HCPC approval process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) (2019), Flexible
Approval visit date	14-15 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12925-H0D9F2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach....2
Section 2: Programme details....3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment....3
Section 4: Outcome from first review....4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation....4
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)....5

Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

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

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

Stephen Fisher	Practitioner psychologist - Occupational psychologist
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Diane Whitlock	Lay
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

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

Geraldine O'Hare	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	British Psychological society – Chief assessor, forensic board
Laura Smith	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	British Psychological Society – Division of Occupational psychology

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) (2019)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Occupational psychologist
Proposed First intake	01 February 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	75 per year (recruited at any point within the year)
Assessment reference	APP01918

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we 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	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	No	There are no module descriptors as this is an assessment based programme. Learners submit their findings to evidence how they meet the standards set out by the education provider. These standards ensure that they meet the standards of proficiency for practitioner psychologists upon successful completion of the programme.
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required	As this programme is not approved there are no external

		examiner reports for the programme.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	As this programme is not approved, we met learners from the currently approved Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2) and Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) programmes.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how they monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and learners.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the Equal opportunities policy, equal opportunities form and Annual report template. At the visit, the visitors were also shown an equality and diversity monitoring survey, which gathers data on the protected characteristics. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the equality and diversity data is monitored during the annual report meetings by reviewing both the equality and diversity monitoring survey and the annual monitoring summary report. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. Although the equality policy includes all the protected characteristics and learners are directed to further help if they feel discriminated against, the visitors noted in the annual monitoring summary report that what is monitored on the form is Gender, Age and Geographical locations. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers revising the annual monitoring summary report form to gather data about all the protected characteristics as on the equality and diversity monitoring survey shown at

the visit. This will ensure that the education provider captures the information about all the protected characteristics via both methods used.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 05 July 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval this report.

At the visit, the visitors noted that all the standards were met based on the discussions and documentation. Through the discussions at the visit however, the visitors were informed that there would be future developments to the programme which could impact on a number of standards. The changes will include an introduction of a new fee structure and the development of a new virtual learning environment for learners. When the education provider knows the details of the changes and when they will be implemented, they should notify us through our monitoring processes so we can consider whether our standards continue to be met.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Name of programme(s)	Master of Occupational Therapy (MOT), Full time Master of Physiotherapy (MPhys), Full time
Approval visit date	3-5 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13370-M3L0W4

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

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

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

HCPC occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel members	
Angela Ariu	Occupational therapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Manoj Mistry	Lay
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive
HCPC diagnostic radiography and dietetics panel members	
Ian Hughes	Lay
Tracy Clephan	Dietitian
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

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

Janine Bolger	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	The Robert Gordon University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Occupational Therapy (MOT)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 44
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01922

Programme name	Master of Physiotherapy (MPhys)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 38
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01923

From 1 September 2018, applicants can no longer apply to the BSc (Hons) Dietetics as this programme has been incorporated in to an integrated Master of Dietetics (MDiet) and now exists as a HCPC registerable exit award from this programme.

From 1 September 2018, applicants can no longer apply to the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic radiography as this programme has been incorporated in to an integrated Master of Diagnostic radiography (MDRad) and now exists as a HCPC registerable exit award from this programme

We undertook this assessment of new programmes proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we 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	Reason
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes	The external examiner reports provided are for the BSc Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy programmes which have been approved by the HCPC.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

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

Recommendation: The education provider should review how learners are made aware of the process to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were provided with documentation including the 'whistleblowing policy'. Following the review of the documentation the visitors agreed that there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and were therefore, satisfied that this standard was met. However, as this information was not easily accessible in the practice-based learning environment, the visitors would like to recommend that the education provider considers where this information is located to ensure learners can easily access it if they need to.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 August 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Name of programme(s)	Master of Dietetics (MDiet), Full time BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Approval visit date	3 – 5 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13152-X8K4T8

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

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

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

HCPC diagnostic radiograph and dietetic panel members	
Ian Hughes	Lay
Tracy Clephan	Dietitian
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive
HCPC occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel members	
Angela Ariu	Occupational therapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Manoj Mistry	Lay
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

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

Janine Bolger	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	The Robert Gordon University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Dietetics (MDiet)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01921

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	The first intake for this programme was 1 June 1994*****
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 36
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01986

*From 1 September 2018, applicants can no longer apply to the BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics as this programme has been incorporated in to an integrated Master of Dietetics (MDiet) and now exists as BSc (Hons) Dietetics which is a HCPC registerable exit award from this programme.

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we 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	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	

Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	No	This is a new programme and as such, there are no external examiner reports available.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	The visitors met with learners from the existing BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 August 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.