

Approval process quality report

Education provider	University of Ulster
Name of programme(s)	Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing (Part time)
Date Assessment commenced	11/02/2021
Visitor recommendation made	25/08/2021
Case reference	CAS-01027-Y0K9H9

Summary of findings from this assessment

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC in relation to the University of Ulster's Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing programme.

This programme intends to deliver training for orthoptist exemptions through an existing programme run by the education provider. Therefore, we have undertaken a review via the approval process to consider whether the programme meets our standards for orthoptists exemptions. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

The outcomes of this process were as follows:

- Visitor-led Stage 1 assessment was not required based on the new programme(s) being proposed for delivery aligning to existing provision at the provider.
- The visitors recommended the programme(s) be approved as all programme level standards were met through their Stage 2 assessment.

The Education and Training Committee will now meet to consider the visitors recommendations and make a decision regarding programme approval.

The areas we cover in this report

Approval process quality report	1
Summary of findings from this assessment	1
Section 1: Background information	3
Who we are	3
Our standards	3
Our approach to quality assuring education	3
The approval process	3
How we make decisions	4
Section 2: Our assessment.....	5
Stage 1 assessment: The institution	5
Stage 2 assessment: The programmes	6
Summary of visitor findings	8
Section 3: The visitors' recommendations	10
Programme approval	10
Section 4: Committee decision on approval.....	10

Section 1: Background information

Who we are

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.

Our standards

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

Our standards are divided into two levels based on their relevance to the institution and programme(s). The following considerations were made when splitting standards between the institution and programme level:

- Where accountability best sits, with either the accountable person for the institution or programme
- How the standard is worded, with references to the education provider and processes often best sitting at the institution level, and references to the programme or profession often best sitting at the programme level
- We have preferred seeking assurance at the institution level, to fit with our intention to put the institution at the centre of our quality assurance model.

Our approach to quality assuring education

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

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

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

The approval process

We take a staged approach to quality assurance, as we need to understand practices which will support delivery of all programmes within an institution, prior to assessing the programme level detail. The approval process is formed of two stages:

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

Through the process we will initially review the proposal and then design our assessment based on the issues we find. As such the assessment methods will be different based on the issues which arise in each case.

How we make decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation 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 the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

Section 2: Our assessment

Stage 1 assessment: The institution

Education provider	University of Ulster
Accountable person	Kerry Clarke

As part of the initiation of the process the education provider indicated that the proposed programme will be running a new route through the existing programme Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing, with an additional annotation being offered of prescription only medicine sale / supply for orthoptists. The education provider is well established with HCPC and currently delivers approved programmes in:

- Biomedical Science
- Dietetics
- Occupational Therapy
- Paramedic Science
- Physiotherapy
- Podiatry
- Prescribing
- Radiography
- Speech and Language Therapy

In previous standards assessments of these programmes, visitors have established the institution level standards are met. The provider has also demonstrated this through ongoing monitoring carried out by the HCPC.

The education provider has defined the policies, procedures and processes that apply to the programmes they deliver. These relate to the institution level standards we set which ensure the following areas are managed effectively:

Admissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• information for applicants• Assessing English language, character, and health• Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)• Equality, diversity and inclusion
Governance and leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Effective programme delivery• Effective staff management• Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level
Quality, monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic components, including how curricula are kept up to date• Practice components, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments• Learner involvement• Service user and carer involvement
Learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support• Ongoing professional suitability• Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)• Equality, diversity and inclusion

Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectivity • Progression and achievement • Appeals
------------	---

Assurance that institution level standards are met

As part of this stage we considered how the proposed programmes align with existing provision at the provider, by considering any notable differences with the application of policies, procedures and processes related to the areas above.

We considered how the proposed programmes are assimilated with the management of existing approved programmes at the institution. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate to take assurance the institution level standards will continue to be met with the introduction of this programme.

Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

Education provider	Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing
Accountable person (for the programmes)	Kerry Clarke
Programmes	Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing
Entitlement	POM sale / supply for orthoptists
Mode of study	Part time
Qualification level	CertHE (Certificate of Higher Education)
Start date	01/9/2021

Through assessment of information provided, we identified that the above proposed programme is based on existing provision. This was considered as context when we assessed the new provision, as there were areas of the new programme which we did not need to directly assess, as approaches matched across existing and new provision.

The provider plans to run a route through their existing programme (ULS01361 - Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing) to deliver training for orthoptist exemptions. The existing programme delivers the POM sale / supply annotation for chiropodists / podiatrists, and the new intended annotation would be POM sale / supply for orthoptists.

The way the learning is structured means that the theoretical basis which underpins a learner reaching competence in the specific annotation applies for different professional groups. For the purposes of regulatory approval, we decided to:

- assess that this programme is fit for purpose for the new professional group, focusing on the competencies delivered against the proficiency standards for orthoptist exemptions; and
- update HCPC programme records so the online list of approved programmes is correct.

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

We also considered other sources of information, intelligence, and data points as noted in the table below:

Data Point	Bench- mark	Value	Score	Executive Comments
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	30	37	-0.04	This data point is for the existing Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing programme, which the education provider manages and will continue to do so going further.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	7.3	6.8	0.01	We collected this data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). The first data point is 0.01, which indicates the education provider has scored well. The second data point -0.01 indicates the education provider is very close to the minimum threshold of good score.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	95	94.4	-0.01	
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	N/A	N/A	The education provider did not take part in this award, and therefore there is no score for this.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	81.98	83.36	0.02	We collect this data from the Office for Students (OfS), who run a survey for learners and graduates of undergraduate Higher Education. This score indicates the education provider is performing well in this area.
HCPC AEPM cycle length	N/A	N/A	N/A	This data point is not currently available, as this will be decided through the education provider's next performance review exercise.
Overall score	N/A	N/A	0.96	This overall score is a very high score, which indicates the education provider is performing very well overall.

Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment

We appointed the following panel to assess the above information against our programme level standards:

Registrant	David Newsham – Orthoptist
visitors	Jo Jackson - Physiotherapist

Assessment of the proposal

Initial review:

- The visitors reviewed the education provider's submission and considered their approach to each standard.
- This first review culminated in a virtual HCPC meeting in which the visitors discussed and made decisions around the standards they considered to be met and the areas they required further information around.
- Following the finalisation of areas to explore the visitors discussed and finalised the most appropriate quality activity to undertake this investigation.

Quality activity: Written Questions:

We design our assessment to be proportionate and appropriate to the issues identified and to seek input from relevant stakeholders when necessary.

Theme	Reason for written question
Practice-based learning competencies	The visitors were unclear which specific orthoptist-linked competencies learners expected to meet during practice-based learning.
Subject areas taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge	Visitors wanted to explore whether there were any staff from an orthoptist background, and as such needed clarity on how teaching will be managed to ensure profession specific requirements will be covered. Additionally, visitors wanted to understand the role of the external adviser (Head of Orthoptic Services) and whether this individual will in any way contribute to teaching.

From their detailed review of the responses submitted, the visitors were satisfied with the clarification provided to address all of the queries identified above. As such, they were able to recommend approval of the programme.

Summary of visitor findings

A: Admissions

Visitors considered the information submitted within the evidence submitted related to admissions, was very well detailed, with clear information provided about the academic and professional entry and selection criteria onto the programme. The

education provider highlighted their requirements for direct entry onto the programme that the visitors considered appropriate and suitable for applicants to be best placed to undertake the programme.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

B: Programme management and resources

The education provider was able to demonstrate the availability of sufficient physical and technology resources that would effectively support learners in the delivery of the programme.

The education provider was also able to demonstrate the profile of their programme team, along with providing clear information on increasing staff numbers to cope with increased learner intake. The programme team consisted of staff from various profession specific backgrounds.

The education provider also confirmed inclusion of an Orthoptist with the exemption qualification as a mentor, following further enquiry from the visitors around staffing. Visitors considered and deemed this approach to suitable.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

C: Curriculum

The visitors considered the standards are mapped against the module learning outcomes, and relates to legislation and context of the qualification for orthoptists.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

D: Practice placements

The visitors considered the evidence provided clearly explained that a Designated Medical Practitioner (DMP) is required to be identified by learners who apply for this programme. The DMP will assist learners in their training as part of the programme application process in place, for the programme. Visitors considered the evidence around this as appropriate, along with the expectations of a practice educator were clearly demonstrated.

The education provider also confirmed specifics of orthoptists competencies covered during practice-based learning, following further enquiry from the visitors. Visitors considered the responses as suitable which highlighted a range of competencies for orthoptists, during practice-based learning

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

E: Assessment

The visitors considered assessment requirements as appropriate. It was noted it consisted of combining theoretical knowledge, drug calculation and competency assessment portfolio with appropriate weighting and pass mark requirements.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

Section 3: The visitors' recommendations

Based on these findings the visitors made the following recommendations to the Education and Training Committee:

Programme approval

The programme is recommended for approval, without conditions.

Section 4: Committee decision on approval

- We will record the decision of the Education and Training Committee here following their meeting on 25 August 2021.

Approval process quality report

Education provider	Coventry University
Programme cluster	School of Nursing Midwifery and Health
Name of programme(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSc Dietetics and Leadership (Full time) • MSc Dietetics and Leadership, Integrated degree apprenticeship (Full time)
Date Assessment commenced	30/03/2021
Visitor recommendation made	14/07/2021
Case reference	CAS-01030-L8X6V7

Summary of findings from this assessment

This a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the Coventry University, School of Nursing Midwifery and Health - MSc Dietetics and Leadership and MSc Dietetics and Leadership, Integrated degree apprenticeship route detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

The outcomes of this process were as follows:

- Further Stage 1 assessment was not required based on the new programme(s) being proposed for delivery.
- The visitors recommended the programme(s) be approved as all programme level standards were met through their Stage 2 assessment.

The Education and Training Committee will now meet to consider the visitors recommendations and make a decision regarding programme approval.

The areas we cover in this report

Approval process quality report	1
Summary of findings from this assessment	1
Section 1: Background information	3
Who we are	3
Our standards	3
Our approach to quality assuring education	3
The approval process	3
How we make decisions	4
Section 2: Our assessment.....	5
Stage 1 assessment: The programme cluster	5
Stage 2 assessment: The programmes	6
Summary of visitor findings	8
Section 3: The visitors' recommendations	10
Programme approval	10
Section 4: Committee decision on approval.....	10

Section 1: Background information

Who we are

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.

Our standards

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

Our standards are divided into two levels based on their relevance to the programme cluster and programme(s). The following considerations were made when splitting standards between the programme cluster and programme level:

- Where accountability best sits, with either the accountable person for the programme cluster or programme
- How the standard is worded, with references to the education provider and processes often best sitting at the programme cluster level, and references to the programme or profession often best sitting at the programme level
- We have preferred seeking assurance at the programme cluster level, to fit with our intention to put the programme cluster at the centre of our quality assurance model.

Our approach to quality assuring education

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

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

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

The approval process

We take a staged approach to quality assurance, as we need to understand practices which will support delivery of all programmes within a programme cluster,

prior to assessing the programme level detail. The approval process is formed of two stages:

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

Through the process we will initially review the proposal and then design our assessment based on the issues we find. As such, the assessment methods will be different based on the issues which arise in each case.

How we make decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation 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 the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

Section 2: Our assessment

Stage 1 assessment: The programme cluster

Education provider	Coventry University
Programme cluster	School of Nursing Midwifery and Health
Accountable person	Patricia Bluteau

As part of the initiation of the process the education provider indicated that the proposed programme would be part of School of Nursing Midwifery and Health at Coventry University. This programme cluster is well established with HCPC and currently delivers approved programmes in:

- Dietetics
- Occupational Therapy
- Operating Department Practice
- Paramedic Science
- Physiotherapy
- Prescribing

In previous standards assessments of these programmes, visitors have established the programme cluster level standards are met. The provider has also demonstrated this through ongoing monitoring carried out by the HCPC.

As part of the provider's definition of their programme cluster, they have defined the policies, procedures and processes that apply to the programmes delivered within it. These relate to the programme cluster level standards we set which ensure the following areas are managed effectively:

Admissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information for applicants• Assessing English language, character, and health• Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)• Equality, diversity and inclusion
Governance and leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Effective programme delivery• Effective staff management• Partnerships, which are managed at the programme cluster level
Quality, monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic components, including how curricula are kept up to date• Practice components, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments• Learner involvement• Service user and carer involvement
Learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support• Ongoing professional suitability• Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)• Equality, diversity and inclusion
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objectivity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progression and achievement • Appeals
--	--

Assurance that programme cluster level standards are met

As part of this stage we considered how the proposed programmes fit into the named programme cluster by considering any notable changes to the policies, procedures and processes related to the areas above.

We considered how the proposed programmes are assimilated with the management of existing approved programmes in the programme cluster. We determined the proposed programmes would be managed in way that was consistent with the definition of their programme cluster. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate for the programme to sit as part of the School of Nursing Midwifery and Health and take assurance the intuition level standards will continue to be met by its introduction.

Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

Education provider	Coventry University
Programme cluster	School of Nursing Midwifery and Health
Accountable person (for the programmes)	Patricia Bluteau
Programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSc Dietetics and Leadership (full time) • MSc Dietetics and Leadership, Integrated degree apprenticeship (full time)
Profession	Dietitian
Type of programme	Pre-registration
Qualification level	Postgraduate
Start date	01/09/2021

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

We also considered additional information from the professional body, British Dietetic Association

Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment

We appointed the following panel to assess the above information against our programme level standards:

Registrant visitors	Sara Smith - Dietitian
	Helen Catherine White - Dietitian

Assessment of the proposal

Initial review:

- The visitors reviewed the education provider's submission and considered their approach to each standard.
- This first review culminated in a virtual HCPC meeting in which the visitors discussed and made decisions around the standards they considered to be met and the areas they required further information around.
- Following the finalisation of areas to explore the visitors discussed and finalised the most appropriate quality activity to undertake this investigation.

Quality activity: Further documentary evidence

We design our assessment to be proportionate and appropriate to the issues identified and to seek input from relevant stakeholders when necessary. We considered that it was appropriate and proportionate to request additional documentary evidence to address the issues that were outstanding prior to the quality activity. The themes we explored are as follows:

Theme	Reason for additional evidence
Ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners and working with placement providers	The visitors were unclear about the education provider's contractual agreement process so they sought clarification on number and types of placements available from existing / new partner providers as well as evidence of communications with other education providers.
Resources to support learning in all settings	There was very limited information provided regarding the resources available to meet the specific criteria of the apprenticeship route so visitors requested further evidence.
Staffing capacity in practice-based learning and ensuring appropriate knowledge and experience	The visitors sought to understand how the education provider would ensure the specific aspects of the apprenticeship specification are met to ensure eligibility for application for registration with the HCPC
How the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency	The education provider has capitalised on COVID virtual adaptations and changes in BDA curriculum guidance around setting / simulation etc. It was unclear how the approach aligns to / meets the requirements of the apprenticeship specification. The

	visitors required clarity around the management of the apprenticeship experience / meeting the requirements of the apprenticeship specification - on the job experience.
Assessment	Because the visitors did not see all the module descriptors, particularly the End point assessment module for the apprenticeship route, they were unable to determine that the assessment strategy and design would ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for dietitians. Also, lack of clear information around pass marks, number of resits allowed, compensation and other assessment areas caused visitors to request further clarification.

From their detailed documentary review of the additional evidence submitted, the visitors were satisfied with the clarification provided to address all of the issues identified above. As such, they were able to recommend approval of the programmes.

Summary of visitor findings

SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register

The visitors were satisfied that the programmes align with the level of qualification expected for entry onto the Register as a dietitian. The programmes are also aligned to that of level 7 qualifications detailed in the Framework of Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awarding Bodies.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 2: Programme admissions

The visitors noted that there was clear information provided about the academic and professional entry and selection criteria onto the programme. They were confident that the entry criteria laid out are appropriate to the level and content of the programme and were assured that learners who complete the programme would be able to meet our standards for registration.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership

The education provider was able to demonstrate how the partnership arrangement between them and practice education providers would ensure available practice – based learning for all learners. The project outlines for placements as well as sample contractual agreements between the education provider and the employers reassured the visitors that practice education providers are committed to the programme. In addition, the visitors saw arrangements in place for employers to provide corresponding practice placement within their organisation for another dietetic learner or apprentice in situations where an apprentice is undertaking a practice placement in a setting away from their normal place of work. The education provider also demonstrated additional placement capacity generated by Coventry University to ensure stability in placement capacity.

Through the tripartite review form and mapping to apprenticeship standards, the education provider was able to further demonstrate the availability of sufficient physical resources that would effectively support the apprenticeship learners in the delivery of the programme.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 4: Programme design and delivery

The evidence submitted along with the mapping to the professional body standards showed how the curriculum delivers the standards of proficiency (SOPs). For the degree apprenticeship programme, the mapping of apprenticeship standards also showed how apprenticeship duties are met through the programme. As such, the visitors were satisfied that learners who successfully complete the programme would be equipped with the necessary skills to practice as autonomous professionals.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 5: Practice-based learning

The visitors could see how the learning outcomes would be delivered through the range of practice based learning opportunities. The tripartite reviews as well as the mapping of apprenticeship standards assured the visitors that the structure and duration of practice-based learning for the degree apprenticeship support the delivery of the learning outcomes.

There was sufficient evidence in the training course provided to practice educators to demonstrate that they will be provided specific training required for the apprenticeship learners and how to support them.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 6: Assessment

The visitors were able to see from the module information descriptors that there is a range of assessment which would effectively assess the learning outcomes and ensure learners who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The course specification outlined the academic regulations governing the programme and there was clear evidence of how this information is made available to learners. Therefore, the visitors were clear that learners are well informed about requirements for achievement and progression on the programmes.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

Section 3: The visitors' recommendations

Based on these findings the visitors made the following recommendations to the Education and Training Committee:

Programme approval

The programme is recommended for approval, without conditions.

Section 4: Committee decision on approval

- We will record the decision of the Education and Training Committee here following their meeting on 25 August 2021

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time accelerated MSc Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging (Pre-registration), Full time accelerated
Approval visit date	27-28 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-16939-J9C8C8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation	5

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
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.

Barbara Henry	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Hertfordshire
Liz Mellor	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Hertfordshire
Jan Bowyer	Internal panel member	University of Hertfordshire
Julie de Witt	External panel member	University of Derby
Louise Robbins	External panel member	University of the West of England, Bristol

Jan Rooney	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Julie Nightingale	Professional body representative	Society and College of Radiographers

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Physiotherapist
Proposed first intake	01 January 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02331

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 meets our standards for the first time.

Programme name	MSc Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Proposed first intake	01 January 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02332

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 meets 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, we 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 being assessed are not running, we met with learners from BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging programmes.
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. Service user and carer representatives attended the programme team meetings. The visitors also explored areas relating to service users and carers 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: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 August 2021 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).