

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Sunderland
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Accelerated), Full time accelerated
Date submission received	25 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16945-P7X3V4

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Outcome from second review	11
Section 6: Additional considerations identified	19
Section 7: Visitors' recommendation	24

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 major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. 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
Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04861

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04871

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Accelerated)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04872

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes reported to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider intends to introduce a new degree apprenticeship programme and a two year accelerated programme from September 2021. The proposal is to have up to a maximum of 12 learners per cohort for each of the new programmes. These two programmes will be based on the existing BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy programme, but instead will be delivered over two years with altered practice-based learning hours.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: As per the two mapping documents submitted, visitors noted there was no information or evidence submitted for any of the standards under SET 2. As such, the visitors could not determine how the admissions process will work for the proposed accelerated and degree apprenticeship programme, as it could potentially differ from the existing BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy programme. The visitors had also reviewed the 'Programme Specification' documents submitted as part of the submission for the major change. From their review, visitors noted there was generic information about the proposed programmes that included details such as programme title, duration and modules to be taught. Additionally, there was no information provided about all admissions related aspects of the proposed programmes. As an example, within these documents it was noted to refer to the website for entry requirements and accreditation of prior learning (APL). However, the website only contained information regarding the BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy programme.

The visitors considered that important information regarding admissions for both proposed programmes will differ in many ways specifically the degree apprenticeship programme, which will have involvement from the employers. Based on this, the visitors could not determine what is the admission process for both the proposed programmes and how will applicants have access to the necessary information required. This includes information regarding the application process, entry and selection criteria, English language requirements, criminal conviction checks process, health requirements and APL. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what information regarding both the proposed programmes will be available, to enable applicants to be able to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme during the admission process.

Suggested evidence: For the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Accelerated) and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship) programmes, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating what the admissions process will be, including information regarding:

- entry and selection criteria requirements;
- English language requirements;
- criminal conviction checks;
- health requirements applicants must comply with;
- APL process;
- any differences in either of the above requirements or processes, from the existing BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy programme; and
- how will applicants be made aware of all the above information.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: From reviewing the two mapping documents submitted, there was no information provided regarding this standard. Without any information provided on what arrangements have been made to ensure sustainability, the visitors could not determine whether there will be adequate support from the education provider and relevant stakeholders to accommodate up to 12 learners per cohort, for each of the proposed programmes. As such the visitors could not make a judgement on these aspects regarding the proposed accelerated and degree apprenticeship programmes:

- the commitment from the education provider in terms of physical resources and senior management support;
- the funding arrangements in place;
- collaboration including commitments from practice education providers, to provide placements to learners;
- processes developed for reviewing the way the proposed programmes will be delivered and considerations if need for development is required; and
- feedback, if any, from stakeholders on whether the programme will be fit for purpose

Therefore, the visitors considered this standard is not met as they could not make a judgement if there is a future for these two proposed programmes. As such, they could not determine whether the proposed programmes will be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how it will ensure the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Accelerated) and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship) programme, will be sustainable and fit for purpose.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: For the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship) programme, there was no information provided regarding this standard in the mapping document. Considering the different nature of a degree apprenticeship programme compared to a traditional BSc programme, it was not possible to determine how management structures will operate as this programme could potentially be an employer led programme. As such, without any information provided it was not clear how the programme management structure will operate and whether there are clearly defined roles and responsibilities in place. The standard requires us to know how the

partnership agreement with employers will work, including clarity on who will have overall responsibility in overseeing the management systems and structures. It is also expected that there will be clear processes to deal with any issues or problems which arise in the partnership. Without having sight of any of the relevant information, the visitors could not make a judgement on how the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship) programme will be effectively managed.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide information demonstrating the programme management structure in place, along with clarity on the roles and responsibilities as part of the partnership agreement for the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship) programme.

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

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

Reason: As noted above under SET 3.1, the visitors could not see any information showing what input and support has been provided by the practice education providers or employers for both the proposed programmes. Without any information provided for these two standards, visitors could not determine what collaboration has taken place between the education provider and practice education providers, regarding the proposed degree apprenticeship and accelerated programmes. As such, visitors could not also determine how regular collaboration will be going forward once both the programmes commence. Therefore, the visitors could not make a judgement on the quality and effectiveness of the collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Additionally, there was no information provided to suggest what communications have taken place with practice education providers to discuss and arrange placement capacity on the degree apprenticeship and accelerated programmes. As such, the visitors could not gather whether practice placements have been secured for the first year, and how will it be ensured that future demand for placements will be met as the programme continues to year two. Based on this, it was not clear whether if this will in any way affect the placement capacity for the existing BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy programme. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if a process exists to ensure the capacity and availability of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must confirm and provide evidence regarding the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Accelerated) and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship) programmes demonstrating:

- what collaboration and communications have taken place with practice education providers and how regular will this be going forward;
- the process in place to determine the capacity and availability of practice-based learning for all learners, The education provider must clarify what arrangements have been agreed between them and practice education providers and how will it work going forward, to ensure the process is effective; and
- how will the above mentioned aspects ensure learners on the existing BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy programme will continue to have access to practice-based learning, by managing any overlap in placement capacity with the two proposed programmes.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From reviewing the 'Appendix 3 Programme Handbook' document, visitors noted on page eight a breakdown of the accelerated programme to be delivered over three years with two semesters each year. Additionally, the same was noted under page seven of the 'Appendix 4 Programme Handbook' document for the degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, both documents had a breakdown of the timelines in terms of the number of weeks to be spent on both the programmes which was above 50 weeks, equating to more than three years. The visitors also noted the number of weeks learners will spend on campus and during practice-based learning but it was not clear how many days will that be per week for both the proposed programmes. As the major change submission suggested the proposed programmes to be delivered over two years, the visitors could not determine what will be the exact length and duration of the programme.

If the proposal is to have both the programmes completed within two years, the visitors considered that the amount of modules to be completed were all similar to the existing BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy programme. There was only one exception to the degree apprenticeship programme, with the addition of an end point assessment towards the end of the programme. The visitors were not clear what strategy was in place regarding how learners on both the proposed programmes will be able to complete a large number of modules in each academic year, over the course of two years. Without having a standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document or information regarding the module descriptors, it was not possible to determine how learners completing the programme can meet all of the SOPs

Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine whether and how it was feasible for all of the SOPs to be covered and learning outcomes achieved in two years' time. As such, they could not make a judgement on whether learners completing the degree apprenticeship and accelerated programme will be able to meet all the SOPs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating the following regarding the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Accelerated) and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship) programmes:

- clarity regarding the length and duration of the proposed programmes, including clarity on the number of days learners will spend on campus and at practice-based learning per week during each semester;
- SOPs mapping document;
- confirmation of how the learning outcomes will be covered for both the programmes, with consideration to the programme structure and timetabling; and
- from the above mentioned points, the education provider must clarify how the learning outcomes will ensure learners will be able to meet the SOPs adequately for the relevant part of the Register.

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.

4.3 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

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

Reason: As noted above under SET 4.1, visitors were not clear regarding the programme structure, length and duration of both the programmes. Additionally as there was no information provided in the mapping documents for these two proposed programmes under SET 4, visitors could not determine how the learning outcomes will ensure learners will meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

This also meant there was lack of clarity around delivery and design of the curriculum, if learners on the proposed programmes especially the degree apprenticeship route are supposed to be spending less time on campus. This is because the information provided gave the impression that the curriculum will be delivered over three years and not two years. Based on this, the visitors considered more information is needed on how the programme structure and duration of both the programmes will ensure all aspects of the curriculum will be covered. Therefore, the visitors could also not make a judgement on whether both the programmes will reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance. As such the visitors could also not make a judgement on whether the curriculum will remain relevant to current practice, including whether integration of theory and practice will remain central to the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how both the proposed programmes will ensure:

- learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs;
- it reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance;
- that curriculum will remain relevant to current practice; and
- integration of theory and practice will remain relevant to the programme.

5.1 Practice-based learning must be integral to the programme.

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

Reason: As noted under SET 3.1, 3.5 and 3.6 the visitors could not find any information suggesting if and whether additional placements have been secured to accommodate learners on the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Accelerated) and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Apprenticeship) programmes. As there is more information needed regarding the partnership agreements and commitments from practice education providers including clarity around the programme design, the visitors could not determine how practice-based learning will be an integral part of the accelerated and degree apprenticeship programmes.

For SET 5.2, it was stated in the SETs mapping documents for both the proposed programmes: "The structure of the placements has altered from three traditional placements and one role emerging placement to two traditional placements and one hybrid placement". From reviewing the 'Placement handbook' provided as evidence for

this standard, visitors noted the number of hours learners will be spending during each of the three years of the programme was the same for both the proposed programmes. As noted above under SET 4.1, it was again not clear whether the placements will be held over two or three years across both the accelerated and degree apprenticeship programmes. Additionally, there was no information to suggest what range of placements will be on offer for both the programmes and neither were there any details regarding what will take place during the final year hybrid placement. As such, the visitors could not make a judgement on how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs on the degree apprenticeship and accelerated programmes.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating:

- what placements will be available for 12 learners per cohort for each of the proposed programmes;
- what the structure and duration of practice-based learning will be for both the proposed programmes;
- what range of placements will be on offer for both the proposed programmes;
- details regarding the final year hybrid placement; and
- how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs for both the proposed programmes.

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

Reason: As per the two SETs mapping documents submitted, there was no information provided regarding this standard. From their review of the 'Placement handbook' documents submitted for both the proposed programmes, visitors noted generic information regarding roles and responsibilities of practice educators. However, visitors could not find any information suggesting what arrangements have taken place to ensure there will be enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning, for both the proposed programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, to support up to 12 learners per cohort for the degree apprenticeship and accelerated programmes.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how it will ensure there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for the degree apprenticeship and accelerated programmes.

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.

Reason: From reviewing the programme handbook and programme specification documents for both the proposed programmes, visitors noted there was generic information regarding assessment strategy and the importance of learners knowing the details of each module's assessment requirements. From their review of the documents, the visitors noted there was no information to suggest the assessment strategy or assessment methods to be used on the proposed programmes. From this, it was not clear which assessment method will be used to determine the relevant learning

outcomes. Additionally as noted under SET 4.1 above the visitors needed more information and clarity regarding the SOPs mapping document and the programme structure and duration, for both the proposed programmes. Whilst it was not clear to visitors how the learning outcomes will be achieved on the proposed programmes within two years, there was also no information provided regarding the end point assessment for the degree apprenticeship programme. Based on this the visitors could not determine how the assessment strategy will ensure learners will be able to meet the learning outcomes on both the accelerated and degree apprenticeship programmes. From this, it was not clear how learners will meet the SOPs before completing the relevant programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide information demonstrating:

- the assessment strategy such as assessment methods, individual module pass marks and resits, for the accelerated and degree apprenticeship programmes;
- information regarding the end point assessment for the degree apprenticeship programme;
- how the assessment strategy will ensure learners will be able to meet the SOPS for the relevant part of the Register,

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.

Reason: As per the reasoning provided above under SETs 4.2, visitors were unable to make a judgement on the assessment strategy for both the proposed programmes. As such, they could not determine how assessment through both the accelerated and degree apprenticeship programmes will ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessments throughout the degree apprenticeship and accelerated programmes, will ensure that learners demonstrate and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

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

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

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

Reason: As noted above under SET 4.1 and 6.1, it was not clear what the assessment strategy and programme structure and duration is for both the programmes. As such it was not possible to determine how learners are able to meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register, on both the proposed programmes. Based on this, the visitors did not have information regarding the following aspects:

- the assessment methods that will be used for both the programmes;
- how the assessment load will be managed for both the proposed programmes, considering plans to deliver the programmes within two years;

- the end point assessment on the degree apprenticeship route, including clarity on how many credits this will be;
- details regarding the re assessment opportunities on both the proposed programmes, with consideration on how will this be managed if the programmes are to be delivered within two years; and
- whether the progression and achievement on the degree apprenticeship programme will differ from the accelerated programme, considering that the degree apprenticeship programme will have a slightly different delivery pattern.

Based on the above mentioned reasons, visitors were unable to make a judgement on whether assessments on the proposed programmes will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. Additionally, the visitors could not determine whether the assessment policies will clearly specify the requirements for progression and achievement, in addition to whether the assessment methods used will be appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes on both the proposed programmes.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how assessment on the degree apprenticeship and accelerated programmes will:

- provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement;
- have policies that will clearly specify the requirements for progression and achievement; and
- ensure the assessment methods used will be appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Recommendation of the visitors – approval visit required

The education provider responded to the request for further evidence set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that the following standards continue to be met, for the reason(s) detailed below.

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.

Reason: In response to the request for further information, the visitors were signposted to various documents highlighting information and details regarding the admissions process for the proposed accelerated and degree apprenticeship programmes.

In the degree apprenticeship programme specification, it was stated that learners will spend 80 percent of their learning on the job, in the learners place of work and as an apprentice, with 20 percent of learning on campus. However, it was also made clear within many of the other referenced documents, such as in Appendix 12 (Timetable), the number of days per week learners will attend lectures on campus and how many days during placements. Within the timetable, it was clear there was colour coding relating to modules but the visitors were unclear which of programmes each colour related to. They were therefore unable to correlate when learners would spend 20 percent of their time on campus. In addition, the visitors noted this information was not

available on the proposed website for the degree apprenticeship programme and therefore the visitors were unclear about how potential applicants would understand the model of delivery.

The programme specification also clarified that the end point assessment will be worth 20 credits at Level 6. However, the breakdown of subjects in each semester provided within the degree apprenticeship screengrab, did not show when learners are expected to take the end point assessment. The screengrab was a draft of the information which would appear on the education provider's website once approval was confirmed. As such, visitors were unclear whether learners are required to undertake the end point assessment during the last semester or after it and therefore how applicants to the programme would know about this requirement of the programme.

For the accelerated programme, the visitors reviewed the two screengrabs of the draft information for the website. As with the degree apprenticeship, the visitors noted this information would appear on the website once approval was confirmed. It was noted within the screengrabs that the fee for the accelerated programme is to be confirmed. From their wider review of the evidence, the visitors could not see any information regarding the proposed fee for the programme. As such, the visitors were unclear about the fee for this programme and how applicants will be made aware of this in order to assist in reaching an informed decision.

Considering the above mentioned points, the visitors were unclear how applicants will have the required information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the proposed accelerated or degree apprenticeship programmes.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programme continues to meet these standards.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: In response to the request for further information, the visitors were signposted to the Occupational Therapy Resources Sign off document. This was signed by the Academic Dean and outlined the commitment to develop the proposed programmes. The visitors were therefore satisfied there is appropriate commitment from the education provider to develop and deliver the programmes.

The visitors were also referred to minutes from meetings in September and November 2019 and February 2020 between the education provider and practice education providers. The minutes demonstrate there has been collaboration with practice education partners regarding the development of the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. However, it was noted in the September and November 2019 minutes, a conversation had occurred about the Education and Skills Funding Agency's guidelines to run a degree apprenticeship over four years. Stakeholders instead suggested a two year programme which could be divided into three semesters each year. Within these minutes, visitors could not see the rationale for finalising on a two year degree apprenticeship programme. As such, they could not determine whether all stakeholders supported the development of the programme and how the education provider would ensure the programme meets the needs of learners who will be entering the profession.

Additionally, the visitors noted that a concern had been raised at the November 2019 meeting. The concern was around the length of the programme and, that if the programme was delivered over two years, the learners would have to be "...learning on Level 5 in order to achieve the Level 6 accreditation". The visitors noted an action attached to this section of the minutes around developing mentorship. This went on to recognise this would be different for each organisation and this would need to be considered for the degree apprenticeship programme. However, the visitors could not locate further information to demonstrate how this concern had been acted upon. As such, the visitors could not identify that these considerations had been taken into account to ensure learners are suitably prepared for practice and that they will be able to meet the SOPs and expectations of professional behaviour in order to ensure the programme is fit for purpose.

The visitors also noted within the September 2019 minutes notes from group work. As part of this, the stakeholders were asked what they saw as the challenges in designing and delivering an apprenticeship programme. Some of the concerns raised were mentorship capacity, accommodating all stakeholders, managing the 20 percent off the job training requirement and balancing apprenticeship, job role, life and family. The visitors considered these were a genuine list of challenges, but could not identify information to outline the work that has been carried out or, agreements reached, to ensure these challenges will not affect the delivery of the degree apprenticeship programme. As no further minutes were provided beyond February 2020, visitors were unclear as to what processes have been developed for continuing to review the degree apprenticeship programme delivery and the related need for development to ensure it is fit for purpose. In addition, the visitors were unclear whether there was sufficient and appropriate support from practice education partners to deliver the proposed degree apprenticeship programme.

For the proposed accelerated programme, the visitors received no information specifically relating to this programme. They were therefore unclear how practice education partners were committed to providing sufficient resources to deliver the two year programme. The visitors were also unclear how the education provider has worked with, and will work with, practice education partners to ensure the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose.

The visitors therefore considered there was limited evidence to demonstrate that the degree apprenticeship programme meets the needs of learners. This is so they are suitably prepared for practice, able to meet the standards of proficiency and meet the expectations of professional behaviour. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the proposed programme will be sustainable and fit for purpose.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for this programme. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard.

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

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

Reason: In response to the request for further information, the visitors were signposted to minutes from meetings in September and November 2019 and February 2020 between the education provider and practice education providers. Visitors considered this demonstrated discussions had taken place around the development of the proposed programmes. However, it was noted the next meeting to take place after February 2020 was in May 2021 (however the visitors did not receive notification of whether this meeting had occurred). Based on this, visitors could not gather how this constitutes a regular and ongoing partnership as it was not clear whether any collaboration took place for more than a year post February 2020. As such, the visitors did not clearly understand how regular this collaboration will be going forward. As such, the visitors could not be sure this represented an effective and continuous partnership between the practice education providers and education provider.

The visitors were referred to Appendices 5 -7 as evidence regarding SET 3.6. The education provider stated 'Appendix 5' was the placement process for all BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy routes. From their review, the visitors noted the document contained information such as details of the placement team, placement audit process, practice educator training and the requirement for practice placement co-ordinator meetings to take place three times per year. However, the visitors were unable to identify any information which outlined the process to determine the capacity of placements. 'Appendix 6' contained a table listing the existing number of placements the education provider has arranged with each of their practice education provider partners. It also outlined that, to accommodate the growth in learner numbers in 2021-22, they would contact 16 organisations (rather than 9 in 2020-21). While the visitors were clear the education provider would be seeking more practice-based learning capacity, this document did not outline the process which would be used to do so. In the covering letter, the education provider stated that 'Appendix 7' contains evidence of discussions with Workforce Leads and placement providers. However, the visitors noted it contained information regarding the faculty management structure for the proposed programmes.

The visitors recognised that the programme team has held meetings and discussions with their practice education partners, as per the minutes provided. However, the visitors considered that the documentation provided does not evidence the process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for the increase in learner numbers relating to the proposed programmes. For example, they were unclear about what happens when there is limited, or no availability, and how the education provider ensures its process for the new programmes is effective. The visitors therefore are not satisfied there are effective processes in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the proposed programmes, including how this will be managed alongside the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continues to meet these standards.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were directed to 'Appendix 9' highlighting the timelines and duration for the proposed programmes. From their review, visitors noted that the

education provider intends to follow the same format as the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme but with a shortened length of holiday between semesters to allow the delivery of the programmes over two years.

For the degree apprenticeship programme, the visitors identified the timelines but noted it made no mention of when, during the second year, the end point assessment will take place.

For both proposed programmes, Appendix 9 mentioned “preparation for third year” within the second year. From this, the visitors were not clear what this refers to when the proposal is to run these programmes over two years. Additionally ‘Appendix 12’ (Sample timetable) provided information on which modules will be delivered during the relevant weeks of years one and two of the proposed programmes. However, it was not clear whether this applied specifically to the accelerated programme or the degree apprenticeship programme. Visitors considered that if the same timetable applied to both the programmes, it was unclear how the delivery of the learning outcomes could be achieved considering that learners on the apprenticeship route will possibly be attending less days per week compared to the accelerated programme. Therefore, the visitors considered it was unclear how all of the SOPs mentioned in the mapping document will be covered within the two years.

Whilst visitors were able to see the SOPs and the relevant learning outcomes within the SOPs mapping document and module descriptors, they could not determine the strategy in place for ensuring learners on the proposed programmes could achieve the learning outcomes, and therefore the standards of proficiency, within two years. This was due to the compressed nature of the proposed programmes and the aim to deliver the modules of the existing three year programme in two years. The visitors recognise that different models of delivery are able to meet the standards of education and training, including differing lengths of a programme. However, they remain unclear about how the mapped learning outcomes can be sufficiently delivered to the level required to ensure an individual can demonstrate safe and effective practise upon graduation.

This meant that visitors require further clarification on the timetabling, timelines and duration of both programmes, and how will the education provider ensures all of the SOPs and learning outcomes will be covered within the proposed timeframes. As such, the visitors could not determine how learners completing either of the proposed programmes can meet all of the SOPs. From this, they could not determine how this will ensure that learners will be able to practise safely and effectively once they enter the profession.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

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.

Reason: The visitors were directed to ‘Appendix 9’ highlighting the timelines and duration for the proposed programmes, and ‘Appendix 12’ demonstrating a sample

timetable. As noted above under SET 4.1, the visitors require clarity on the timetabling and programme structure and duration of the programmes and how all the learning outcomes and SOPs be covered within two years. Visitors were not clear how the condensed nature of the proposed programmes and the aim to deliver the modules of the existing three year programme in two years, will ensure the learning outcomes allow learners to understand and meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As per this standard, we do not set how these standards should be covered during the proposed programmes, however the visitors were unclear how, during the two years, learners will be made aware of all their obligations to meet them to ensure they are fit to practise when they qualify and apply for registration. Therefore, the visitors considered this standard is not met.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

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

Reason: Visitors were directed to 'Appendix 9' where the education provider outlined the timelines for the proposed programmes. The education provider stated that practice placement one is 6 weeks, practice placement two is 9 weeks whilst practice place three is 12 weeks for the proposed programmes. It was not clear to visitors how it is possible for both programmes to have the same number of placement weeks, as the education provider has proposed learners on the degree apprenticeship programme to spend 80 percent of their time on the job, in the learners place of work and as an apprentice (Appendix 10, degree apprentice programme specification) compared to the learners on the accelerated programme. Additionally, Appendix 9 stated the total duration of the accelerated programme is 91 weeks in duration, whilst the degree apprenticeship programme is 104 weeks. Based on this, the visitors remained unclear about the structure and duration of practice-based learning. As such visitors could not determine how the structure and duration of practice-based learning of the proposed programmes will ensure the achievement of learning outcomes and SOPs.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

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

Reason: Visitors were directed to 'Appendix 6', which included a table outlining the number of placements arranged with each of their current practice education provider partners. This document also showed names of the relevant co-ordinators from each of the listed practice education providers. However, this document did not clearly specify whether these co-ordinators are practice educators or first points of contact. In addition, it did not outline the qualifications or experience required of practice educators. The visitors were also unclear whether these arrangements applied to the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme or the proposed programmes. Based on this, the visitors could not gather what the education provider considered to be a suitable

number of practice educators for the increase in learner numbers, based on the introduction of two new programmes. Nor could the visitors determine the appropriate qualifications and experience required of practice educators to effectively support learning and assessment. Therefore, the visitors require clarity about whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, to support up to 12 learners per cohort for both the proposed programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine this standard had been met.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

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.

Reason: The visitors were directed to 'Appendix 9' highlighting the timelines and duration for the proposed programmes. From their review, visitors noted that the education provider intends to follow the same format as the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme but with a shortened length of holiday between semesters to allow the delivery of the programmes over two years.

For the degree apprenticeship programme, the visitors identified the timelines but noted it made no mention of when, during the second year, the end point assessment will take place.

For both proposed programmes, Appendix 9 mentioned "preparation for third year" within the second year. From this, the visitors were not clear what this refers to when the proposal is to run these programmes over two years. Additionally 'Appendix 12' (Sample timetable) provided information on which modules will be delivered during the relevant weeks of years one and two of the proposed programmes. However, it was not clear whether this applied specifically to the accelerated programme or the degree apprenticeship programme. Visitors considered that if the same timetable applied to both the programmes, it was unclear how the delivery and assessment of the learning outcomes could be achieved considering that learners on the apprenticeship route will possibly be on campus less days per week compared to the accelerated programme. Therefore, the visitors considered it was unclear how all of the SOPs mentioned in the mapping document will be delivered and assessed within the two years. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the learners will be able to demonstrate the threshold level of knowledge, skills and understanding to practise their profession safely and effectively.

Whilst visitors were able to see the SOPs and the relevant learning outcomes and assessments within the SOPs mapping document and module descriptors, they could not determine the strategy in place for ensuring learners on both the programmes could demonstrate the learning outcomes, and therefore the SOPs, within two years. This was due to the compressed nature of the proposed programmes and the aim to deliver and assess the modules of the existing three year programme in two years. The visitors recognise that different models of delivery are able to meet the standards of education and training, including differing lengths of a programme. However, they remain unclear about how the mapped learning outcomes can be sufficiently delivered and assessed to

the level required to ensure an individual can demonstrate safe and effective practise upon graduation.

From their review of 'Appendix 16', the visitors noted the assessment schedule for both the programmes and considered the resit period and modules being delivered. From this the visitors remained unclear about the assessment strategy design, particularly around when and how long learners would have to undertake any resits on the proposed programmes. For example, module OCC105 was delivered in week 24 for both programmes. For the degree apprenticeship programme, a resit would take place in week 37, while for the accelerated programme it would take place in week 33. The visitors noted in 'Appendix 9' (Timetable) the number of teaching sessions provided and how these aligned to the potential resit weeks. For both programmes, the indicated resit week for module OCC105 was during the third week of module 'Professional Reasoning & Strat for Intervention'. The visitors were unclear whether this would provide sufficient time for learners to prepare for, and undertake, a resit. The visitors were particularly concerned about the proposed degree apprenticeship programme as learners would also be in employment at this time. The visitors were therefore unclear how, due to the compressed nature of the proposed programmes, the assessment strategy and design sufficiently supports learners to succeed while ensuring they meet the SOPs.

From this, they could not determine how the assessment strategy and designed ensures that learners will be able to practise safely and effectively once they enter the profession.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

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.

Reason: The visitors were directed to 'Appendix 16' which demonstrated the assessment schedule and 'Appendix 15' showing how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are assessed within the modules.

As noted above under SET 4.1, 4.2 and 6.1, the visitors require clarity on the timetabling and programme structure and duration of the programmes and how all the learning outcomes and SOPs be delivered and assessed within two years. Visitors were not clear how the condensed nature of the proposed programmes and the aim to deliver and assess the modules of the existing three year programme in two years, will ensure the learning outcomes allow learners to understand and meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As per this standard, we do not set how these standards should be covered during the proposed programmes, however the visitors were unclear how during the two years, learners will be made aware of all their obligations to meet them to ensure they are fit to practice, when they qualify and apply for registration. Therefore, the visitors considered this standard is not met.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing

these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

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

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

Reason: Visitors were directed to 'Appendix 14' detailing the modules with their relevant methods of assessment and 'Appendix 9' showing details of the assessment and resit submission weeks. Additionally, information was provided regarding the assessment schedule ('Appendix 16'). Visitors considered there was a lack of clarity regarding the timetabling and duration for the proposed programmes. This was because 'Appendix 9' confirmed that the number of teaching sessions was the same as the existing approved 3 year programme. However, as outlined earlier, the visitors were unclear about the assessment strategy and design due to the compressed nature of the proposed programmes and in particular, the resit policy. The visitors were therefore unsure whether the assessment requirements were realistic for learners to undertake in the time period.

The visitors also reviewed the assessment policies in 'Appendix 10', Appendix 11' and 'Appendix 24', which are currently applied to the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. They were unclear how these policies will be applied consistently to the proposed programmes. For example, it was not clear what might prevent a learner on either of the programmes from progressing and what options will be made available to those at risk of not progressing, considering that the proposed programmes have shortened breaks between each semester. This meant that visitors could not determine how will assessment regulations for the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme, be implemented within a shorter duration for the proposed programmes. As such, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on whether assessments on the proposed programmes will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. Additionally, visitors considered that assessment and progression requirements for both the proposed programmes will require clarification on how it will differ from the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. Therefore the visitors considered these standards are not met.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet these standards.

Section 6: Additional considerations identified

Considering their review of the responses to the visitors' request for additional information under Section 4, the visitors identified additional SETs which they also recommend exploring and possibly discussing as part of the approval visit.

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

Reason: From reviewing the initial submission and additional information submitted for this major change, the visitors could not gather whether service users have had any involvement towards the development of the proposed programmes. Though the proposed programmes are based on the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme, the education provider is required to consider the impact to all of the standards of education and training. In addition, they are asked to provide a rationale to support where current arrangements used for an existing approved programme are deemed to be appropriate. As the visitors were unable to identify any involvement, such as through minutes of meetings, they were unclear about how service users and carers will be involved in these particular programmes and how they will be supported to do so. As such, the visitors require further information. From this, they will be able to determine how appropriate service user and carer involvement is and how their contribution adds to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programmes.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From reviewing the initial submission and additional information submitted for this major change, visitors noted that stakeholders such as senior management team and practice education providers have been involved in the development and planning of the proposed programmes. However, the visitors could not gather whether learners have had any involvement towards the development of the proposed programmes. Though the proposed programmes are based on the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme, the education provider is required to consider the impact to all of the standards of education and training. In addition, they are asked to provide a rationale to support where current arrangements used for an existing approved programme deemed to be appropriate. As the visitors were unable to identify any involvement, such as through minutes of meetings, they were unclear about how learners will be involved in the programme and how they will be supported to do so. This is so the visitors can determine how learners contribute to the programme to ensure its overall quality and effectiveness.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

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.

Reason: Within the response, in 'Appendix 30', visitors were directed to a sign off form confirming approval of resources by the faculty's Academic Dean for the proposed programmes. From their review, visitors noted on page two "Staffing numbers have also been taken into consideration – a new staff member is planned for 2021. Further staff will be reviewed in each annual round". Without any further information provided,

visitors could not gather what staffing arrangements have been taken into consideration and agreed to ensure there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programmes effectively. For example, when the recruitment process would commence or the qualifications and experience they were seeking. Nor could the visitors determine how this ensured that subject areas would be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. This is particularly in relation to the increase in learner numbers across the provision of occupational therapy at the education provider and the condensed nature of programmes with less breaks between each semester. The visitors recognise the statement of commitment from the Academic Dean but remain unclear about the justification for the number of staff in place, or to be recruited to run the programmes effectively. As such, they require further information to demonstrate there will be adequate staff with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise in place to support learners on the proposed programmes.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Reason: Within the response to the request for further information, visitors noted 'Appendix 30', which was a sign off from the faculty's Academic Dean providing assurance that aspects of learning resources, including teaching rooms and equipment, will be adequate to support learners on the proposed programmes. It was also noted within the same form that all aspects of learning resources, including staffing and physical resources, have been discussed between the programme teams and faculty senior management team. Whilst it was clear to visitors that there is commitment from senior management, it was not clear what considerations or audit of the physical resources has been carried out to determine that the support for learners joining the programmes will be adequate. The visitors remained particularly unclear about whether the nature of a condensed programme had been considered in terms of resources for the programmes. For example, it may be that the resources, or access to the resources, are different for the degree apprenticeship programmes as these learners are primarily based at their place of employment or are trying to access the resources outside of normal hours. As such, the visitors were unclear whether the existing resources are sufficient to provide an appropriate level of support for the new programmes (as well as the existing programme).

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, a visit is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet these standards.

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

Reason: From their review of initial submission and additional evidence, visitors could not see any information regarding what arrangements are in place to support the

wellbeing and learning needs of learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. Visitors recognise there are arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in all settings, for the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. However, the visitors have not received information to illustrate how the current arrangements for the existing approved programme continue to be appropriate. For example, it may be that these resources, or access to them, may be different for the degree apprenticeship programme as these learners are primarily based at their place of employment with additional employer policies or are trying to access the resources outside of normal hours. Therefore, the visitors require information regarding the arrangements in place to ensure appropriate arrangements are in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs in all settings is provided to learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard.

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

Reason: From reviewing the module descriptors submitted within 'Appendix 14', the visitors noted the statement in the response to HCPC mapping document "It is only the method of teaching that varies (in the workplace or on campus)". Based on this and their review of the learning outcomes and SOPs for the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme, visitors determined the method of teaching is the same for the proposed programmes. This is because Section Q of the modules in Appendix 14 outlines "Programmes using the module as Core/Option:" and lists all three programmes (for example for Personal and Professional Development 2; Occupational Disruptions). Within these module descriptors there is no difference in the teaching or learning methods across the programmes. As such, visitors were unable to see details regarding how the teaching methods will vary for the proposed programmes from the existing BSc programme. The visitors therefore could not make a judgement on the appropriateness of the teaching methods and how will it help in supporting learners to achieve the learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors will need to explore this further at the approval visit.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, assessing these programmes via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet this standard.

4.7 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

4.8 The delivery of the programme must support and develop evidence-based practice.

Reason: From their review of the responses to the request for further evidence, the visitors considered the delivery of the proposed programmes over two years, together with the learning outcomes to be delivered and assessed. As noted elsewhere within this report, whilst visitors were able to see the SOPs and the relevant learning

outcomes within the SOPs mapping document and module descriptors, they could not determine the strategy in place for ensuring learners on the proposed programmes could achieve the learning outcomes, and therefore the standards of proficiency, within two years. This was due to the compressed nature of the proposed programmes and the aim to deliver the modules of the existing three year programme in two years. The visitors recognise that different models of delivery are able to meet the standards of education and training, including differing lengths of a programme. However, they are unclear about how the mapped learning outcomes can be sufficiently delivered to learners so they become autonomous and reflective practitioners and be able to use evidence to inform and systematically evaluate their practice within the programme.

This meant that visitors require further clarification on the timetabling, timelines and duration of both programmes, and how will the education provider ensure all of the SOPs and learning outcomes will be covered within the proposed timeframes. As such, the visitors could not determine how learners completing the proposed programmes can become autonomous and reflective practitioners and use evidence to inform and systematically evaluate their practice within the timeframes. Therefore, the visitors will need to explore this further at the approval visit.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and meetings with various stakeholders for both the programmes. Therefore, a visit is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programmes continue to meet these standards.

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

Reason: For the degree apprenticeship programme, from their review of the responses to the request for further evidence, the visitors considered the delivery of the proposed programmes over two years, together with the learning outcomes to be delivered and assessed.

In addition, for the degree apprenticeship programme, the visitors considered how often the learners would be on campus and how they would take part in interprofessional education. As noted elsewhere within this report, whilst visitors were able to see the SOPs and the relevant learning outcomes within the SOPs mapping document and module descriptors, they could not determine the strategy in place for ensuring learners on the degree apprenticeship programme could achieve the learning outcomes, and therefore the standards of proficiency, within two years. This was due to the compressed nature of the proposed programme and the aim to deliver the modules of the existing three year programme in two years. The visitors recognise that different models of delivery are able to meet the standards of education and training, including differing lengths of a programme. However, they are unclear about how the mapped learning outcomes can be sufficiently delivered to learners so they are prepared to work with other professionals and across professions for the benefit of service users and carers.

This meant that visitors require further clarification on the timetabling, timelines and duration of both programmes, and how will the education provider ensure all of the SOPs and learning outcomes will be covered within the proposed timeframes. As such, the visitors could not determine how learners completing the degree apprenticeship programme can learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant

professions within the timeframes. Therefore, the visitors will need to explore this further at the approval visit.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for the apprenticeship programme. Therefore, assessing this programme via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Reason: For the degree apprenticeship programme, and from their review of page seven of 'Appendix 13a' (Programme handbook), the visitors noted the minimum attendance requirement is 80 percent per semester. However, from their review of the various other documentation submitted as additional evidence, the visitors are unclear how many days per week learners will be attending lectures on campus and what the number of days for practice-based learning is. As outlined elsewhere within the report, the visitors require further clarification on the timetabling, timelines and duration of both programmes, and how will the education provider ensures all of the SOPs and learning outcomes will be covered within the proposed timeframes. As such, the visitors could not gather how learners will be fully involved in the parts of the programme which are essential to achieving the learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors require further information to explore what parts of the degree apprenticeship programme are mandatory and how will this be communicated to learners.

The approval process will require a documentary submission and review, and if needed meetings with various stakeholders for the degree apprenticeship programme. Therefore, assessing this programme via the approvals process is the most appropriate process to gather evidence to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard.

Section 7: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and have identified additional areas for consideration through the process. The visitors therefore recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

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](#).