keele University
Sally Thompson	External panel member	University of Cumbria
Graham Harris	Professional body member	College of Paramedics

Robert Fellows	Professional body member	College of Paramedics
Sakina Waller	Professional body member	College of Paramedics

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSci Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	ParamedicParamedic
Proposed first intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02306

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
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	No

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
Learners	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice educators	Yes
Programme team	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 11 June 2021.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and 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 there is a clear procedure in place for learners who wish to opt out of certain activities.

Reason: From the documentation the visitors noted there did not seem to be a clear mechanism for dealing with learners who, for whatever reason, were not comfortable participating in certain activities involving body manipulation or partial undressing. This was raised at the visit and the programme team gave assurances that the documentation had not given full information regarding this aspect, and that learners who felt unable to consent to particular activities would be given alternative ways of achieving the learning goals of those activities. However, the visitors were not able to see the updated materials giving more information and so were unable to determine at this point whether the standard was met. They therefore require further information

regarding how the education provider will appropriately manage learners who wish to opt out of certain activities.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.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 that there is an effective system for monitoring all placements, including those not with West Midlands Ambulance Service.

Reason: The visitors did not receive in the documentation clear evidence of how the audit system for placements would work in detail. They were satisfied that the education provider would be able to secure enough capacity for placement, and had effective relationships in place with their practice partners. However, they were not clear how exactly the education provider would undertake appropriate auditing of their placements, especially those outside the West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS), which is an experienced placement provider working with many HEIs. The visitors raised this at the visit and were told that an audit process was in place and that it would be straightforward to provide examples of how the process worked. However, without having seen these examples of completed audits, the visitors could not be sure at this point that the standard was met, especially in light of a lack of clarity around practice educator training, which they were told would be addressed through the completed audit forms. They therefore require further evidence showing that the education provider has completed sample audit forms available, to ensure an effective ongoing audit process.

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 all practice educators are appropriately trained, particularly those coming from outside West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS).

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors were not clear what the content of regular practice educator training would be. At the visit, they discussed this with the programme team. The programme team told them that the education provider would expect all practice educators to be appropriate for the role. Placement providers will hold live registers of Practice Educators and Keele University will maintain a log of Practice Educators, their qualification (including date) and attendance at annual update sessions. However, the visitors considered that there was uncertainty about how the education provider would ensure regular updates for staff supporting learners in their placement settings, especially among the non-WMAS providers. Evidence showing how this updating process would work was not available. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met and require further evidence showing how the education provider will ensure that they have an appropriate strategy for updating practice educators as necessary.

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.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Recommendation: The education provider should keep under review its relationships with placement partners to ensure that they continue to deliver sufficient practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the condition was met at threshold, because the education provider had a process in place to ensure that all learners coming on to the programme would have appropriate practice-based learning. They did note, however, that as the programme upscaled learner numbers in subsequent years, the education provider would need to ensure that their processes continued to be sufficient for the task.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should keep under review the progress of its appointment of an external examiner, so that one will be in place as planned by the start of the second year.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the condition was met, as there was a process for the appointment of an appropriate external examiner. They were aware that the education provider's plan was that the appointment would take place towards the end of the first year of the programme. They did wish to note that it was important that this appointment was made as necessary and that the education provider should ensure that the plan laid out was followed.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	MDiet (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Approval visit date	26 – 27 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16824-J3Z6H0

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:

Susan Lennie	Dietitian
Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Niall Gooch	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.

Christopher Groucutt	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Plymouth
Natalie Dixon	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Plymouth
Ruth Boocock	Panel member	British Dietetics Association
Najia Qureshi	Panel member	British Dietetics Association

Laura Stuart	Panel member	British Dietetics Association
Phil Gee	Internal panel member	University of Plymouth
Angela Madden	Internal panel member	University of Plymouth
Kahila Smith	Internal panel member	University of Plymouth
Chris Johns	Internal panel member	University of Plymouth

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MDiet (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
Proposed first intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02310

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	New programme so not available

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
Learners	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice educators	Yes
Programme team	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 16 July 2021.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

The following condition applies to the above standards. For simplicity, as the issue spans two standards, the education provider should respond to this condition as one issue.

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: In their mapping document, under these standards, the education provider referred the visitors to sections of the programme handbook and the programme specification. In these documents the visitors were able to see a brief overview of how the practice-based learning would fit into the programme, where it would sit and what its general aims were. However, the visitors were not given more detailed evidence about what practice placements would be available to the learners, and how these would be managed and guaranteed. The visitors were aware that the programme start date was not until September 2022 (sixteen months from the visit date), and it was therefore not reasonable or proportionate to expect the education provider to have all their arrangements for practice-based learning finalised. However, they did consider that there was not yet enough detail regarding what the education provider planned to do over the next year to ensure that they were ready in time for September 2022.

The issue was discussed at the visit. The visitors received reassurances from both the programme team and the practice educators that there were strong relationships between the education provider and placement partners, because of the existing undergraduate programme. However, the visitors considered that interpersonal relationships were not sufficient on their own to ensure a robust process for securing sufficient availability and capacity in practice-based learning. They also considered that if there was not a clear pathway to obtaining formal commitments from practice partners, they could not be clear that the programme would be able to run as intended. In particular, the visitors were not clear about the detail of the “special placements” that the programme team had mentioned at the visit.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that they have a plan for ensuring sufficient commitment from practice partners, and that they have an effective process for securing sufficient capacity of placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme effectively.

Reason: During discussions at the visit, the visitors were informed by the programme team that, in their opinion, more staff recruitment was required for the programme to operate as planned. The visitors had not previously been aware of this need from the documentation. They had considered that the evidence provided around staffing was appropriate. They had not seen any evidence relating to a recruitment plan, or a timetable for the recruitment. They were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met. They were aware that as the programme was not due to start until September 2022, it was not reasonable to expect that all staff would be in place at this stage. However, they did consider that it would be reasonable to request further evidence about when the recruitment would take place and how the education provider would ensure that the most suitable person was recruited.

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 that the structure and duration of practice-based learning on the programme will be appropriate to the programme design.

Reason: As noted in the condition under SETs 3.1 and 3.6 above, the visitors were aware that the details of the practice-based learning on the programme were not yet finalised. The documentation stated that there would be two weeks in year one, and twelve weeks in each of years two and three. However, the visitors were not given details of where these placements would take place, with which partners, and for how long learners would be at each setting. There was also mention at the visit of “special placements” of various kinds but their nature was not clear to the visitors and the planning for them was still at an early stage. The visitors were not clear about the structure and the duration of placements and so could not be sure that the standard was met. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating that the education provider will provide placements of appropriate duration and structure so that all learners can meet the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

The following condition applies to the above standards. For simplicity, as the issue spans two standards, the education provider should respond to this condition as one issue.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that, when it becomes necessary to do so, they will be able to effectively monitor the quality of all practice-based learning, and ensure that there will be an adequate number of appropriate staff.

Reason: As noted in the conditions above, the visitors were aware that at this stage the plans for practice-based learning were still at a relatively early stage, because the programme was not due to start for another 16 months. The visitors did not see evidence relating to the systems and processes by which the education provider would monitor the quality of practice-based learning, or by which they would ensure that practice educators were suitable. They did discuss these issues at the visit with both the senior team and the programme team. In these discussions verbal assurances were given regarding relationships with practice partners (see the condition under SETs 3.1 and 3.6 above). The education provider were intending to develop the placements and its related procedures already used on the existing undergraduate programme, which the visitors considered to be a reasonable and appropriate approach. However, they did not see details of how exactly this would be done and how the education provider would ensure that it was done, for example by designating particular responsibilities to particular staff. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that they will be able to effectively monitor the quality of placement, and that there are an adequate number of practice educators.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that, when it becomes necessary to do so, they will be able to ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: As noted in the conditions above, the visitors were aware that at this stage the plans for practice-based learning were still at a relatively early stage, because the programme was not due to start for another 16 months. The visitors did not see evidence relating to how the education provider would ensure that practice educators were appropriately qualified, for example with role briefs or person specifications.

The visitors were given verbal assurances about these areas, and were aware that a similar approach to that on the existing undergraduate programme would be taken. However, they did not see details of how exactly the education provider would ensure appropriately qualified staff, and therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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.

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

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep under review their mechanisms for ensuring that learners are aware of what they can expect if they need to go through a fitness to practice process or a raising concerns process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standards were met at threshold because appropriate processes were in place, both for learners to raise concerns and for learners to go through in the event of difficulties around their conduct, character and health. From conversation with learners at the visit, the visitors understood that learners knew where to access the relevant policies, and particularly that they had a good grasp of the requirements of professionalism. However, it was not clear that the learners understood what would actually happen during a concerns process or a fitness to practice process. This created a possible risk that in future the standard would not be met, because a process might not be effective if learners did not understand how it worked. The visitors therefore suggest that the education provider reflect on how they can improve learners' understanding of these processes.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of East London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy via apprenticeship, Work based learning
Approval visit date	12 – 13 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16000-B9F9M0

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Niall Gooch	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.

Richard Hartey	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of East London
Deirdre Larkin	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of East London
Clair Parkin	Professional body panel	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Alison Warren	Professional body panel	Royal College of Occupational Therapists

Karen Morris	Professional body panel	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
--------------	-------------------------	--

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy via apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed first intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02244

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	No	Not required because it is a new programme

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	We spoke to learners enrolled on the existing approved physiotherapy programme
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	No	The education provider was not able to arrange a meeting and we considered we could discuss the relevant issues with the programme team
Facilities and resources	Not Required	Discussion of this area was incorporated into the programme team meeting
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 26 June 2021.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure appropriate oversight of the process by which employer partners allocate placements to learners.

Reason: The visitors were aware from programme documentation and from discussions at the visit that responsibility for finding and allocating particular placement settings would sit with the employers of the learners on the programme. This was not in itself an inappropriate arrangement, as the HCPC does not specify how the allocation of

settings should work. However, the visitors did consider that the education provider did need to exercise some level of oversight of the employer partners' decision-making. The programme team stated that this would be achieved through existing interpersonal relationships between the education provider staff and the employers. Nevertheless it was the view of the visitors that there needed to be a more formal and specific description of how this process would work on an ongoing basis, even if individual staff members left – which may endanger an arrangement based on the informal personal links.

The visitors were therefore unable to be certain the standard was met, and require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that on a consistent basis, all learners' placement allocations are appropriately handled.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have a clear plan in place for how to involve service users and carers in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were aware from the documentation and from discussions at the visit that there would be service user involvement in the programme. However, they were not able to see the detail of this involvement. The mapping document cited a narrative of service user and carer involvement but did not give detail about how those involved would be selected and how their involvement would be planned and assessed. In the discussion of service user and carer activity at the visit, the programme team gave a broad idea of their plans but did not provide the kind of detail noted above. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence showing that the service user and carer involvement on the programme will be sustainable, appropriate and clear.

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 all curriculum areas will be appropriately covered by staff with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: The visitors were aware from their review of documentation and from conversations at the visit that the intended staffing arrangements were not yet in place, and that further staff recruitment was planned to be in place by the start date of September 2021. The visitors noted there was a recruitment plan in place to ensure an appropriate range of staff for autumn 2021. However, the visitors considered that the job description and person specification did not specify clearly the areas that the new staff would need to cover – for example, in the key areas of foundational occupational therapy. There was therefore a risk that the recruitment process would not ensure that the new staff had relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. The visitors therefore require that the education provider submit further evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure that the recruitment process can deliver appropriate staff.

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 that they have an effective process enabling learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users in any setting.

Reason: The mapping document pointed the visitors to a section of the programme handbook that gave a brief narrative of the raising concerns procedure. The handbook mentioned a formal raising concerns policy but this was not included in the documentation.

The visitors discussed the procedure for raising concerns with the programme team and were assured that one was in place. The learners also mentioned one. However, as they had not seen its details, the visitors considered that they were unable to be sure the standard was met. For example, the visitors were unclear how learners were able to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, how they were supported in raising any concerns, and the clear mechanism for ensuring action is taken in response. The visitors therefore require that the education provider submit further evidence showing that an effective policy is in place.

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 an effective process for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

Reason: The visitors were not clear, either from the documentation or from discussions at the visit, how the education provider intended to obtain appropriate consent from learners. The mapping document cited documents that referred to obtaining consent but the actual policy was not included and the discussions with the programme team did not make it clear to the visitors that learners would be enabled to understand what the expectations and arrangements about the obtaining of consent were. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met and require further evidence.

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

Reason: The visitors were provided with a narrative of how the audit programme would work, and the mapping document cited parts of the validation document explaining many of the details of practice-based learning. The visitors were also able to discuss the audit arrangements with the programme team and with practice educators. However, they were not clear what exactly would be audited and how potential problems would be flagged through the process, because they had not seen, for example, a completed audit form. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met and require further evidence to demonstrate that the audit system will be thorough and effective.