

---

## Approval process quality report

Education provider	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy Integrated Degree Apprenticeship
Date Assessment commenced	21 May 2021
Visitor recommendation made	13 October 2021
Case reference	CAS-01056-G8B5W6

### **Summary of findings from this assessment**

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme detailed in this report meets 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 .....	4
Stage 1 assessment: The institution .....	4
Assurance that institution level standards are met.....	5
Stage 2 assessment: The programmes .....	5
Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment.....	6
Assessment of the proposal .....	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 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 institution 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	Coventry University
Key contact	Kim Stuart

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

- Paramedic
- Biomedical scientist
- Independent / Supplementary prescribing
- Operating department practitioner
- Occupational therapist
- Physiotherapist
- Dietitian
- Diagnostic radiographer

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.

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

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

### **Assurance that institution level standards are met**

As part of this stage we considered how the proposed programmes fit into the named institution 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 institution. We determined the proposed programmes would be managed in way that was consistent with the definition of their institution. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate for the programme to sit as part of Coventry University and take assurance the institution level standards will continue to be met by its introduction.

### **Stage 2 assessment: The programmes**

Education provider	Coventry University
--------------------	---------------------

Accountable person (for the programmes)	Kim Stuart
Programmes	MSc Occupational Therapy Integrated Degree Apprenticeship
Profession	Occupational therapist
Mode of study	Work based learning
Type of programme	Pre-registration
Learner numbers	50 learners once per year
Qualification level	Postgraduate
Start date	January 2022

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.

### Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment

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

Registrant visitors	Dawn Blenkin - occupational therapist
	Jane Grant - occupational therapist

### 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:

We design our assessment to be proportionate and appropriate to the issues identified and to seek input from relevant stakeholders when necessary. In this case, we considered it was appropriate and proportionate to request additional information via further documentation.

Theme	Reason for additional clarification / documentation
How the education provider makes sure there is an effective process in place to ensure the	The visitors noted the education provider's process for forecasting placements and information in the statement of commitment, which demonstrated an employer's responsibility to provide corresponding practice placements. The visitors noted that the education provider has existing

<p>availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.</p>	<p>BSc and MSc Occupational therapy provision. The visitors saw no specific reference in the documentation around how the education provider will ensure capacity and availability of placements for the additional number of learners on the new programme. It was also unclear how the additional placements taken by the apprentices will affect the existing programmes.</p>
<p>Ensuring adequate staffing capacity to deliver an effective programme.</p>	<p>The education provider referred to a 'large teaching team' which will be supplemented by hourly paid lecturers and visiting guest lecturers. They also indicated their staff: learner ratio to be 1:20. The visitors sought clarification to know whether the education provided had considered all programmes this set of staff would be teaching. The visitors also needed to know if the provider had considered the time taken for other non-teaching duties.</p>
<p>Ensuring adequate resources to support learning in all settings.</p>	<p>The programme appeared to be well resourced to ensure effective delivery to learners in their first year. The visitors saw that there were adequate resources in place for the first cohort of 50 learners. It was unclear how the current resources would meet the needs of additional 50 learners in their second year. The visitors were unclear what teaching is face-to-face and which elements are online and the percentage split of these, because this information was lacking in the evidence submitted. The visitors also needed further clarity on any considerations the provider had given to the differing learning needs of apprentices.</p>
<p>How the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.</p>	<p>The visitors saw very detailed information about how the provider will ensure that practice educators will have adequate training and ongoing refresher training. The visitors considered there needs to be further evidence of how the education provider will ensure adequate placement capacity to be able to determine whether there will be adequate staff in practice-based learning.</p>
<p>Ensuring adequate range of practice-based learning opportunities.</p>	<p>The visitors needed clarification if the same structure, duration and range of practice-based learning on the existing MSc programme would apply to the degree apprenticeship programme.</p>
<p>Assessment policies specifying requirements for progression and assessment methods being effective at measuring learning outcomes.</p>	<p>The visitors sought clarification around the End Point Assessment to understand when apprentices are required to undertake it and whether they receive adequate support.</p>

## **Summary of visitor findings**

### SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register

The visitors considered that the Masters level was an appropriate level of qualification for the new Occupational therapy programme.

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

### SET 2: Programme admissions

The evidence supplied demonstrated that entry requirements are aligned to the current MSc programme and the apprenticeship standards. There was also detailed information around how accreditation of prior experiential learning will be assessed for the new programme, and what prospective applicants would have to provide in order to evidence this.

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

### SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership

The evidence from the submitted documents showed that there is collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers – particularly around how the placements will operate and be supported on the MSc Occupational Therapy Degree Apprenticeship programme. The information submitted included the education provider's placement expansion strategy and their placement allocation standard which demonstrated their processes to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning are effective.

The staffing projections reassured the visitors that the provider had adequately forecasted the staffing requirements and had institutional commitment for the growth in learner numbers. The staff curriculum vitae showed a wide range of experience and research interests. Visiting guest lecturers from different areas of practice are also employed.

Adequate detail provided in learner handbooks and the course specification demonstrated that the education provider had considered what additional resource implications there will be, and how they will ensure accessibility to all learners.

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

### SET 4: Programme design and delivery

The visitors understood from the standards mapping submitted and through earlier discussions with the programme team, that the design and delivery of the programme is modelled on the existing approved MSc pre-registration programme.

Therefore, they were confident that the new programme would also meet the learning outcomes in a similar way. It was evidenced in the documentation that the education provider adopts a range of learning and teaching methods to suit a wide range of learners. The visitors saw that there are changes in the way that learning and teaching will be undertaken on this new MSc route, but the visitors were satisfied that the learning and teaching methods are appropriate to the different nature of the apprenticeship route, with an equal split between practice-based learning, university-based learning and work-based learning.

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

#### SET 5: Practice-based learning

The information provided demonstrated that the structure and duration of practice-based learning will be same for both the apprentice and full-time learner. The apprentice will have the additional chance to Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL) the first placement depending on their prior work experience. This mirrors their existing MSc pre-registration provision so the visitors were satisfied with this approach.

The education provider included a statement that showed employers will be expected to provide a placement for an apprentice at each placement point. This, combined with other evidence of a placement expansion strategy, reassured the visitors that the provider had a process in place to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff were involved in practice-based learning.

The evidence supplied also showed that the education provider has good systems in place to ensure that practice educators are on the relevant part of the Register, and there is a robust process for working collaboratively with practice educators, including visits during placements. The provider also has a comprehensive programme of training and Continuing Professional Development for practice educators.

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

#### SET 6: Assessment

As with the programme design and delivery, the visitors noted the way the assessment strategy and method are designed is the same as the MSc pre-registration programme. From further clarification sought by the visitors from the programme team around End Point Assessment (EPA), the visitors understood that the EPA is fully integrated within the programme with no additional assessment of the apprentices. The visitors were clear that the EPA will be signed off at an exam board by a dedicated external examiner who will independently review a sample of learner journeys from across the programme.

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 07 December 2021.

---

## Approval process quality report

Education provider	Keele University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Prosthetics and Orthotics
Date Assessment commenced	18 August 2021
Visitor recommendation made	26 October 2021
Case reference	CAS-01044-L4P9N1

### **Summary of findings from this assessment**

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme detailed in this report meets 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 institution .....	5
Stage 2 assessment: The programmes .....	6
Summary of visitor findings.....	10
Section 3: The visitors' recommendations.....	12
Programme approval .....	12
Section 4: Committee decision on approval .....	12

## 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 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 institution 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	Keele University
Key contact	Anne O'Brien

As part of the initiation of the process the education provider indicated that the proposed programme would be part of Keele University. This institution is well established with HCPC and currently delivers approved programmes in:

- Biomedical scientist
- Physiotherapist
- Diagnostic radiographer
- Independent / Supplementary prescribing
- Paramedic

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.

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

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

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeals</li> </ul>
--	---

### Assurance that institution level standards are met

As part of this stage, we considered how the proposed MSc Prosthetics and Orthotics programme fits into the named institution 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 institution. We determined the proposed programmes would be managed in way that was consistent with the definition of their institution. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate for the programme to sit as part of Keele University and take assurance the institution level standards will continue to be met by its introduction.

### Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

Education provider	Keele University
Accountable person (for the programmes)	Anne O'Brien
Programmes	MSc Prosthetics and Orthotics
Profession	Prosthetist / Orthotist
Mode of study	Full time
Learner numbers	20
Type of programme	Pre-registration
Qualification level	Postgraduate
Start date	01 January 2022

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 other sources of information, intelligence, and data such as the Higher Education statistics Agency (HESA), Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and the National Student Survey (NSS).

<b>Performance area</b>	<b>Data point / comparison</b>	<b>Benchmark</b>	<b>Data</b>	<b>Score</b>
Performance indicator	Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	460	463	0.00
Performance indicator	Aggregation of percentage not continuing	6.8	4.9	0.01
Performance indicator	Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	95.5	96.1	0.04
Teaching quality	TEF award	N/A	Gold	0.00
Learner / graduate satisfaction	NSS overall satisfaction score (Q27)	75.01	80.63	0.08
<b>Total</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1.00</b>

### **What the scores mean**

Overall, the enrolled numbers across the institution are within reasonable range of the numbers approved by the HCPC. Keele University has a very small number of learners not continuing which may indicate a very high percentage of learners are satisfied with their learning at this institution. Overall risk scores can range from 0 to 1. Keele University has an overall score of 1, which means they are performing at a very high level and we can take some assurance from these scores when considering possible risks to the proposed programme.

### **Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment**

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

Registrant visitors	Hazel Anderson - prosthetist / orthotist
	Fiona McCullough - 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:

We design our assessment to be proportionate and appropriate to the issues identified and to seek input from relevant stakeholders when necessary. We considered it was appropriate and proportionate to request additional information via further documentation.

The themes we explored are as follows:

Theme	Reason for additional clarification / documentation
How the education provider ensures collaboration between them and practice education providers is effective.	The visitors saw evidence of a collaborative approach being adopted in the process of practice educator recruitment, which involves evaluation and induction. They also noted that thorough guidance and support was provided to practice educators through initial training and when there are failing learners. However, the visitors were unclear what routine collaboration exists between the education provider and practice educators and how this is planned at programme level. The visitors needed to be clear if this included a 3-way collaboration with learners. The visitors also considered evidence of meetings with practice education providers would further demonstrate the effectiveness of their collaboration.
How the education provider makes sure there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.	The visitors considered the education provider's approach to link with the national placement pilot and map capacity with other providers was helpful. However, the visitors noted that placements have been shortened to make allocation easier within the region.  The visitors also needed to know if the service level agreements had been signed off yet. The visitors received a placement spreadsheet that demonstrated many of the proposed providers will not overlap placements with existing learners from Salford and Strathclyde. However, the visitors were interested to find out how Keele, and Salford in particular, will coordinate their placements if Salford learners have placements all year round.

<p>Ensuring adequate staffing capacity to deliver an effective programme.</p>	<p>The visitors saw a staff: learner ratio of 1:7, which they considered adequate for the first intake. The visitors however saw a plan to increase learner intake to 50 and wondered if there was a similar commitment to increase staffing if and when this occurs.</p>
<p>Ensuring adequate resources to support learning in all settings.</p>	<p>The visitors saw there are adequate and available resources on placement. The visitors also noted other resources at the education provider such as the library, and the programme and placement handbooks were clearly laid out. The visitors noted however, that the Prosthetics and Orthotics building was currently at the planning stage. The visitors were unable to determine how likely the building was to be completed in time for the first intake and contingency plans if not.</p>
<p>How the education provider ensures staffing in practice-based learning is adequate.</p>	<p>The visitors were satisfied that all clinical practice educators are prosthetists or orthotists and noted evidence of their training, including non-clinical placement practice educators. Given the possibility that some practice educators may have learners from more than one education provider at the same time, the visitors needed to be clear if Keele has a maximum ratio of learner to practice educators. The visitors also needed to be clear if a learner is assigned to a named practice educator or to the clinical centre/placement. The visitors also considered that the number of practice educators available is adequate for 20 learners but they wanted to know if there was a timeline and plan to increase when learner numbers go up to 50.</p>
<p>Ensuring practice educators are suitable and able to support learners in a safe and effective way.</p>	<p>The visitors saw a 3-stage training provided to new practice educators, with a targeted version given to those experienced with Salford or Strathclyde learners. However, the visitors were unclear what practice educator training will be delivered by Keele University considering that many of the practice educators will already have learners from other education providers in the region. The visitors were keen to know what training will be required for the practice educators and the delivery plan.</p>
<p>Ensuring that the way practice-based learning is designed allows learners to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and the standards of proficiency.</p>	<p>There were innovative dedicated manufacturing setting placements but with reduced clinical placements. The visitors noted that the learning outcomes were heavily reliant on exposure to clinical practice. The visitors considered that the workshop/manufacturing placements are of value and welcomed by the profession. However, they considered the risk that heavy reliance on these may have on how learners meet the learning outcomes and the SOPs. This is because the learning outcomes and the SOPs are mostly linked to clinical practice.</p>

## **Summary of visitor findings**

### SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register

The visitors considered that the Masters level was an appropriate level of qualification for the new MSc Prosthetics and Orthotics programme.

On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this standard.

### SET 2: Programme admissions

Information provided in the programme specification and the Course Specific Regulations document clearly demonstrated the programme's entry requirements and the interview selection process. Information around costs and how learners are supported on the programme was clearly laid out to assist applicants in their decision making. A letter from the Head of School also provided additional information on the support provided to develop the programme and ensure suitable applicants are recruited on to the programme.

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

### SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership

Evidence, including an introductory letter from the Head of School, programme specification, staff CVs and the student and placement handbooks, all demonstrated that the programme is adequately supported. The visitors noted that a dedicated member of the Prosthetics and Orthotics academic team will lead the Prosthetics and Orthotics placements throughout the course. This will include monitoring placement provision throughout the course to ensure each learner achieves a balanced profile of Prosthetic and Orthotic experience prior to their MSc completion.

The visitors also received evidence of collaborative working with other providers in the region. For example, they saw that Keele University have been part of a "Placement E-learning Form (PELF)" project for 18 months, collaborating with colleagues in Salford / Strathclyde and Derby. This has created a forum for them to dialogue and work together to improve the placement allocation process.

The staff CVs demonstrated adequate staff with appropriate clinical experience in all key areas. A business plan agreed by the University Executive Committee also provided projected staffing level for the first five years.

A building delivery timeline submitted confirmed that the Prosthetics and Orthotics building would be ready for the first intake in January 2022. An additional contingency time was also included in learners' timetabling should there be any delay.

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

#### SET 4: Programme design and delivery

The education provider submitted a comprehensive standard of proficiency (SOPs) mapping. The standards of conduct, performance and ethics were also covered in the programme specification, taught modules and the placement handbook. Mapping to the British Association of Prosthetists & Orthotists standards demonstrated how philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base are reflected throughout the programme. The modules, practical sessions and placements were appropriately timed throughout the programme which demonstrated integration of theory and practice. Post placement debrief session's evidenced autonomous and reflective thinking and the module contents and research projects demonstrated the programme supports evidence-based practice.

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

#### SET 5: Practice-based learning

Sections of the placement handbook demonstrated placements have been designed to include a variety of opportunities for learners, within the programme. One of the key areas noted is the understanding of the manufacturing and design of prosthetic and orthotic devices upon which clinical development is dependent. The visitors saw that there was support from stakeholders for learners to develop skills in this area, and the visitors were reassured the non-clinical placements will not be used to replace clinical placements and that learning outcomes will be achieved within placement timeline.

The visitors also saw that all Prosthetics and Orthotics practice educators working in a clinical setting are HCPC registered and current health professionals. Keele University will provide Practice Educator training for all practice educators. Some industry-based placements will be supervised by Prosthetics and Orthotics industry experts who will not be HCPC registered, but who will have undertaken the Keele Practice Information on Practice Educator training.

Evidence submitted also showed 0.2 whole time equivalent (WTE) dedicated placement support senior orthotist will be seconded for the first year of the programme therefore the visitors were confident that practice-based learning will be effectively coordinated.

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

#### SET 6: Assessment

The visitors considered that the mapping of assessments clearly demonstrated how the SOPs will be delivered. The visitors considered that the programme specification clearly outlined the requirements to progress through, and successfully complete the

programme. The visitors identified an effective range of assessments including practical, oral and written assessments, focusing on critical analysis, justification and decision making. Policies are well documented and explained to learners in the student handbook and clear regulations were set out in the programme specification.

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 07 December 2021.

## Approval process quality report

Education provider	University of Derby
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice (Full time) Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice (Part time)
Date Assessment commenced	10/08/2021
Visitor recommendation made	02/11/2021
Case reference	CAS-01070-M1Q9L7

### Summary of findings from this assessment

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the College of Health, Psychology and Social Care - Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology 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, 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.....	9
Section 3: The visitors' recommendations.....	10
Programme approval .....	10
Section 4: Committee decision on approval .....	11

## 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 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 institution 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 Derby
Institution	College of Health, Psychology and Social Care
Key contact	Denise Baker

As part of the initiation of the process the education provider indicated that the proposed programmes would be part of College of Health, Psychology and Social Care. This institution is well established with HCPC and currently delivers approved programmes in:

- Occupational Therapy; and
- Diagnostic Radiography

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.

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

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

### Assurance that institution level standards are met

As part of this stage we considered how the proposed programmes fit into the named institution 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 institution. We determined the proposed programmes would be managed in way that was consistent with the definition of their institution. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate to take assurance the institution level standards will continue to be met by the introduction of these programmes.

### Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

Education provider	University of Derby
Institution	College of Health, Psychology and Social Care
Accountable person (for the programmes)	Denise Baker
Programme	Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice
Mode of study	Part time
Programme duration	48 months
Learner numbers	7
Intakes per year	3
Qualification	PGDip
Start date	01/01/2022

Education provider	University of Derby
Institution	College of Health, Psychology and Social Care
Accountable person (for the programmes)	Denise Baker
Programme	Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice
Mode of study	Full time
Programme duration	24 months
Learner numbers	8
Intakes per year	3
Qualification	PGDip
Start date	01/01/2022

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

Performance area	Data point / comparison	Benchmark	Data	Score	Executive comments
Performance indicator	Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	185	172	-0.01	This data point is for all the existing programmes within the institution, for the last academic year. This has resulted in a negative score because the actual total learner numbers is higher than the benchmark value. This occurred across the occupational therapy and radiography programmes, within this institution.
Performance indicator	Aggregation of percentage not continuing	9.8	10.3	-0.05	We collected this data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). The score, indicates the education provider has scored below the benchmark and is performing slightly below the minimum good score.
Performance indicator	Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	94.6	96	0.02	We collected this data from the HESA. The score, indicates the education provider is above the minimum threshold of a good score of 0. This indicated the education providers is performing well in this area.
Teaching quality	TEF award	N/A	Gold	0.00	The data point 'Gold' is the highest score in this area. This indicates the education provider is performing well in this area
Learner / graduate satisfaction	NSS overall satisfaction score (Q27)	74.83	77.66	0.04	We collect this data from the Office for Students (OfS).. This score indicates the education provider is performing well in this area
<b>Total</b>				<b>0.93</b>	This overall score is considered a very high

					score as it is close to the maximum score of 1. This 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 visitors	Sally Evans – Practitioner psychologist
	Jennifer Caldwell – Occupational therapist

### 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: Email response to questions

We design our assessment to be proportionate and appropriate to the issues identified and to seek input from relevant stakeholders when necessary. We considered it was appropriate and proportionate to consider additional information via email response to questions.

The themes we explored are as follows:

Theme	Reason for email response to questions
Ensuring applicants are made aware of the selection and entry criteria, as part of the admissions process	Visitors were unclear as to how applicants will be made aware of the requirement for them to find their practice-based learning prior to starting on either of the programmes. As this was one of the requirements of admissions, visitors sought clarification about how this requirement will be conveyed and made available to applicants as part of the admissions process.
Ensuring resources for the programmes are effective and appropriate to support learners, for	Visitors could not locate information regarding resources, specifically physical resources for the proposed programmes. As such, they asked for further evidence regarding this and how the education provider will ensure these resources are adequate and effective, to support learners on these proposed programmes.

the delivery of the proposed programmes	
Clarity on range of placements which will be on offer, for learners on the proposed programmes	Visitors noted 'The Supervisor' will be responsible for managing the practice-based learning, along with ensuring learners will have access to the required breadth and range of practice-based learning. However, visitors could not locate any information regarding what range of practice-based learning will be on offer for learners on these programmes.
How the education provider ensures practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.	Visitors understood that learners need to identify an appropriately qualified and experienced registered psychologist as a supervisor, prior to joining these programmes. From reviewing the submission, visitors could not identify what the minimum expected qualification and experience is for practice educators to possess, to be able to support learners on these programmes. Additionally, visitors wanted clarity who makes a decision on the suitability of practice educators including keeping an audit, on the practice-based learning chosen by the learner.

From their detailed review of the responses submitted, the visitors were satisfied with the clarification provided to address all of the queries identified above.

## **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 HCPC Register. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area.

### SET 2: Programme admissions

Visitors considered the information submitted as part of the evidence was very well detailed. It contained clear information about the academic, professional entry and selection criteria for these programmes. The education provider highlighted their requirements for direct entry onto the programmes, that the visitors considered appropriate and suitable for applicants. On this basis and from the queries raised during the quality activity, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

### SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership

The education provider demonstrated the availability of sufficient and adequate resources, including digital and physical resources that would effectively support

learners in the delivery of the proposed programmes. The education provider also demonstrated the profile of their programme team, along with providing clear information regarding their qualifications and experience. This along with the use of associate lecturers was adequate to support the required teaching activities, for the proposed learner numbers on these programmes. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

#### SET 4: Programme design and delivery

The visitors considered the programme curriculum to be appropriate for learners to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) and be suitably prepared for practice. They also noted learning outcomes were clearly mapped to the SOPs. Visitors also noted expectations of professional behaviour, including standards of conduct, performance and ethics professional was explained clearly within the documents. Visitors noted the blended learning approach was appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes. Visitors also considered the evidence provided demonstrated a clear integration of theory and practice, with a clear linkage between the two. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

#### SET 5: Practice-based learning

Visitors noted learners are expected to have a practice-based learning arrangement and clinical supervisor agreed, prior to joining the proposed programmes. Through the quality activity, visitors were able to determine the range of practice-based learning and how auditing will take place. Additionally, visitors were satisfied about how the education provider will check there will be adequate practice educators with the necessary knowledge and experience to support learners on these programmes. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

#### SET 6: Assessment

The visitors noted the assessment strategy aligned with curriculum which would enable learners to demonstrate the learning outcomes and SOPs. Additionally, visitors considered the assessment policies were clear in terms of progression and achievement on the respective 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 7/12/21

## Approval process quality report

Education provider	University of Winchester
Name of programme(s)	Independent & Supplementary Prescribing
Date Assessment commenced	23 June 2021
Visitor recommendation made	4 October 2021
Case reference	CAS-01062-K8S0X2

### Summary of findings from this assessment

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training and standards for prescribing respectively. 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 institution .....	5
Assurance that institution level standards are met.....	5
Stage 2 assessment: The programmes .....	6
Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment.....	7
Assessment of the proposal .....	7
Summary of visitor findings.....	7
Section 3: The visitors' recommendations.....	8
Programme approval .....	8
Recommendation to other process .....	9
Section 4: Committee decision on approval .....	9

## 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 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 institution 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 Winchester
Key contact	Justine Clements

As part of the initiation of the process the education provider indicated that the proposed programme would be part of University of Winchester. This institution is well established with HCPC and currently delivers approved programmes in:

- Dietetics
- Occupational therapy
- Physiotherapy

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.

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

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

### Assurance that institution level standards are met

As part of this stage we considered how the proposed programmes fit into the named institution 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 institution. We determined the proposed programmes would be managed in way that was consistent with other programmes within institution. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate to take assurance the institution level standards will continue to be met by the introduction of this programme.

## Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

Education provider	University of Winchester
Institution	University of Winchester
Accountable person (for the programmes)	Justine Clements
Programmes	Independent & Supplementary Prescribing
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Learner numbers	35 per cohort, two cohorts per year
Type of programme	Entitlement
Qualification level	Post-graduate
Start date	14 February 2022

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 intelligence and data from HESA, TEF and the NSS. We sought insight from the professional bodies for the professions entitled to prescribe in the UK, but we received no usable intelligence or insight from them.

Performance area	Data point / comparison	Benchmark	Data	Score
Performance indicator	Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	35 maximum intended learners	n/a	n/a - Programme has not yet run
Performance indicator	Aggregation of percentage not continuing	7.4	6.6	0.1 - Data from 2018/19

Performance indicator	Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	95.5	93.6	-0.02 - Data from 2016/17
Teaching quality	TEF award	n/a	Silver	0.01 - Award from 2017
Learner / graduate satisfaction	NSS overall satisfaction score (Q27)	75.53	69.88	-0.08 - Data from 2021
Performance indicator	HCPC AEPM cycle length	n/a	n/a	0
<b>Total</b>				<b>0.92</b>

This indicates that the education provider is performing well, and the visitors considered this information when undertaking their assessment.

### Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment

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

Registrant visitors	Alaster Rutherford – Independent prescribing
	Janet Lawrence – Independent prescribing

### Assessment of the proposal

#### Initial review:

- The visitors reviewed the education provider's submission and considered their approach to each standard.
- The visitors made decisions around the standards they considered to be met and the areas they required further information around.
- The visitors considered they did not need to undertake any quality activity.

### Summary of visitor findings

#### Standards for prescribing A: 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.

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

#### Standards for prescribing B: Programme governance, management and leadership

The education provider demonstrated that appropriate resources are provided to all learners. They saw that there is an adequate number of staff in place. The visitors considered the education provider had clear processes in place to address placement capacity. The education provider showed that there is effective collaboration between themselves and practice education providers. The education provider demonstrated that subject areas will be delivered by educators with relevant knowledge.

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

#### Standards for prescribing C: Programme design and delivery

The evidence submitted by the education provider demonstrated how the curriculum delivers the standards set out in the Competency Framework for all Prescribers. 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.

#### Standards for prescribing D: Practice-based learning

The visitors could see how well practice-based learning was integrated into the programme and the learning outcomes would be delivered through practice-based learning. There was sufficient evidence in the documentation to demonstrate to the visitors there is a clear process for ensuring an adequate number of staff, and that they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

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

#### Standards for prescribing E: Assessment

The visitors were able to see that the assessment strategy is clear and ensures that the learning outcomes are effectively assessed so learners who successfully complete the programme meet the standards set out in the Competency Framework for all Prescribers.

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 education provider has demonstrated that all standards for prescribing (standards for education providers) are met through this exercise. This means that the institution and the programme should be approved, without conditions.

#### Section 4: Committee decision on approval

- We will record the decision of the Education and Training Committee here following their meeting on 7 December 2021.