HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Aston University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), Part time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), Work based learning
Approval visit date	19-20 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13134-Q4Y1F2

Contents

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:

David Houliston	Biomedical scientist
Richard Sykes	Hearing aid dispenser
Christine Morgan	Lay
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.

Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	The chair was unable to attend the visit due to personal reasons.

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35 across both programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01912

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35 across both programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01913

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	Not Required	As this is not yet an approved programme, the education provider was not required to submit this.

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	As this is not yet an approved programme, we met with learners from the existing BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology).
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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 03 August 2018.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the required information about the programme is available to potential applicants, so that they can make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on a programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not determine how the education provider would ensure that certain information would be communicated to potential applicants allowing them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. From the documentation, the visitors understood that the responsibility of ensuring the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) or health requirements was the responsibility of the employer. However, in discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the education provider would assess the criminal convictions checks with the other admission checks, before the learner starts

the programme. Due to the difference in the information provided, the visitors could not see how applicants will be made aware of the process for assessing the DBS and health checks or who will be responsible for making those assessments. As such, the education provider will need to ensure that the information provided to potential applicants regarding DBS and health checks is accurate so they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

The visitors were unable to see how the education provider intends to communicate the following information to prospective applicants:
- the process associated with any Disclosure and Barring Service or health requirements and any associated costs to the learner;
- the selection and entry requirements; and
- the attendance requirements of the programme in the academic setting.

Therefore, the visitors require further information, which demonstrates that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate selection and entry criteria for the programmes, and ensure that it includes the appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the website and advertising materials, the visitors noted the selection and entry criteria for the existing BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine the selection and entry criteria for the degree apprenticeship route. As such, the visitors were unable to determine the relevant academic and professional entry standards for the programme and could not make a decision about whether the criteria is appropriate for the level and content of the programme. The education provider must clearly articulate selection and entry criteria for the programmes and ensure that it includes the appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

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

Condition: The education provider must provider further evidence of the criteria used to assess applicants have a good command of English.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that learners are able to use language at the level necessary to communicate effectively with service users and carers, educators and others, and to complete the programme successfully. In discussions with the programme team, it was highlighted that each applicant is subject to interview and that this is how English skills are assessed. However, from the evidence provided and discussions, the visitors were unable to determine, whether the applicants' command of English will be tested beyond the verbal communication skills. The visitors could not determine if, how or when the applicants, written, listening and reading English language will be tested. Furthermore, the visitors were unclear what criteria will be used to assess applicants command of English, how the criteria will be

applied consistently and how applicants will be informed of English language requirements prior to the interview. The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how applicants' command of English will be assessed, what criteria will be used and how applicants will be informed about the English requirements.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify whether applicant's prior leaning and experience will be considered for this programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the visitors were directed to the education provider's "General Regulations for Undergraduate and Integrated Master's Programmes include information on APEL [accreditation of prior (experiential) learning] requirements". In assessing the regulation the visitors understood that learners who are eligible for AP(E)L will be able to access it for this programme. However, during the meeting with the programme team, the visitors learnt that AP(E)L will not be made available for applicants and learners. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors were unclear whether applicants and learners are able to AP(E)L any elements of the programme, and if so, the process that would be used to determine whether to exempt individuals from elements of the programme. As such, the education provider must confirm whether applicants' prior learning and experience will be considered for this programme.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes is appropriate.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced and, on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

Reason: In the standards mapping document, the education provider referred to an 'audit form', which gives a narrative of how practice-based learning settings are approved. The visitors considered that this did not provide evidence of regular and effective collaboration itself. At the visit, the visitors were able to discuss the existing arrangements for collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers. The visitors were given verbal reassurances by the programme team that collaboration has taken place for this programme, but from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine the nature or extent of this collaboration. In discussions with practice education providers, the visitors were informed that some practice educators considered that collaboration with the education provider was informal. The visitors understood that such collaboration tended to be driven by existing relationships between individuals rather than by a formal process, and that it tended to be reactive. It was not clear to the visitors whether formal records were kept of meetings and communication between the education provider and practice education providers. The visitors were also unable to determine, the level of input that practice education providers had had into the development of the new programme. The education provider must therefore demonstrate how they will ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is a formal and effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided to evidence this standard, in particular the pathway for positive discipline, raising concerns and placement information file. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine the formal process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about safety and wellbeing of service users. At the visit, the visitors heard that there is a 'pathway for positive discipline and raising concerns' policy. The visitors were unsure how the education provider's policies ensure that learners are able to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, support them in raising any concerns and ensure action is taken in response to those concerns. As such, the visitors were unable to determine a clear, definitive, formal process. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about safety and wellbeing of service users.

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

Condition: The education provider must define where attendance is mandatory and demonstrate that there are associated monitoring processes in place, along with how these requirements will be communicated to learners.

Reason: From review of the documentation, the visitors were unclear on the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, or what the consequences would be for learners that do not attend these parts of the programme. In discussions with the existing BSc (Hons) Health Science (Audiology) learners, the visitors heard that attendance is not mandatory for programmes at the education provider and as such, there is no minimum requirement of attendance required of them. From the evidence and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear where attendance is mandatory. The visitors noted that this is important so all learners who complete the programme are supported to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers, by being fully involved in the parts of the programme which are essential to achieving them. The visitors require the education provider to define where attendance is mandatory, and demonstrate that associated monitoring processes are in place, along with how these requirements are communicated to learners on the programme.

6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the curriculum vitae of the external examiner. The visitors noted that the external examiner identified was appropriately qualified and experienced and, on the HCPC Register. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced external examiner for the programme. The programme team mentioned that this process includes the criteria for appointing the external examiner, and that there will be two external examiners for the programme, one with an academic background and the other with a clinical background. The education provider also highlighted that they are currently in the process of recruiting the second external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that there will be at least one external examiner for the programme, who is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, and the request for further evidence set out in section 5, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend 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	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Social Work, Full time
	PGDip Social Work, Full time
Approval visit date	27-28 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13162-B1C8Z9

Contents

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:

Mohammed Jeewa	Lay
Graham Noyce	Social worker
Sheila Skelton	Social worker
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive (observer)

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.

Clare Mackie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Birmingham City University
Victoria McGrath	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Birmingham City University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01914

Programme name	PGDip Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01915

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
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

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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 10 August 2018.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources to support learning in all settings are accessible to all learners.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that resources such as the programme specification, VLE and Moodle were available for learners to access. In discussions with the learners, the visitors were informed that the books and eBooks for the current BSc social work programme were not up to date or readily available in the library. The learners explained that whenever they accessed the recommended reading, the books and eBooks were all signed out. The learners went on to explain that if they left their eBook idle for a period, they would be signed out of the eBook when someone else requested it and would have to wait for it to be available again. The visitors noted that if the learners on the existing programme consider the resources to support learning to be under resourced then they could not determine that there would be enough resources for the fifty extra learners on the new MSc and PGDip programme. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that the resources to support the learning are accessible to all learners.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure timely support is available for learners with additional learning needs.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there were academic support systems provided by the education provider, such as ASK desk and Student services, whereby learners can access support around learning needs. In discussions with the learners, the visitors were informed that there was a long waiting list for learners with additional learning needs. The visitors were told that there could be a waiting period of up to eight weeks before support was offered to a learner. As such, the visitors were unable to establish how these arrangements were effective in providing necessary support to learners with additional needs. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has timely, effective and accessible support arrangements in place to support learners with additional learning needs on the programme.

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.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the payment process for service users to ensure continued involvement of service users in the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the service users and carers, the visitors noted that service users were involved in the development of the programme including aspects such as interviewing. The visitors were able to determine that service users are involved in the programme and therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, from discussions with the service users and carers the visitors were informed that there was often a delay between the work being completed and the payment being received. In some instances, there was a delay of up to three months. As such, the visitors recommend that timely financial payment is provided to service users and carers to ensure they are continually involved in the programme over the coming years.

3.15 There must be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how they make information about the complaints process available to learners so that the information is readily available to them.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there was an effective process in place for learners to raise a complaint, which was contained within the admissions handbook. As this information was provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, from discussions with the learners the visitors were informed that learners were unaware of how they would access

information about the complaints process if they needed to. Although learners explained, they would complain to certain individuals they were unclear what the process was and how to find that information should, they need to. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider strengthen the information provided to learners on how to raise a complaint should this be necessary.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, and the request for further evidence set out in section 5, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend 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	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice with Foundation Year, Full time
Approval visit date	23- 24 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13041-B5Q8M9

Contents

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:

Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Diane Whitlock	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.

Ellie Smith	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Buckinghamshire New University
Susan Watkins	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Buckinghamshire New University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60 across both programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01901

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice with Foundation Year
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60 across both programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01909

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
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

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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 11 July 2018.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that appropriate information about the programme is provided to potential applicants prior to application, allowing them to make an informed choice about taking up a place on a programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that information regarding the additional costs associated with studying on the programme, criminal conviction checks and occupational health checks was available within the programme specification. As this information, was contained within the programme specification the visitors could not see how applicants would have access to this information prior to securing a place on the programme. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that this information would be updated on the website. As the visitors were unable to access all the necessary information that would be contained on the website, the visitors could not determine how applicants to this programme would have all the information they require to make an informed decision about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to what information will be available to applicants and at what points in the process this information will be provided. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine how the education provider ensures that applicants have all the

information they require in order to make informed decisions about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that information about the programme English language requirements are clear, accurate and consistent across all materials.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the entry requirements regarding International English Language Testing System (IELTS) for the programme were inconsistent throughout the programme documentation. In the programme specification on page 10 it states "Applicants for whom English is not their first language will be required to hold an IELTs certificate graded 7 or equivalent, with no element below 6.5". However, on the website it states the applicants are required to meet IELTS "6.0 (5.5) or below". As such, the visitors were unclear how the admissions process ensured that applicants had a good command of spoken English to communicate effectively with service users and carers, educators and others if there were inconsistencies in the level required. The visitors therefore require the education provider to amend the documentation to ensure accurate information is provided for applicants concerning English language requirements.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of the programme leads to the eligibility to apply for admission onto the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that there was some inaccurate information contained within the documentation provided regarding HCPC requirements. On the website, it states, "On this programme you will gain real experience as well as grasp the theory behind the peri-operative environment, and achieve the qualification required to register with the Health and Care Professional Council (HCPC)". However, this is not accurate as successful completion of the programme gives the learner the eligibility to apply for registration, not the entitlement to register with the HCPC. Consequently, the visitors require that the documentation is amended to reflect the correct information. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether the resources available to support learning in all settings are accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for operating department practitioners.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors together with a SOPs mapping document providing information about how learners who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for operating department

practitioners. The visitors noted that there were several SOPs, which were each linked to one learning outcome only. This was the case for the following SOPs:

- **SOP 2.6** be able to practise in accordance with relevant medicines legislation
- **SOP 13.6** understand the concept of leadership and its application to practice
- **SOP 13.10** understand how to order, store, issue, prepare and administer prescribed drugs to service users, and monitor the effects of drugs on service users
- **SOP 13.12** understand the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic effects and contraindications of drugs used within the perioperative and acute setting
- **SOP 13.14** be able to calculate accurately prescribed drug dosages for individual service user needs
- **SOP 14.4** understand the role of the surgical first assistant in assisting with surgical intervention

In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned that the education provider considered that the above SOPs were covered across different modules throughout the programme. However, in the documentation, these SOPs were each mapped to one learning outcome only. Therefore, as information about where these SOPs are delivered is inconsistent, the visitors were unclear where these SOPs were delivered through the programme. With the information provided, they are unable to determine where the above SOPs are delivered within the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further documentation to evidence how the learning outcomes will ensure that learners can meet the above SOPs on successful completion of the programme so they are able to practice safely and effectively once, they enter the profession.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the formal processes in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners and service users are effective.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that the process for learners to obtain appropriate consent from service users when taking part in practice-based learning situations was not contained within the programme documentation. Additionally they also noted that the process for obtaining appropriate consent from learners in situations where they take part as service users themselves in practical and clinical teaching was not provided. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned that learners complete a consent form before taking part in practical situations and learners obtain verbal consent from service users. However, from this information the visitors could not determine how the education provider manages situations whereby learners decline from participating as service users in practical sessions or how learners would be aware of how and when to obtain consent from service users. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence, which demonstrates the following:

- the formal protocols in place for obtaining consent from learners and service users, including how records are maintained;
- how learners and service users are informed about the requirement for them to participate,

- to show what alternative learning arrangements will be put in place where individuals do not consent to participating as a service user.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the SETs mapping document under SET 5.5 submitted by the education provider referenced the educational audits. These audits detailed information about practice-based learning including link lecturer details, health and safety checks and the role of mentors in supporting learning and assessment in practice-based learning. However, as there was no information provided about practice educators involved in the practice-based setting the visitors could not establish whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. In discussions with the practice placement providers, the education provider considered that they were unable to disclose any further information in regards to the number of staff in the practice-based setting due to confidentiality reasons. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in the practice-based setting. Therefore, the visitors require further information demonstrating how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning in the practice-based learning.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that under SET 5.6 in the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider reference was made to the educational audits. These audits detailed information about practice-based learning including link lecturer details, health and safety checks and the role of mentors in supporting learning and assessment. However, as there was no information in the education audits, which explained how the education provider selects, practice educators who have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to work with learners on this programme in the practice-based setting. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. In discussions with the practice placement providers, the education provider considered they were unable to disclose any further information in regards to practice educators in the practice- based setting due to confidentiality reasons. The visitors noted that they do not require personally identifiable information about practice educators. However, the visitors require further information about the process in place, which ensures that all of the practice educators are appropriately knowledgeable, skilled and experienced. In this way, the visitors can determine whether there is an effective process in place, which ensures practice educators are able to support safe and effective learning when learners are in the practice-based setting.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that practice educators undertake regular training, which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that under SET 5.7 of the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider reference is made to the educational audits. These audits detailed information about practice-based learning including link lecturer details, health and safety checks and the role of mentors in supporting learning and assessment. However, as there was no information about the training, which practice educators, must undertake to work with learners on the programme. Consequently the visitors were unable to determine whether the content of that training is appropriate to the practice educator role, learner' needs and delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme. The visitors were also unclear when initial training would need to be completed by, and how frequently refresher training would need to be completed. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate what training practice educators must undertake and how the education provider ensures that all practice educators undertake regular training, which is appropriate to their role, the learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes.

5.8 Learners and practice educators must have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice‑based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that learners and practice educators have the information they need in order to be prepared for practice-based learning.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that there was no information provided to practice educators and learners communicating the expectations in practice-based learning. As such, they were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that learners and practice educators are fully prepared for practice-based learning. In particular, they could not identify how practice educators were made aware of the learners' ability and expected scope of practice while in the practice-based setting and what the expectations of both the learners and practice educators should be at each individual placements to ensure that learners gain the experience they require. In the meeting with the practice educators, it was clear that discussions regarding information needed for practice-based learning had yet not been discussed or finalised. As such, the visitors were unable to determine the process in place for ensuring learners and practice educators have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require information about the mechanisms in place, which demonstrates how the education provider ensures learners are fully prepared for practice-based learning. In particular, this should demonstrate how practice educators are made aware of learners' experience and expected scope of practice for each placement and how the expectation of both the learners and practice educators at practice-based learning are managed to ensure that learners get the experience they require to meet the relevant learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how learners

and practice educator will be fully prepared for practice-based learning and in a timely manner.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing (Exemptions) for Orthoptists, Part time BSc (Hons) Orthoptics, Full time
Approval visit date	22-23 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12175-D6V2D0

Contents

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 and standards for the use by orthoptists of exemptions to sell and supply medicines (for education providers) (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:

Christine Timms	Orthoptist
David Houliston	Biomedical scientist
Frances Ashworth	Lay
Jasmine 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.

Helen Gallagher	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Glasgow Caledonian University
Elaine Skea	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Glasgow Caledonian University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Entitlement	Orthoptist exemptions
First intake	01 September 2016 This intake date pre-dates the visit date in order to include those learners who will transfer on to the new progamme in year two of their studies. These learners will be assessed to meet the standards for orthoptists using exemptions for the sale and supply of medicines in the second and third years of the new programme. This will enable learners from the 2016 intake on the old programme, who successfully complete and graduate from 2020 onwards, to apply for the annotation on the register.
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01943

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:
- meets the standards of education and training;
- delivers the standards of proficiency for orthoptists; and
- delivers the standards for orthoptists using exemptions for the sale and supply of medicines.

The education provider informed the HCPC that their currently approved BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme has taken its last intake. The learners from this programme will transfer onto the second and third year of the new programme subject to this programme being approved. As this programme has now taken the last intake, and as it was not being changed by the education provider, it was not assessed via this approval visit.

The proposed new programme is intended as a pre-registration programme for orthoptists, with a contained module to also allow for individuals who successfully complete the programme the orthoptist exemption annotation.

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing (Exemptions) for Orthoptists
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Orthoptist exemptions
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01854

We undertook this assessment of a new post-graduate module proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether, within the

standards for the use by orthoptists of exemptions to sell and supply medicines, the programme:

- meets the standards for education providers; and
- delivers the standards for orthoptists using exemptions in legislation for+ the sale and supply of medicines.

The module will be accessible to HCPC-registered Orthoptists who intend to train in the annotation, and integrated within the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, as noted above.

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
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

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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient

evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 09 July 2018.

3.3 **The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.**

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriate.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individual who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors noted that the staff member identified was appropriately qualified and experienced and, on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were also shown the university wide Quality Enhancement and Assurance handbook at the visit, which highlighted the specification for the person with overall professional responsibility. In the specification it states the individual would "monitor admissions, progression and completion rates in accordance with the University and the external requirements PSRBs [Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies]". However, the visitors were not given the process for identifying the individual along with the requisite qualifications and experience. They also could not determine how the requirements highlighted would ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced, and unless other arrangements are appropriate from the relevant part of the Register.

B.8 **The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

Condition: The programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that the resources to support teaching and learning are accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the Non Medical Prescribing (Exemptions) for Orthoptists Student Handbook provided prior to the visit and clarification at the visit, the visitors noted various instances of inaccurate information. The information in the Student Handbook was identical to the information in the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme. Examples include:

- Information about the length of the programme. The Handbook states that "the programme is taught largely by staff within Health and Life Sciences although there are also contributions from ophthalmologists from local hospitals in the 3rd and 4th years". However, this is a 3-month programme.
- The information around the attendance requirements does not apply to the programme. The Handbook for example states, "Where you have failed to attend classes over 5 timetabled days, we will send you an email to your University email account advising you that your attendance is of concern". However, learners will not attend five timetabled days for this programme, as this programme is timetabled for two weekends.

These are only some examples of inaccurate information identified in the Student Handbook, which will be made available to both learners and educators. Considering these and other instances, the visitors were not satisfied the education provider has ensured that learners will have the accurate information they require in order to support their learning, and ensure that the resources are effectively used. The programme team must provide the visitors with the amended final version of the documentation, to enable them to determine that it is accurate and appropriate for all.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Keele University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Accelerated), Full time accelerated
	MSci Physiotherapy, Full time
	MSci Physiotherapy (with International year), Full time
Approval visit date	27 - 28 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13160-X1F9P8

Contents

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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Susanne Roff	Lay
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive
John Archibald	HCPC executive (observer)

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.

Katie Szkornik	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Faculty of Natural Sciences, Keele University
Claire Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Keele University
Peter Coventry	Internal panel member	Keele University

John Wootton	Internal panel member	Keele University
Sophie Bessant	Internal panel member	Keele University
Nina Paterson	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy panel member	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
John Stephens	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy panel member	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Accelerated)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01916

Programme name	MSci Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01917

Programme name	MSci Physiotherapy (with International year)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02017

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.

The three programmes listed above will replace the education provider's current approved BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (with International year). The education provider intends to enrol up to 80 learners per year across the MSci Physiotherapy and MSci Physiotherapy (with International year). For our records, we have recorded this as split across two programmes, however the education provider does not know how many learners will enrol on each programme.

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
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

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	We met with learners and graduates of the current approved BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy.
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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 23 August 2018.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the type of exit awards offered for the programme, and demonstrate that learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: In the programme specification for the MSci Physiotherapy and MSci Physiotherapy (with International year), the visitors read that "on completion of 360 credits, plus a minimum of 1000 hours practice experience, a BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy would be awarded, where graduates are eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. N.B. This route to award will only be available in exceptional circumstances. Please see course specific regulations." At the visit, the programme team explained that the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, providing eligibility for application to admission to the Register, would be awarded to a learner who met the following requirements:

- due to exceptional circumstances could not continue their studies
- has met the progression requirements to move onto year four of the MSci programme
- has met the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for physiotherapists in the first three years of the MSci programme
- has completed the clinical hours requirements of 1000 hours.

The programme team highlighted that they did not wish to offer this award as an exit award for those who did not wish to complete the MSci Physiotherapy, but rather an option for learners who due to exceptional circumstances could not complete the MSci Physiotherapy. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear how the education provider would clearly define "exceptional circumstances", to ensure that learners are aware this is not routinely offered as an exit award for the MSci Physiotherapy. The programme team also mentioned that they had been in discussions about what exit award they might offer and had not decided at that stage. The visitors require further information about what exit awards, if any the education provider will offer. Should the education provider offer a BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy exit award in exceptional circumstances, the visitors require further information to determine that clarification is provided to ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the type of exit awards offered for the programme, and demonstrate that learning outcomes for the proposed BSc (Hons)

Physiotherapy exit award ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

Reason: In the programme specification for the MSci Physiotherapy and MSci Physiotherapy (with International year), the visitors read that "on completion of 360 credits, plus a minimum of 1000 hours practice experience, a BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy would be awarded, where graduates are eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. N.B. This route to award will only be available in exceptional circumstances. Please see course specific regulations." At the visit, the programme team explained that the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, providing eligibility for application to admission to the Register, would be awarded to a learner who met the following requirements:

- due to exceptional circumstances could not continue their studies
- has met the progression requirements to move onto year four of the MSci programme
- has met the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for physiotherapists in the first three years of the MSci programme
- has completed the clinical hours requirements of 1000 hours.

On review of the SOPs mapping document for the MSci Physiotherapy, the visitors noted that some of the SOPs are mapped onto modules in year four of the MSci Physiotherapy, as well as modules in the first three years of the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine how all SOPs would be met in the first three years of the MSci programme. At the visit, the programme team also mentioned that they had been in discussions about what exit award they might offer and had not decided at that stage. The visitors require further information about what exit awards, if any the education provider will offer. Should the education provider offer the proposed BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy exit award in exceptional circumstances, the visitors require further information to determine that the learning outcomes for the proposed exit award would ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the type of exit awards offered for the programme, and demonstrate that the assessment strategy and design will ensure that those who are awarded the proposed BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy exit award meet the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

Reason: In the programme specification for the MSci Physiotherapy and MSci Physiotherapy (with International year), the visitors read that "on completion of 360 credits, plus a minimum of 1000 hours practice experience, a BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy would be awarded, where graduates are eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. N.B. This route to award will only be available in exceptional circumstances. Please see course specific regulations." At the visit, the programme team explained that the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, providing eligibility for application to admission to the Register, would be awarded to a learner who met the following requirements:

- due to exceptional circumstances could not continue their studies

- has met the progression requirements to move onto year four of the MSci programme
- has met the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for physiotherapists in the first three years of the MSci programme
- has completed the clinical hours requirements of 1000 hours.

On review of the SOPs mapping document for the MSci programme, the visitors note that some of the SOPs are mapped onto modules in year four of the MSci programme, as well as modules in the first three years of the programme. As such, because some of the SOPs include mapping to modules in year four of the MSci programme, the visitors were not clear how the assessment strategy and design will ensure that those who are awarded an exit award meet the SOPs for physiotherapists. At the visit, the programme team also mentioned that they had been in discussions about what exit award they might offer and had not decided on it at that stage. The visitors require further information about what exit awards, if any the education provider will offer. Should the education provider offer the proposed BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy exit award in exceptional circumstances, the visitors require further information to determine that the assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who complete an exit award meet the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

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.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider strengthen how they plan and monitor service user and carer involvement in the programme.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors understood that service users and carers were involved in reviewing and providing feedback on programme documentation, attending school meetings and activities, and in the recruitment and selection process for the programmes. At the visit, the visitors met the service users and carers who were involved in the programme, such as involvement in reviewing documentation for the proposed new programmes, involvement in the admissions process and some teaching on the programme through talking to learners about experiences. One of the service users the visitors met with had more recently been recruited by the education provider, and at that point had only been involved in attending school meetings. The visitors noted that the education provider does not currently arrange regular or formal meetings for service users and carers involved in the programmes, other than attending the school meetings. While the visitors found that service users and carers were involved in the programme in various ways, the visitors noted that the education provider could strengthen the planning and monitoring of this involvement to ensure meaningful and ongoing involvement. This could include regular meetings organised by the education provider to involve service users and carers in planning and to meet with other service users and carers involved in the programmes. The visitors found also found that service users and carers were mainly involved through attending school meetings and reviewing documentation, and that the

education provider could strengthen the involvement of service users and carers by involving them in wider areas, such as those listed in the SETs guidance.

HCPC approval process report

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

Contents

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 Diagnostic Radiography (MDRad)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01920

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1997*
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01980

*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 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	Yes	This is a new programme and as such, there is 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) diagnostic radiography.
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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 31 July 2018.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: From review of programme documentation and discussions with current learners, the visitors were not able to see an effective process which enables learners to highlight concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. They were aware that there was a formal policy in place, "Professional Conduct", but from discussions with the learners they did not seem to be familiar with it. The learners suggested that they had tended to rely on informal pathways by which concerns could be raised, but the visitors considered that this was insufficient for the standard to be met, as it appeared to be dependent on relationships between learners and educators rather than a process. The visitors considered that the lack of awareness of a formal policy would make it harder for all learners to understand what constituted acceptable behaviour across different contexts and in different practice-based learning settings. They also considered that it would be difficult for learners to know what to do if a concern involved the person to whom they would normally report concerns on an informal basis, and that the lack of awareness of a formal process might mean a lack of equity or consistency in how concerns were dealt with. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that learners and educators are aware of the formal process for raising concerns. In this way they can determine whether there is an effective process.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetitcs (Pre-Registration), Full time accelerated
Approval visit date	07-08 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13048-V4K3Q9

Contents

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:

Sara Smith	Dietitian
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Frances Ashworth	Lay
Jasmine 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.

Keith Hurst	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Teesside University – Associate Dean (Learning & Teaching), School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Law
Steven Gibson	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Teesside University – Senior Administrator (Documentation, Modularity &Assessments)
Paul Taylor	Internal validation panel member	Teesside University – Principal lecture (Learning & Teaching), School of Health &

		Social Care
Joanne Almond	Internal validation panel member	Teesside University— Quality Manager, Academic Registry
Jill Foley	Internal validation panel member	Teesside University— Principal Lecturer (Programmes), School of Health & Social Care
Duane Mellor	External validation panel member – part of internal validation panel	Coventry University
Tim James	Internal validation panel member	Teesside University
Wendy Wiles	Service User Representative – Internal validation panel member	Teesside University
Jackie Bishop	Professional body representative	The British Dietetic Association
Jane Wilson	Professional body representative	The British Dietetic Association
Najia Qureshi	Professional body representative	The British Dietetic Association

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetitcs (Pre-Registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	1 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01889

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	Not Required	This is a new programme and therefore there are no external examiners' reports.

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	As this programme is not yet approved we had discussions with learners from the food science and nutrition programme delivered by Teesside University.
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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 20 July 2018.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that appropriate information about the programme is provided to potential applicants, allowing them to make an informed decision about taking up a place on a programme.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were made aware that learners on this programme will have to cover the costs associated with the programme, including criminal convictions checks and travel costs to practice-based learning. The visitors were also informed that the programme will be delivered at both the Darlington and Middlesbrough campuses. However from discussions at the visit and documentation including the programme website, the visitors were unsure how applicants will be informed about the costs to enable them to make an informed choice about taking up an offer of a place on the programme. As such, the education provider must demonstrate how potential applicants will be given the appropriate information about costs to learners on this programme, to allow them to make an informed choice about taking a place on the programme

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that the resources to support teaching and learning are accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit and clarification at the visit, the visitors noted various instances of inaccurate information. Examples include:
- references to other education providers in the documentation
- incorrect hours attached to modules, for example the hours attached to module DTC4000-N states zero hours but also states learners can access tutorial support.

These are only some examples of inaccurate information identified in the programme documentation, which will be made available to both learners and educators. Considering these and other instances, the visitors were not satisfied the education provider has ensured that learners will have the accurate information they require in order to support their learning. The internal validation panel also required the programme team to amend various parts of the documentation which will be made available to learners and educators. The programme team must provide the visitors with the amended, final version of the documentation to enable them to determine whether it is appropriate for all.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will make learners and educators aware of the exit awards, and that exit awards will not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the Register.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the Course Handbook and Course Approval document. From the visitors' review of the documentation prior to the visit, they noted that the named fall back award will be the **"**PgDip Dietetics (Pre-registration) Dietetics… which would provide [learners] with eligibility to apply for HCPC". The senior team informed the visitors that they did not require approval for the PgDip programme and it will therefore not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. Furthermore, the visitors noted that "all interim awards will contain the title 'in health and social care". However, the visitors were unsure what the full name of the interim awards will be or how learners can achieve these interim awards. To enable the visitors to determine whether this standard is met, the education provider must provide further evidence, which demonstrates the following:

- what the exit awards will be for this programme;
- exit awards do not contain HCPC protected titles;
- that information about exit awards clearly states that they do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC; and
- how information about exit awards will be communicated to learners and educators.

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

Condition: The education provider must communicate any changes to the programme learning outcomes, and demonstrate that they ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for dietitians.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were satisfied that the current learning outcomes for the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for dietitians. However, throughout the visit it was stated that the internal validation panel would require the programme team to review the learning outcomes. The visitors noted that there could be significant changes to the learning outcomes as a result of the internal panel requirements. Without seeing the changes to the finalised learning outcomes, the visitors cannot make a judgement on how they enable learners to meet the SOPs for dietitians. The visitors therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the SOPs for dietitians.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how any changes to the assessment strategy and design, ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for dietitians.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors reviewed the assessment strategy and design for the programme, which is designed to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for dietitians. However, during the meeting with the programme team and the informal feedback meeting at the visit the visitors noted that the internal validation panel will require the programme team to make some changes to parts of the assessment strategy and

design. As such, the visitors have not seen the final, confirmed, assessment strategy and design for the programme. Therefore, they cannot determine how the amended learning assessment strategy will ensure that successful graduates can meet the SOPs for dietitians. The visitors will therefore require the education provider to provide additional evidence, which will communicate any changes to the assessment strategy and design, so they can make a determination about whether the programme meets this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will guide practice educators into making objective, fair and reliable decisions about the progression of learners.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the module specifications. At the visit there were discussions with the programme team regarding how practice educators make objective, fair and reliable decisions based on the progression of a struggling learner. From the discussions the visitors could not get a clear understanding of how decisions such as whether a learner would have to repeat a whole practice-based learning opportunity or hours to make up the failed parts of that practice-based learning opportunity, would be made. The visitors were unclear how the practice educators assessing the learners are given clear guidelines on how to make decisions about the progression of a learner through their practice-based learning experiences. As such, the education provider must demonstrate how they will provide guidance, which ensures that practice educators have the information they require to make objective, fair and reliable decisions about the progression of learners.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the assessment regulations. The visitors noted in the documentation that **"**If students fail the placement, at the assessment board they will be offered a reassessment. They would normally be given a further four weeks of practice placement to achieve the assessment criteria which they had failed". From the discussions however, the programme team informed the visitors that there are possibilities where learners would have to retake the whole placement module or have fewer than four weeks to achieve the practice-based learning competencies that they failed. From the disparity in the information provided the visitors could not see how learners or staff would know which information was accurate. Additionally, from the documentation the visitors were unclear how the learners would progress between stages of the programme or what the maximum duration that learners could be on the programme would be, if a learner interrupts their studies or fails an element. As such, the education provider must clearly specify the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there will be at least one external examiner for the programme, who is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the Course Handbook and the University's External Examiners process. From the documentation provided, the visitors could not see how the External Examiners process defines whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there are other arrangements in place, which are appropriate. In conversations with the programme team, the visitors were informed that they were currently in the process of recruiting an External Examiner. This standard is concerned with the process of appointing an appropriately qualified examiner who is from the relevant part of the Register, unless other appropriate arrangements are made. As such, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that there will be at least one external examiner for the programme, who is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of the Highlands and Islands
Name of programme(s)	V300 – Nurse Independent/Supplementary Prescriber, Part time
Approval visit date	07 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13093-K6X1Y5

Contents

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 for prescribing (for education providers) (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:

Nicola Carey	Independent prescriber
Prisha Shah	Lay
Rosalie Barrett	Physiotherapist (Independent prescriber)
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.

Ian Morrison	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Highlands and Islands
Jacqueline Barclay	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Highlands and Islands

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	V300 – Nurse Independent/Supplementary Prescriber
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP01900

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
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

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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 27 July 2018.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors were unclear how the education provider involves service users and carers in the programme. The visitors were provided with a document, which included the school strategy of involving patients and the public. In discussions with the service users, the visitors were told that they would be happy to be involved in the programme but at present, they had not been approached by the education provider. Although the programme team committed to putting plans in place, from the documentation and discussion, the visitors saw no formalised information to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme, or will be involved in the programme going forward. The visitors therefore cannot determine the following:
- who the service users and carers are (or will be);
- how they will be involved in the programme;
- how their involvement is appropriate; and
- how the programme team will support them appropriately in undertaking this role.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence demonstrating that service users and carers will be involved in the programme and their strategy for supporting the continued involvement of service users and carers in the programme.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the HCPC standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how learners who successfully complete the programme meet the HCPC standards for supplementary and independent prescribers. However, the mapping made broad references to 'domains', rather than specific references to the module and the learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the module learning outcomes linked to each of the proficiency standards, to ensure that learners completing the programme can meet our standards for supplementary and independent prescribers. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the content is yet to be finalised. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to make a judgement that this standard was met. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define how the programme's learning outcomes will ensure that learners completing the programme can meet all of the relevant HCPC standards for supplementary and independent prescribers.

E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the HCPC standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers,

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how learners who successfully complete the programme meet the HCPC standards for supplementary and independent prescribers. However, the mapping made broad references to 'domains', rather than specific references to the module and the learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors were unable to see the link between the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers, the programme's learning outcomes, and the assessment of those learning outcomes. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the content is yet to be finalised. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to make a judgement that this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define how the assessment strategy and design ensures that the learner who successfully completes the programme meets the standards for independent and supplementary prescribing.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, and the request for further evidence set out in section 5, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend 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	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	PG Dip Social Work, Full time accelerated
Approval visit date	22 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12253-G5V2Y4

Contents

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:

David Ward	Social worker
Ian Hughes	Lay
Niall Gooch	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.

Jane Roscoe	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of the West of England
Lisa Connors	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of the West of England

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Bristol delivery – Up to 26 Plymouth delivery – Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01824

The education provider submitted a major change form describing their plan to run a version of the programme at a new site. We decided that an approval visit was the most appropriate way to assess the possible resulting changes in how the programme met the standards.

The programme notified us of a planned January 2018 start date for delivery at the new site, in August 2017. The HCPC normally requires a six month lead-in to approval visits, and does not normally allow new programmes to start before a visit has taken place. In this case, the education provider is running a version of their existing programme, and therefore we were able to visit following the changes being implemented, in line with normal HCPC requirements.

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment.

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
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

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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 18 July 2018.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme learning outcomes ensure that learners meet the current standards of proficiency for social workers (in England).

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard. This included a reference to the Practice Learning Handbook, in which the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England were mapped against the learning outcomes from the programme. These learning outcomes are based on the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) issued by the British Association of Social Workers. The visitors noted that this mapping exercise had used the 2012 version of the HCPC SOPs, and not the most up-to-date version. They were therefore unable to determine whether these learning outcomes would ensure that learners meet the revised SOPs. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that learners meet the current HCPC standards of proficiency for social workers (in England).

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard. The education provider mentioned in their SETs mapping that learners on the programme have contributions from practising social workers who are specialists in particular fields, and from a police specialist. They also stated that the skills days available to learners involve practising social workers. However, the visitors could not see how these activities would give learners an opportunity to learn with professionals and learners in other professions. The police specialist appeared to be giving a one-off lecture, so although learners may learn from a police staff member, they would not learn with this profession. In discussions, the programme team suggested that learners would have opportunities for learning with and from learners and professionals in other relevant professions while on practice-based learning. The visitors considered that while this could be an appropriate way to meet the standard, it was not clear how learners' participation in inter-professional education during practice-based learning would be quantified, recorded, or would happen in all cases. In particular, they could not see what opportunities might be available anywhere on the programme for learners to learn with and from learners from other professions. Therefore, they were unable to determine whether the programme could ensure that learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how the system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning is integrated into the overall management structure of the programme.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as there was a system in place for approving practice-based learning and ensuring quality on an ongoing basis. They were able to discuss how this system worked with practice educators, the programme team and representatives of the consortium. A database, holding records of placement audits, was managed by the consortium as a result of an agreement with the education provider, and there is a staff member at the education provider who holds the responsibility for liaison between the consortium and the education provider on matters related to audit. However, the visitors could not see how this role was formally integrated into the management structure of the programme. They considered that there was a risk that if the staff member was no longer available for any reason, the system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning would no longer be thorough and effective. They therefore recommend that the

education provider consider developing this role so that it has a clearer and more permanent status within the programme management.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should considering reviewing how they ensure that placement partners fulfil their contractual responsibilities around practice educator training.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as the education provider had a contract in place with all partners who provided practice-based learning requiring that practice educators were appropriately trained. From discussions with the programme team, practice educators, learners, and the consortium there did not appear to be any issues with the appropriateness or regularity of training received by practice educators. The visitors did note, however, that the education provider did not seem to have a clear process in place for ensuring that their partners were fulfilling their contractual responsibilities around training. The education provider relied on the contracts, on the professionalism of placement partners, and on long-standing personal relationships with placement partners. They therefore recommend that the education provider keep under review their methods for ensuring that practice educators are receiving appropriate training in line with the contracts.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Second response to conditions required
The education provider responded to the conditions set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that the following condition was met, for the reasons detailed below. Therefore, in order for the visitors to be satisfied that the following conditions are met, they require further evidence.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme learning outcomes ensure that learners meet the current standards of proficiency for social workers (in England).

Reason condition not met at this time: In response to the condition, the education provider directed the visitors to the Practice Learning Handbook. In the "Response to HCPC conditions and recommendations" document it states the "revised version of the Practice Learning Handbook, [maps to] the new SOPS against the programme learning outcomes". However, in the Practice Learning Handbook, the visitors noted that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England were mapped to the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) and not the learning outcomes of the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how the learning outcomes of the programme would ensure that learners meet the SOPs.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that learners meet the HCPC standards of proficiency for social workers (in England).

Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, and the request for further evidence set out in section 5, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend 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	University of Winchester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Approval visit date	08 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13008-B1Q5X3

Contents

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 7 of this report.

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Mohammed Jeewa	Lay
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.

Janice de Sousa	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Winchester
Rory Elliot and Tessa Valentine	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Winchester
Nina Paterson	Education Advisor	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

| Julie Jones | Professional Representative | Chartered Society of Physiotherapy |

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	1 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01869

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
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	This is a new programme.

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	The visitors met with learners from other programmes within the Department of Sport, Exercise and Health.
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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 30 July 2018.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that appropriate, clear and consistent information, that enables applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme, is available to applicants.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures pertinent admissions information relating to the programme will be communicated to potential applicants in order for them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. At the visit, the visitors heard that the education provider intends to provide applicants with information packs containing programme information. However, the visitors were not provided with the information pack and as such, they were unable to assess whether the education provider is providing appropriate, clear and consistent information that enables applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. As such, they were unable to determine how important information would be appropriately communicated to prospective applicants. In particular how the education provider intends to communicate the following information to prospective applicants:

- selection and recruitment process;
- any additional costs learners may incur over and above the usual programme fee; and
- the expectation that learners will travel to practice-based learning settings at their own expense and that this is an additional cost for the learners.

The visitors therefore require further information showing how the education provider ensures prospective applicants are provided with the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to apply for a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about the admissions procedures and how they ensure that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding Disclosure and Barring Service checks.

Reason: From the information provided in the documentation and in discussion at the visit, the visitors were clear that all learners must undergo a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check as part of the admissions process to the programme. The visitors noted on page 63, the following statement "in exceptional circumstances the panel may choose not to proceed with the student application". The visitors were unable to determine what constitutes 'exceptional circumstances', or how a learner or the education provider would know the criteria for an application not being accepted. In discussions at the visit, the visitors were told that all learners must undergo a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check as part of the admissions process to the programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine how the DBS check is applied and how policies are structured to deal with any issues that would arise as a result of the check. The visitors were also unable to determine how or whether the practice based learning providers are involved in the decision-making process and who makes the final decision about accepting a learner onto the programme should an issue arise. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the DBS checks that are applied at the point of admission. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the education provider's process and clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if an issue arises from the DBS check.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the future plans for the programme are sustainable.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors understood there would be 15 learners per cohort with one annual intake, as per the visit request form. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that there would be a maximum of 70 learners per cohort with one intake per academic year. The senior team also noted that they could take more learners in one year, and less in another, and that the maximum of 70 learners per year would be on a full time basis. The visitors did not see a plan in place to explain the staffing for the programme considering the learner numbers and that this is the first physiotherapy programme at the university. As the visitors were also unable to see information that demonstrates what the staff-student ratio is, they could not determine that the programme will remain sufficiently staffed once the programme has been running for several years. Therefore, the education provider will need to demonstrate how they will ensure that the learner and staff numbers for the programme are managed, to ensure it is sustainable in the long term.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the structure for the day-to-day management of the programme and the lines of responsibility of the teaching team.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with brief curriculum vitae for all staff responsible for the programme. However, from the information provided, it was not clear which members of the programme team would be responsible for which aspects of programme management, or who would be delivering specific areas of the programme. At the visit, the visitors heard that plans to recruit additional staff members have been agreed. In discussions at the visit, the visitors were still unclear how the programme continues to be effectively managed even with the clinical hourly staff. As such, the visitors require further information regarding the structure for the day-to-day management of the programme and the lines of responsibility of the teaching team, including teaching and pastoral responsibilities. In this way, the visitors can determine how the management of the programme will work in practice, and how learners will be supported through the programme by members of the programme team.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes is appropriate.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individual who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced and, are on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not given the process to review, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process in place for ensuring that they only appoint a person, with overall professional responsibility for the programme, who is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors discussed the collaboration that has taken place in the lead up to the approval visit and during the development of this programme. The visitors were given verbal reassurances that regular collaboration has taken place between the education provider and practice education providers. However the visitors were not able to see, from the evidence provided, the nature or extent of this collaboration. The visitors understood that current collaboration tends to be driven by existing relationships between individuals rather than by a formal process, and that it tends to be reactive rather than planned at regular intervals. It was not clear to the visitors whether formal records of meetings and communications between the education provider and practice education providers were kept. They were also unable to determine from the evidence provided and from discussions at the visit, the level of input practice education providers have had into the development of the new programme. They therefore require further evidence that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers, including the nature and extent of the collaboration.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an effective process in place to ensure access to practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the SETs mapping document (SET 3.6) submitted by the education provider stated, "The programme is in the process of working with local education providers. The Programme Leader and Placement Manager are in the process of linking up with the South Coast Placement Group, Southwest placement group and the London placement group". However, the visitors were not provided with evidence of the process in place that ensure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs. From discussions with the programme team, the visitor understood that learners must undergo a placement provided by the education provider. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors were unable to identify whether there is an effective process in place for ensuring that there is sufficient availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners including future learners. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners are enabled to secure practice-based learning and that there is an effective process in place to ensure access to practice-based learning for all learners on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors understood there would be 15 learners per cohort with one annual intake, as per the visit request form. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that there would be a maximum of 70 learners per cohort with one intake per academic year. In discussions with the senior team, the visitors heard that plans to recruit additional staff members have been agreed; however, the additional staff are yet to be recruited. Due to the lack of clarity about who would be delivering the different aspects of the programme, the visitors were unable to determine how, following the recruitment to these posts, there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is, or will be, an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver this programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information, which demonstrates that module leaders and external or associate tutors have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise for their role in the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit gave no indication of module leaders for this programme. During discussion at the visit it was highlighted that recruitment for staff to the programme was ongoing and the final arrangements as to the module leaders and module contributors were ongoing. In order to be assured that there is enough profession-specific input in to the programme and to ensure subject areas will be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further evidence. As such, the education provider must demonstrate who the module leaders and external/associate lecturers are and that they have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver the programme content for which they are responsible. The visitors therefore require details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be in order to determine how this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence demonstrating how the resources to support learning in all setting will be appropriate to the delivery of the programme and be accessible to all learners.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors understood there would be 15 learners per cohort with one annual intake, as per the visit request form. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that there would be a maximum of 70 learners per cohort with one intake per academic year. The visitors were given a tour of the physical learning resources at the new campus and were provided with images of what the new classrooms will look like once finished. The visitors were told that the new campus will be ready before the programme starts. Whilst the visitors were happy with the size of the classrooms available to learners, the visitors were not able to determine if this building is accessible for all learners and educators given that the access to the first floor is restricted. In addition, the visitors were not provided with a list of profession specific equipment that will be available for the number of learners on this programme. Therefore, the visitors

need to see further evidence to show the progress and accessibility of the new campus as well as a list of profession specific equipment that will be available for learners on this programme. In this way, the visitors will be assured that the resources to support learning in all setting will be appropriate to the delivery of the programme and be accessible to all learners.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate what significant changes have been made, as a response to the professional body's requirements, and how those changes ensure that resources are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit and from the conclusions of the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by the joint panel. The visitors consider the programme documentation that learners routinely refer to, an important resource to support learning. In particular, the joint panel conditions referred to amendments to module assessments, possibly the programme specification document, and the learner handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review any changes made to the resources due to the education provider's response to the internal validation event. As such, the education provider must provide evidence, which demonstrates that the amended learner resources to support learning are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme. The education provider may wish to provide the programme documentation that has been revised, or provide an overview of their response to the internal validation event.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the formal procedure in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether there was a process in place, which deals with concerns about learners' conduct, character and health. In discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that practice educators are given training on learners' conduct and learners' conduct is monitored at practice-based learning by practice educators. However, the visitors were unable to determine a clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around learners' conduct, character and health to ensure that issues of this kind are dealt with clearly and consistently. They were also unclear how this process links into the established fitness to practise procedure in place at the education provider. As a result, the visitors could not determine what criteria are used to determine when an issue related to learners' conduct is referred to the fitness to practise procedure and how this is communicated to learners, staff and practice educators to ensure consistency. Therefore, the visitors require clear evidence of the formal procedure in place to deal with issues around learners' profession-related conduct and how this procedure connects to the fitness to practise processes in determining if learners can continue on the programme. This evidence should also highlight what explicit information is provided to learners and

practice educators around this process so that visitors can determine how this standard is being met.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to clearly state, that if an exit award is awarded it does not lead to eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy was listed as an exit award, along with Diploma of Health Studies and Certificate of Health Studies for this programme. In discussions with the programme team, it was clear that the final award for this programme is BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and the exit awards are Diploma of Health Studies and Certificate of Health Studies. From the documentation, it was not clear how learners, educators and the public are made aware that exit awards do not lead to eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. As such, the education provider should revisit programme documentation to clearly state that if an exit award is awarded it does not lead to eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate how they will ensure that learners will be able to learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions and where this will take place within the programme structure.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how learners will be able to learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that there will be a case scenario that will link learners with General practitioners (GPs) and Social workers (SW). From the information provided the visitors could not determine what the 'case scenario' consisted off or how the education provider will ensure that each learner will be able to learn with and from other professionals. As such, the visitors were unclear how learners are prepared to work with other professionals across professions. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unclear on the rationale behind the design and delivery of interprofessional education or how the education provider intends to ensure that it is as relevant for learners on this programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine the following:
- what interprofessional education will take place on the programme;
- why the professions and learners selected are relevant for this programme and;
- how learners will be able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions

The education provider must therefore articulate what interprofessional learning will take place on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the formal and effective process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors did not see evidence of any formal protocols in place to obtain appropriate consent from service users in activities with learners such as role-play and practising clinical techniques. At the visit, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures that the learning and teaching methods respect the rights of service users and appropriate consent is sought from service users. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence of the formal protocols in place for obtaining consent from service users. They also require evidence that demonstrates how service users are informed about the requirement for them to participate in activities such as role-play and practising clinical techniques, and how records are maintained to indicate consent has been obtained. The education provider must therefore provide evidence of the formal process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users.

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

Condition: The education provider must define where attendance is mandatory and demonstrate that associated monitoring processes are in place, along with how these requirements are communicated to learners on the programme.

Reason: From review of the documentation, the visitors were unclear on the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, or what the consequences would be for learners that do not attend these parts of the programme. In the documentation, there is an 80 per cent attendance requirement; however, it is not clear exactly how this applies across the programme (for example, practice-based learning) or how attendance is monitored by the education provider. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors could not establish how the team would apply this requirement, or which parts of the programme could not be missed. Therefore, the education provider must define what the attendance requirements are across the programme elements, how attendance is monitored, and how this is communicated to learners. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners have access to practice-based learning opportunities of appropriate structure, duration and range to support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors understood there would be 15 learners per cohort with one annual intake, as per the visit request form. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that there would be a maximum of 70 learners per cohort with one intake per academic year. Given the increase in learners from the original documentation, the visitors were unclear how learners will have access to practice-based learning of appropriate structure, duration and range to support the achievement of the learning

outcomes. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the education provider intends to make use of a wide variety of practice-based learning settings, and that this could be considered appropriate for physiotherapist trainees. However, it was not clear to the visitors how the education provider ensures that the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency for each learner. Additionally, the placement handbook gave a narrative briefly explaining some of the details of practice-based learning on the programme. However, it did not give any detailed information about the expected structure, duration or range of practice-based learning. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that practice-based learning for each learner would be different. The visitors were unable to determine how, without a process in place, the achievement of learning outcomes and standards of proficiency would be ensured for each learner on the programme. Therefore, visitors were not able to determine whether the education provider's approach to ensuring an appropriate structure, duration and range of practice-based learning was sufficient, as they could not see information about what this approach was. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure an appropriate structure, duration and range of practice-based learning for all learners to determine whether this standard it met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: From the discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that learners will undertake a range of practice-based learning. As the visitors were unable to determine where learners will go for practice-based learning, the visitors could not make a judgement at this stage that the education provider will have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. Specifically, the visitors were unable to see whether there is a process in place for identifying suitable practice-based learning staff, including the criteria that are used to make this judgement. In order for the visitors to determine whether this standard is met, the education provider must demonstrate there is a process in place for identifying and ensuring that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the system for approving all practice-based learning on this programme will ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that learners will undertake a range of practice-based learning. As the visitors were unable to determine where learners will go for practice-based learning, they could not make a judgement at this stage that the education provider has a suitable process for ensuring that practice educators will have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Specifically, the visitors

could not see that there is a process in place for identifying suitable practice-based learning staff, including the criteria used to ensure that these individuals have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In order for the visitors to make a judgement about whether this standard is met, the education provider must demonstrate there is a process in place for ensuring practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

5.8 Learners and practice educators must have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice‑based learning.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures learners and practice educators are fully prepared for practice-based learning.

Reason: The visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how the education provider ensures that learners and practice educators are fully prepared for practice-based learning. In particular, they could not identify how they were made aware of the learners' ability and expected scope of practice while on placement and what the expectations of both the learners and practice educators should be at each individual placement to ensure that learners gain the experience they require. In the meeting with the practice educators, it was clear that discussions regarding information needed for practice-based learning was conducted on an informal basis. As such, the visitors were unable to determine the process in place for ensuring learners and practice educators have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require information about the mechanisms in place, which demonstrate how the education provider ensures learners are fully prepared for practice-based learning. In particular, this should demonstrate how practice educators are made aware of students' experience and expected scope of practice for each placement and how the expectation of both the learners and practice educators at practice-based learning are managed to ensure that learners get the experience they require to meet the relevant learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how learners and practice educators will be fully prepared for practice-based learning and in a timely manner.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to information about assessment regulations and exemptions to academic regulations. From a review of the documentation, the visitors understood the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme. However at the visit, the visitors heard placements two, three and four are eight weeks in length and can be in different aspects of the same discipline. Alternatively, they can be split into two, four-week blocks in the same or similar discipline with one four-week block being in a secondary setting and another four weeks in a complementary community or primary care setting. From the discussions, the visitors noted that it is possible to fail one four-week placement but pass another four-week placement. As such, the visitors were unclear on the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme. In particular, the visitors were unable to determine the following:

- how progression is achieved if a learner fails one, four week placement but passes the other four week placement; and
- how requirement for progression and achievement relating to practice-based learning is communicated to learners.

In discussions with the learners, the visitors noted that there was a lack of clarity in their understanding around the expectations for progression and achievement within the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme and how this will be communicated to learners. In this way, the visitors can make determinations about whether the programme meets this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must further evidence that the assessment methods employed are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Reason: During the visit, the visitors were provided with revised module descriptors that have been amended as a result of internal validation at the visit. In scrutinising this evidence at the visit, the visitors noted that for a number of modules several learning outcomes were expected to be achieved but only one assessment method is employed. For example, page 32 of the revised module descriptors has five learning outcomes to be achieved but only one assessment method. The visitors were unsure how utilising one assessment method is appropriate to and effective at measuring whether the learners meet the learning outcomes for the programme. Although we do not specify the methods of assessment that should be included in the programme, the visitors were unable to see how the chosen method is effective at assessing whether all of the associated learning outcomes are met. In addition, from the information provided the visitors were unsure how the education provider ensures that assessments carried out at appropriate stages during the course of the programme match a learner's expected progression. As such, the education provider must further evidence that the assessment methods employed are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes to ensure that learners who complete the programme can practise safely and effectively.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Second response to conditions required
The education provider responded to the conditions set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were satisfied that the conditions for several of the standards were met. However, they were not satisfied that the following conditions were met, for the reasons detailed below. Therefore, in order for the visitors to be satisfied that the following conditions are met, they require further evidence.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners have access to practice-based learning opportunities of appropriate structure, duration and range to support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason condition not met at this time: To evidence this condition, the visitors were provided with an excel spreadsheet detailing the organisations that will be providing practice-based learning for this programme and the number of learners each organisation will take on. Upon reviewing the spreadsheet, the visitors noted that seven out of the 17 organisations were listed as 'in progress', the visitors understood this to mean that these practice-based learning opportunities have yet to be confirmed. Although it appears that there is capacity to support the first intake for this programme, there is not sufficient growth identified for the following academic year when an additional 120 placement will be required. Given this requirement, the visitors were unclear how learners will have access to practice-based learning of appropriate structure, duration and range to support the achievement of the learning outcomes for the whole programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that all learners (including future learners) will have access to practice-based learning opportunities of appropriate structure, duration and range to support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason condition not met at this time: To evidence this condition, the visitors were provided with a schedule of practice educator training and a narrative of the quality assurance process for ensuring that staff were appropriately qualified and experienced. Whilst the visitors were satisfied with the level of training available to practice educators, they were unable to determine whether there were an adequate number of staff involved in practice-based learning. This standard is about making sure there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning. Given that by the second year of the programme there will be 120 learners, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided how the education provider will ensure that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence detailing that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, given the number of learners on the programme.

Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, and the request for further evidence set out in section 5, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend 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.

Section 7: 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 this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future. 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.

From the documentation, discussions and presentation reviewed at the visit, the visitors were clear that the standards continue to be met. The visitors however, noted that capacity for practice-based learning over the course of the programme might be challenging given that there are existing provision at other education providers within the region. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit information in the next annual monitoring audit to demonstrate that there is capacity to support the second and final year of the programme. This will enable learners to continue to have access to practice-based learning of appropriate structure, duration and range to support the achievement of the learning outcomes for the whole programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of York
Name of programme(s)	Masters in Social Work (Hons), Full time
	MA in Social Work, Full time
	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time
Approval visit date	30 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12091-Z7F0F6

Contents

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:

Sheila Skelton	Social worker
Susan Bell	Social worker
Joanne Watchman	Lay
Niall Gooch	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.

Tracy Lightfoot	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of York
Hayley Rowan	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of York

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Masters in Social Work (Hons)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed first intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01774

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.

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01947

Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01948

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment.

The HCPC considered that the ability of these two programmes to meet the standards might be affected by the introduction of the new programme, so we decided to consider their ongoing approval as part of the visit.

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
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

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	We met with learners from the existing HCPC-approved MA in Social Work, which is already running, and the BA (Hons) in Social Work, as the Masters in Social Work (Hons) has not yet started.
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

Recommendation of the visitors
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 was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 03 August 2018.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will communicate to learners the detail of attendance policies, and the action to be taken if learners miss compulsory parts of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence supplied for this standard, including policy statements, information supplied to learners, and a monitoring sample. They discussed attendance monitoring with the programme team and learners. However, from their review and these discussions, it was not clear how all learners would be enabled to understand the full consequences of missing compulsory parts of the programme, and the action that will take in relation to absence. The visitors could also not see where it was clearly explained to learners that self-certification of illness absence would only be allowed for a limited period, which the programme team had confirmed was the policy. Specifically, the visitors considered that information provided for learners needed to be more explicit about the following:

- How learners are expected to catch up with teaching or learning activities, or assessments, missed due to absence;
- That self-certification of illness absence would only be allowed for a limited time and that after that time it would be necessary to provide a doctor's certificate.

They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they will ensure that learners are provided with information about the consequences of missing compulsory parts of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the process by which they ensure the quality of the 30-day placement on the Masters in Social Work (Hons) programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, and discussed audit processes with the programme team. They were satisfied that there were appropriate systems in place for approving and ensuring the quality of most of the practice-based learning on the programme. However, the visitors noted that learners on the Masters in Social Work (Hons) programme would undertake a 30-day placement, which learners would be responsible for finding for themselves and could be in a wide variety of settings. It was not clear to them how the education provider would ensure the quality of this practice-based learning, if for example a particular setting had not previously been used by learners from the University of York or was otherwise not within the scope of the general audit system. In the programme team meeting the visitors were told that all 30-day placements had to be quality assured, but in the practice educator meeting the visitors heard that there was uncertainty about whether new practice based learning settings would be quality assured. As such, the visitors were unable to determine that all practice based settings, would be approved and quality assured and consequently that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system to do so. They therefore require the education provider to clarify how

they will ensure that there is a thorough and effective system in place for ensuring the quality of all of the 30-day placements learners will undertake.

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 reviewing how they ensure that service users and carers involved in admissions are appropriately trained in equality and diversity policies.

Reason: The visitors considered that the standard was met at threshold, as there were equality and diversity policies in place in relation to applicants, and that they were implemented and monitored. The programme team had a clear understanding of their responsibilities in this area. From discussions with service users and carers, the visitors were aware that some service users and carers were involved with admissions. When the visitors asked the service users and carers how they were prepared for involvement in admissions, they were aware of the equality and diversity policies. However, the visitors were not clear that all service users and carers were aware of how they might need to let those policies influence their behaviour and decision-making in the admissions process. This might create a risk in future that equality and diversity policies in admissions are not implemented. They therefore suggest that the education provider keep under review how they prepare service users and carers for involvement in admissions.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Recommendation: For the Masters in Social Work (Hons), the education provider should keep under review contingency plans for accommodating changes if the Practice Education Consultant posts are no longer funded, once the Teaching Partnership Initiative funding ends.

Reason: The visitors considered that the standard was met at threshold, as the programme was well supported by management at the University of York and the wider Department of Social Policy and Social Work. There were no threats to the viability of the programme. There were agreements in place with local authority partners. However, visitors were aware that the Practice Educator Consultant posts were funded by the Teaching Partnership initiative and had a significant role in the programme. If these posts were not funded after the Teaching Partnership funding ends, consideration would need to be given as to how the roles and tasks of these posts would be covered to ensure that the programme was fit for purpose. The visitors therefore suggest that the education provider maintain a contingency plan for this situation.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider a formal development programme for service users and carers.

Reason: The visitors considered that the standard was met at threshold, as there was an active body of service users closely involved in different parts of the programme, who were well supported by the programme team. The education provider had considered and was able to justify the different types of involvement by different service users and carers. The visitors did note, however, that the service users and carers said that they would appreciate more formalised training and development opportunities. This would provide opportunities for them to become more familiar with appropriate guidelines and policies (see the Recommendation under SET 2.7 above), where this was judged necessary. The visitors therefore suggest that the education provider review the development and training structure available for service users and carers.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Recommendation: For the Masters in Social Work (Hons), the education provider should keep under review how they ensure that all learners have a full understanding of appropriate consent throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as there were clear processes in place by which learners, and service users and carers, could give their consent. They saw examples of forms and policies. Most of the learners appeared to have a clear understanding of consent. However, the visitors did note that the learners appeared to have only one opportunity to give written consent to involvement in role play exercises, at the start of the programme. In a discussion of consent one of the learners appeared to think that it would not be possible to continue on the programme if he withdrew ongoing consent. As the programme lasts for four years, the visitors considered that there was a risk that if learners only had one formal opportunity to give consent, they would not be enabled to understand the ongoing nature of consent, and might feel pressured to take part in particular activities when they feel uncomfortable. They therefore suggest that the education provider review whether learners should be given more regular opportunities to renew and reflect upon their written consent.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend 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.