HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Validating body	Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Approval visit date	15-16 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-12155-Q5R3B2

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:

Calum Delaney	Speech and language therapist
Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Ian Hughes	Lay
Eloise O'Connell	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.

| Liz Hryniewicz | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Faculty Director of Childhood Education Sciences Scheme, Canterbury Christ Church University |
| Alison Coates | Quality and Standards panel member | Assistant Director of Quality and Standards, CCCU |

Diane Coutinho	Quality and Standards panel member	Quality Manager, University of Greenwich
Jennifer Shearman	Internal panel member	Faculty of Education, CCCU
Sarah James	External assessor	Leeds Beckett University
Lauren Smyth	Quality Office	Quality Officer, CCCU

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 36
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01784

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.

The education provider previously ran an approved PG Dip Speech and Language Therapy programme, which will be closed and replaced by the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy 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 three graduates and a current first year learner on the approved PG Dip Speech and Language Therapy programme.
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, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 18 May 2018.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose by ensuring that the programme meets the needs of learners who will be entering the profession.

Reason: Following a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were not clear how various communication disorders and their assessment and management are addressed across the programme, and how this provision is managed in relation to staffing provision. The 'Clinical areas and the curriculum' document states "academic modules are linked both within and across the stages of the programme through use of the principles of spiral curricula, whereby topics and themes are revisited several times across the three years of the programme". The document lists the clinical areas, and how these are integrated through the modules in the curriculum. From this, the visitors were not clear what range of communication disorder specific information and foundation subject information learners will receive at different points during the programme, as the visitors could not track this through the curriculum from the information provided. As such, the visitors were not clear if the learners would develop an adequate understanding of the communication disorders for practice. This is related to standards 3.9, which requires the programme to have an adequate number of staff in

place, and 4.3, which requires the programme to reflect the knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance, which are detailed later in this report. As the visitors could not determine how the programme would ensure learners develop an adequate understanding of communication disorders for practice, the visitors could not determine how the programme meets the needs of learners who will be entering the profession. As such, from the information provided, the visitors could not make a judgement as to whether this standard has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how there will be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers

Reason: In their review of the documentation, the visitors read about the 'Practice Learning Unit' comprising of support staff and an academic placement lead whose role is to arrange placements for learners. The programme specification document notes that practice education providers "have direct liaison with identified practice placement coordinators within each organisation using a range of communication methods". At the visit, the visitors heard from practice education providers that communication between themselves and the education provider is ongoing through email, and there has not been much face-to-face interaction. The visitors heard from the programme team about the collaboration with the practice education providers, and the different meetings that are in place between practice education providers and the education provider, in addition to the ongoing email communication. However, from the documentation provided, the visitors could not see any information regarding the meetings between the practice education providers and the education providers, or plans to have meetings in place in future. As such, while the visitors have heard about the collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers, they were unable to see how the education provider ensures that collaboration between both parties happens at regular intervals and how they ensure that it is effective. Therefore, in order for the visitors to make a judgement as to whether this standard is met, the education provider must demonstrate how there will be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an effective process in place that ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: In their review of the documentation, the visitors read about the 'Faculty Practice Learning Sub Committee', which has responsibility for overseeing, monitoring and enhancement of the practice based learning environment. The programme specification also outlines that finding capacity for practice-based learning, which ensures an appropriate range of experiences for all learners, is "challenging in the current Health and Social Care context". The documentation mentions that efforts to increase capacity include building capacity in the private, voluntary and independent sectors. At the visit, the visitors heard from the learners and practice educators that it is often a difficult time sourcing learners onto placements. The visitors heard from the practice education providers that over the last few years the education provider has had

difficulty placing learners, in particular for adult-specific practice based learning, which is placement two on the current PG dip programme. The visitors heard from both the practice education providers and the programme team that as the proposed BSc programme has a different placement structure, pressure will be taken off providing adult placements, which will solve some of the issues they have had with practice-based learning capacity.

In addition, the visitors noted that the proposed new programme will have a higher number of learners and an additional year on the programme in comparison to the PG Dip programme. The visitors heard from the programme team that they have been preparing for the change to the programme and increase in capacity needs. Through their good relationship with the practice education providers they are confident there will continue to be adequate provision. The programme team talked about how the structure and design of practice-based learning is different for the proposed new programme, and there will not be as much pressure on providing targeted practice-based learning, which will allow for more capacity. The programme team talked about their efforts to involve private and independent sectors to increase capacity. The visitors heard reassurances and plans around practice-based learning capacity, however the visitors have not seen where or how this has been documented to demonstrate that there is an effective process in place that will ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. As such, the education provider must demonstrate that there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the new 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 demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From reading the documentation, the visitors were not clear what the staffing provision would be for the programme, considering there will be a significant increase in learner numbers on the proposed three-year programme in comparison to the existing programme which will be superseded by the new programme. In the documentation, the education provider noted the full time equivalence (FTEs) for staff on the programme. However the visitors were not clear how this would be an adequate number of staff in place for the number of learners anticipated for the programme. The education provider also noted that other staff based at the education provider will carry out teaching on some of the modules that are not speech and language therapy specific. In addition, some teaching on the speech and language therapy specific modules will be carried out by 'visiting lecturers' who are speech and language therapy practitioners with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. The visitors were not clear on what the visiting lecturers are responsible for delivering across the modules in the programme to ensure the delivery of an effective programme. As such, they could not determine whether they have the appropriate qualifications and experience to teach certain aspects of the programme, which are yet to be disclosed, and whether there are sufficient numbers of visiting lecturers teaching alongside staff to deliver to the number of learners on the programme.

In addition to the increase in learner numbers, the visitors noted that the needs of learners for this programme may differ to those on the current programme, considering

the proposed new programme is at undergraduate level. For example, undergraduate learners may need more support in study or research skills when compared to those who have already completed an undergraduate degree. The visitors heard from the programme team that the plan is to draw on resources from other programmes at the education provider, in addition to continued use of 'visiting lecturers' who have also taught on the current PG Dip programme. However, the visitors have not seen information regarding all staff that will be brought in to teach on the programme, or how their teaching time is distributed across modules. Therefore, in consideration of the increase in learner numbers and the needs of the learners, the visitors could not determine whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff in place to deliver an effective programme. As such, they require further evidence to demonstrate this to determine whether the standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: From review of the documentation, the visitors understood that some teaching on the speech and language therapy specific modules will be carried out by 'visiting lecturers' who are practising speech and language therapists, and will teach their areas of speciality. The programme specification states, "clinical areas not within the specialisms of the permanent teaching staff will be taught by expert clinicians". However, the visitors have not seen information about the educators that will be brought in to teach on the programme, or what they are responsible for delivering within the modules of this programme. As such, in order for the visitors to make a judgement on whether this standard is met, the education provider must demonstrate that the additional teaching staff used on the programme will have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver the subject areas.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that an effective programme is in place to ensure the continuing and academic development of all educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the programme specification states "clinical areas not within the specialisms of the permanent teaching staff will be taught by expert clinicians". At the visit, the visitors heard that the education provider has long-standing relationships with the visiting educators who have taught on the PG Dip programme for many years. However, the visitors were not clear on what the arrangements for preparation and arrangements for visiting staff development and support are for visiting staff on the programme. The programme specification states that "permanent teaching staff have access to a broad range of staff development opportunities, and robust appraisal systems ensure that lifelong learning is prioritised". However, the visitors were not clear what, if any, arrangements are in place for continuing professional and academic development for visiting educators that is appropriate to their role in the programme. The visitors recognise that visiting educators may not take part in all professional-development arrangements that the education

provider has in place. However, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that these educators are keeping their professional and academic skills (relevant to their role on the programme) up to date. Therefore, in order for the visitors to make a judgement as to whether this standard has been met, the education provider must demonstrate that there is an effective programme in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of all educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme does reflect the knowledge base as articulated in relevant curriculum guidance.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were not clear how various communication disorders and their assessment and management are addressed across the programme. The 'Clinical areas and the curriculum' document states "academic modules are linked both within and across the stages of the programme though use of the principles of spiral curricula, whereby topics and themes are revisited several times across the three years of the programme". The document listed the clinical areas, and how these are integrated through the modules in the curriculum. From this, the visitors were not clear what range of communication disorder specific information and foundation specific information learners will receive, as the visitors could not track this through the curriculum from the information provided. As such, the visitors were not clear if the learners will develop an adequate understanding of the range and depth of communication disorders for practice. The visitors were also unclear how many hours will be taught by visiting educators, and when, and where different disorders appear across modules due to the nature of the spiral curriculum. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the programme reflects the knowledge base as articulated in relevant curriculum guidance, and the relationship of this to the overall programme structure, to ensure learners will have an adequate breadth and depth of understanding of communication disorders for practice.

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.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how learners are made aware of the differences between the appeals, raising concerns, and complaints processes, how the processes are initiated, and where the information can be found.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the SETs mapping document references the student handbook in relation to this standard, however the visitors could not find information related to the complaints procedure. From discussion at the visit, the visitors heard from the learners that they were not sure of the complaints procedure or where to find it, though they did know where they would go to look for it if needed. At the visit, the visitors heard from the programme team that in the placement

handbook learners are referred to a 'my essential information' link which will direct the learners to information on the complaints procedures. However, the visitors were not clear how learners would clearly understand to use this if they wanted to find information on the complaints procedure. The visitors understand that there are processes in place, however they note that the education provider could strengthen how learners are made aware of this and the importance of it, in order for the process to remain thorough and effective.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Liverpool
Name of programme(s)	Medicine Exemptions for Orthoptists, Distance learning BSc (Hons) Orthoptics, Full time
Approval visit date	05 April 2018- 6 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12223-V6Q6Y8

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 the standards relevant to the programme (the standards of education and training, and the 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:

Claire Saha	Orthoptist
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Joanne Watchman	Lay
Christine Timms	Orthoptist (observing)
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Orthoptist
Entitlement	Orthoptist exemptions
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1

Assessment reference	APP01942

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 in legislation 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 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	Medicine Exemptions for Orthoptists
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Orthoptist exemptions
Proposed First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01905

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 documents (standards of education and training, and the standards for education providers part of the standards for the use by orthoptists of exemptions to sell and supply medicines)	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping documents (SOPs for orthoptists, and standards for orthoptists using exemptions in legislation for the sale and supply of medicines)	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 14 June 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: For the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, the education provider must ensure that appropriate information about the programme is provided to potential applicants, to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the prospective website does not convey to potential learners that on graduation successful learners will be able to have their HCPC registration annotated with orthoptist exemptions. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that learners would be informed through open days held at the university, and that the programme specification will be updated to ensure accurate information is provided to learners. However, to be sure that this standard is met, the visitors need to see information that is clear about the annotation that will be available to potential applicants. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine how prospective applicants are able to make an informed choice about whether to apply for a place on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: For the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, the education provider must demonstrate that the transitional arrangements for current students transferring onto the second year of the new programme will be appropriate and effectively managed.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that currently enrolled first year learners from the existing programme will transfer onto the second year of the new programme (subject to approval). In this way, they will be able to continue their studies until the final year so they can gain the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics award, and be eligible to apply for registration as an orthoptist, with the orthoptist exemptions annotation. At the visit, the visitors understood learners would be consulted in advance to ensure they are happy to transfer onto the new programme and support would be in place to allow learners to re-adjust to the new programme structure. However, as there was no information provided in the documentation to explain how transitional arrangements would support learners being phased into the second year of the programme the visitors will need evidence to demonstrate that this has been addressed. Therefore, the visitors require further information to ensure learner consultation has taken place, learners are happy to transfer onto the new programme, and the support is available to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

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

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the ophthalmic training element of module ORTH230.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the academic staff for this module include one prescriber, ophthalmologists and pharmacologists. However, from these conversations the visitors understood that the ophthalmologists and pharmacology staff were not currently in place. As there is a small number of staff involved in the teaching of this module, the visitors noted that the full range of skills and knowledge are necessary in order to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence, which demonstrates that the education provider will ensure there, is an adequate number of appropriately, qualified and experienced staff in place for the teaching of this module. Particularly, the visitors would expect to see that the education provider has plans in place to recruit to these roles, prior to the module commencing. In this way, the visitors can determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that relevant subject areas in the ORTH230 module are taught by staff with specialist knowledge and expertise in ophthalmology.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to see who would be providing the ophthalmic training in the ORTH230 module. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned that the education provider would recruit ophthalmologists and pharmacology staff to provide the specific ophthalmic training required for the teaching of this module. As there is a small number of staff involved in the teaching of this module, the visitors noted that the ophthalmologists and pharmacology staff are necessary in order to ensure that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. Therefore, the visitors require evidence, which demonstrates that the education provider will ensure that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Particularly, the visitors would expect to see that the education provider has plans in place to recruit to these roles prior to the module commencing. In this way, the visitors can determine whether staff have the requisite specialist knowledge and experience to deliver the specific ophthalmic training for this module.

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: For the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, the education provider must demonstrate 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. Within the programme specification on page 4, it states, "Successful completion of the programme results in the award of the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics degree, which allows graduates to

register with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and practise as an orthoptist". 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.

C.1 **The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for orthoptists using exemptions in legislation for the sale, supply and administration of medicines.**

- **Standard 10: Be able to demonstrate safe use of medicines**

Condition: The education provider must ensure that learners who successfully complete the programmes meet the standards for orthoptists using exemptions in legislation for the sale, supply and administration of medicines.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the list of medicines contained within the module descriptor ORTH 230 and 408 omitted proxymetacaine from the list of prescription only medicines and also omitted the teaching of pharmacy medicines allowed by exemptions. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that learners would be taught about these medications in the programmes and this omission would be amended to reflect the accurate information is given to learners on the programmes. The visitors require evidence, which demonstrates that the education provider ensures that learners meet the standards for orthoptists using exemptions in legislation for the sale, supply and administration of medicines.

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: For the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, the education provider must demonstrate that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners on the programme.
Reason: In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned that at this time, there are no orthoptists with the exemptions annotation involved with the practice-based learning. This is because training in this area is only just being approved by the HCPC and therefore, currently no individuals have completed this training, and had their registration record annotated. In order for practice educators to be able to assess this module, the education provider must ensure they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. This applies whether individuals have the orthoptist exception annotation or not. The visitors were unclear how the education provider was making this judgement, from the information provided and discussions at the visit. In order for the visitors to be able to make a judgement on whether this standard is met, the education provider must demonstrate they have practice educators in place that are appropriately qualified to support safe and effective learning.

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

Condition: For the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, the education provider must demonstrate that the programme documentation reflects the changes made to the assessment policies as discussed at the approval visit.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that in the programme specification, assessment of all clinical examinations and clinical placements must be passed with a minimum of forty per cent, and cannot be compensated by other assessments within a module. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that compensation would be allowed across three specific modules ORTH139, ORTH141 and ORTH238, as long as the learner achieves a minimum of thirty five per cent in each component. As the visitors were provided with conflicting information, they were unable to determine how learners would understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to determine the information has been amended to reflect accurate information about assessment policies and is available to learners and educators.

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.
E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the process in place for appointing an external examiner ensures individual(s) are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted the external examiner who has been appointed for this programme does not have the orthoptist exemptions annotation. As previously noted, no orthoptists currently have this annotation, and although we do not require the external examiner to have the orthoptist exemptions annotation, having knowledge of this area across external examiners is relevant to properly assess and quality assure the programme. The visitors could not ascertain how areas of this programme outside of the scope of knowledge of the external examiner would be externally moderated. Therefore, the visitors require evidence of the process used to appoint external examiners, and that this process ensures that their external examiner(s) have the full breadth of knowledge required to assess this 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.

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

Recommendation: For the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, the education provider should require prospective students to disclose if they have been subject to any convictions, cautions, reprimands or warnings.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that learners underwent a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check prior to admission onto the programme. The visitors noted that the education provider would be able to make a reasonable decision about the suitability of applicants using this information, and through other requirements of the admissions processes, and therefore this standard is met at a threshold level. However, the visitors considered that it may also be pertinent to ask for further information from applicants, to allow the education provider to make a decision based on a broader range of evidence. For example, the education provider could require applicants to disclose if they have previously been dismissed from employment, or whether they have been subject to any disciplinary processes or hearings. As such, the visitors recommend the education provider to consider asking applicants additional information to gain a deeper understanding of their suitability for the programme.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: For the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, the education provider should strengthen the way learners understand the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that learners had the opportunity to learn about professional conduct and to demonstrate an understanding of which types of behaviour are appropriate for a professional and which are not. From discussions with the learners, the visitors noted that learners did not specifically know what the HCPC standards of conduct and performance and ethics (SCPEs) were, although they were able to give examples of the content included in the SCPEs. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider strengthen references to this set of standards, so that learners understand and are able to use them as a working document. This will assist learners when working towards meeting the SCPEs as part of the programme, and will provide a good grounding in using the standards day-to-day once individuals who complete this programme are out in practice.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	The University of St Mark and St John
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Part time
Approval visit date	07 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-12088-V0T5T9

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:

Prisha Shah	Lay
Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
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.

Ian Luke	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of St Mark and St John
Norman Jope	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of St Mark and St John
Michelle Prout	Member of internal panel (university Quality and Standards Manager)	University of St Mark and St John

Fiona Wilcox	External member of panel	Birmingham City University
Lance Doggart	Member of internal panel	University of St Mark and St John
Sarah McAdam	Member of internal panel	University of St Mark and St John
Rhys Roberts	Student member of internal panel	University of St Mark and St John

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01767

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 university informed the HCPC through the major change process that they wished to shorten the programme from three and a half years to three years.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01768

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 university informed the HCPC through the major change process that they wished to shorten the programme from three and a half years to three years.

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 May 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 demonstrate how they will ensure that applicants have all the information they require about the costs and structure of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme website offered as evidence against this standard. They were not able to see where on this site applicants could find information about the costs, if any, associated with the Disclosure and Barring Service check and the occupational health check required by the education provider. They were also not able to see where applicants were informed of the accommodation and travel costs that might be incurred during practice-based learning. The visitors were aware from discussions with learners and staff that some placement settings were a long distance from the education provider. The visitors were also unclear about where applicants would be able to access information about the structure of the programme. In particular, they could not see how applicants could find information about the third year of the programme being longer than the normal academic year, or about how the part-time route on the programme was intended to work. The visitors considered that it was important that applicants understood that on the part-time route they would spend four days a week in practice-based learning, as learners opting for a part-time route may be expecting to be able to combine their studies with family, childcare or work commitments. This structure may not allow for that and the visitors could not see how learners would be made aware of the timetable before accepting a place on the programme. The programme team said that some of this information was conveyed in an open day presentation, but the visitors considered that, if applicants missed this for any reason, it was not clear where else they might access it. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all applicants have access to the following information to determine how this standard is met:

- potential costs the learners may incur in relation to additional criminal convictions and health checks;
- potential costs the learners may incur due to travelling long distances to practice-based learning; and
- information about the structure of the programme and the timetable for practice based learning for those on the part time route.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that applicants from the Scottish education system have access to clear information about the academic entry standards.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the information provided on the programme website concerning academic requirements, but were not able to see a full list of academic requirements for applicants educated in Scotland. The Level 2 requirements for Scottish applicants were outlined, but no information was provided above Level 2. This meant that not all of the relevant academic and professional entry standards had been clearly set out for applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing how they will ensure that applicants can access all relevant standards for entry.

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 revise relevant materials to include clear references to the penalties associated with plagiarism and other academic misconduct.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence regarding the education provider's processes for monitoring the suitability of learners' conduct, character and health. Discussion with the learners suggested that they were aware that some processes were in place, but did not appear to be clear about the possible consequences of academic misconduct, including plagiarism. The visitors could not see in any of the visit documentation a clear statement for learners of the process for dealing with such issues. They were happy with the process in place, but they were unclear how it was communicated to learners. The TurnItIn system is used at the education provider, but the visitors could not see how learners were informed what might happen to their studies if misconduct was committed. Therefore they were not clear that the process was fair and supportive. The visitors require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that learners are fully aware of the process for dealing with academic misconduct.

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 ensure that information for learners and applicants about eligibility for admission to the Register is consistent and correct.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme specification provided as evidence for this standard. On page 3 of the document, it states that "on completion of the programme students are competent to practice as autonomous SLT practitioners and are recommended for registration with the Health and Care Professions Council." This does not clearly inform learners of the requirement that they must apply for registration with the HCPC and achieve registration before practicing as a Speech and Language therapist. The programme website states, "On completion you will able to apply to the Health and Care Professions Council for your licence to practice as a Speech and Language Therapist". The visitors considered that these statements were inconsistent with each other, and that neither statement was sufficiently clear or accurate about the entitlement for learners who successfully complete the programme. For instance, learners are eligible to apply to the HCPC for registration on successful completion of an HCPC approved programme but the HCPC does not award licenses to individuals to practice. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all relevant documentation provides learners with accurate and consistent information. Particularly, that only successful completion of an HCPC approved programme provides eligibility to apply for admission to the HCPC Register and only registration with the HCPC permits individuals to practice the profession.

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 ensure that the learning outcomes for module SCLT06, Anatomy and Physiology for Speech and Language Therapy, appropriately reflect the knowledge base appropriate for practice of the speech and language therapy profession.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the module descriptors submitted as part of the documentation. They noted that in the learning outcomes, and in the indicative content, for SCLT06, there was no mention of disorders of anatomy and physiology. Therefore, they were unable to ascertain how the module would enable learners to meet the standards of proficiency for speech and language therapists that require knowledge of

physiological and anatomical dysfunction, for example 13.1 and 13.13. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how the learning outcomes for this module ensure that learners will meet the standards of proficiency for speech and language therapists.

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 where in the curriculum learners have an opportunity to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions, and the rationale for the design and delivery.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard. This included the descriptors for the clinical placement modules. In SLTH03H the education provider was planning for learners to have joint learning about dysphagia with dietetics learners, and in SLTH01 one of the learning outcomes is that learners are able to "critically evaluate interprofessional working across agencies". The mapping document also referred to "annual collaborative learning project with dentistry students" and "shared learning with psychology students", but did not direct the visitors towards any evidence of how this is delivered. From discussions with the programme team and with learners on the existing version of the programme, the visitors were aware that there had been some learning with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions, on that programme. However, it was not clear how this learning was formally and sustainably embedded in the curriculum for the new version of the programme, or how the education provider had made decisions about designing and delivering inter-professional education (IPE) to make sure that it was as relevant as possible for learners.

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 ensure that learners have access to clear and consistent information about attendance requirements, and the consequences of not meeting these requirements.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided against this standard, and discussed attendance monitoring with the programme team and learners on the existing programme. They noted that there were policies in place concerning attendance and that the university used the electronic "CheckIn" system. From discussions with the programme team and learners, the visitors were aware that there had been technical problems with this system, which are currently being addressed. However, the visitors considered that there still seemed to be some uncertainty among both learners and the programme team about the exact attendance requirements for the programme and what formal process was followed if these requirements were not met. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that all relevant materials make it clear to learners and staff when attendance is mandatory, and what will happen if they do not attend those 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 demonstrate how they will maintain a thorough and effective system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: The visitors reviewed documentation relating to quality monitoring of practice-based learning, and were able to discuss the issue with practice educators and the programme team. They were aware that there were a number of individual means by which the education provider could monitor different aspects of a particular placement's quality. However, it was not clear that there was any means of bringing all of this information together systematically to provide a clear picture of any given placement setting. Therefore the visitors were unable to be sure that the overall system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning was thorough and effective. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing that they have such a system and that it is effective.

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 that they have a mechanism in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of practice educators.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence relating to how the education provider monitored the suitability of practice educators on an ongoing basis, in the form of a "Clinical Education Training attendance database". They were not clear from this review how the education provider would be able to monitor the HCPC registration status of practice educators, or under what circumstances, if ever, they would waive the registration requirement. From discussions with the programme team and practice educators they were aware that the education provider had ongoing relationships with many of the placement settings, but it was not clarified what formal process was in place to ensure the ongoing suitability of all educators. The visitors considered that this was a particular concern outside NHS settings, where policies designed to ensure such suitability might not be so robust. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure that all practice educators are suitable.

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 will ensure that the training needs of practice educators are appropriately identified, and that it is clear what the training requirements are for practice educators.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence presented for this standard, the "Clinical Education Training presentations" and the "Clinical Education Training attendance database". It was not clear to the visitors from these documents, or from discussions with the programme team and practice educators, whether it was mandatory or simply desirable for all practice educators to receive specific training before learners were placed with them. They could also not see how the education provider was able to

monitor and identify the training needs of particular individual educators, and were therefore unable to determine whether all practice educators were undertaking regular appropriate training which met learners' needs. They therefore require the education provide to submit further evidence clarifying what training requirements a practice educator must have met before learners are place with them, and how the training needs of practice educators are monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the assessments throughout the three years of the programme will provide a fair measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the document "Assessment Practices" which was provided as evidence against this standard. It was not clear from this document how the assessments would be spaced through the year and across the three years of the programme. At the visit, the visitors were provided with a separate document listing the assessments that would take place during the programme. However, this document did not make clear the timing of these assessments, and so the visitors could not determine the overall assessment load through the programme or how learners would have the opportunity to demonstrate their progression and achievement. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing the assessment load throughout the programme and demonstrating how they will ensure that this is fair for learners.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence demonstrating how they ensure that the assessments carried out by practice educators provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the document "Assessment Practices" which was provided as evidence against this standard. It was not clear to them from this document, or from discussions with the programme team or practice educators, how the programme team ensures that assessments carried out in practice-based learning settings is of a consistent and appropriate standard. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure that all practice educators who assess learners are appropriately prepared to do so. The visitors considered that there was a link between this condition and the conditions set under SETs 5.6 and 5.7 regarding the knowledge, skills, experience and training of practice educators.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will make it clear to learners how the Honours classification will be calculated.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the "Student Assessment Regulations" that were presented as evidence for this standard. They were not able to see in these regulations

where it was explained to learners how they would achieve an Honours classification. As well as this, as noted in the first condition under SET 6.3 above, it was not clear how assessment would be spaced throughout the programme, and so the visitors could not be certain that learners would understand how the assessment structure would enable them to progress and achieve within the programme. From discussions with the programme team and with learners, the visitors were unclear about where this information would be provided to learners. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that information about progression and achievement within the programme, including information about assessment load and how to achieve Honours classification, will be made available to learners.

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.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider keeping a more systematic record of actions taken in response to consultations with programme stakeholders in order to ensure that feedback is used as effectively as possible on an ongoing basis.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as there had been consultation with different stakeholders about the fitness of the revised programme. This was clear from discussions with the senior team, the programme team, service users and carers, and practice educators and learners. All these groups said they had been involved in discussions with the programme team and that their input had been taken on board. The visitors were not, however, able to see written evidence of all these consultations. They considered that if written records of actions taken in response to feedback were not available, it would be harder for the education provider to monitor the fitness for purpose and development needs of the programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	St Mary's University, Twickenham
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), Full time accelerated
Approval visit date	06 - 07 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-12196-T0G4Z8

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
Pamela Bagley	Physiotherapist
Roseann Connolly	Lay
Eloise O'Connell	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.

Chris Hull	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	St Mary's University
Stephen Scott	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	St Mary's University
Jonathan Gibbs	Internal panel member	St Mary's University
Isaac Sorinola	External advisor	King's College London

Nina Paterson	External panel member	Representative from the Chartered Society of Physiotherapists (CSP)
Heather Stewart	External panel member	Representative from the Chartered Society of Physiotherapists (CSP)

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01802

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 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 therefore there have been no external examiner reports.

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	As this is a new programme, and the education provider has no other HCPC approved programmes, we met with current learners on the BSc (Hons) Sport Rehabilitation programme offered by the education provider.
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 April 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 demonstrate that admissions information will give applicants the information they require so that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up the offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the assessment load on the programme is particularly high, and were not clear how prospective applicants would be made aware of this. The visitors were referred to a section on assessment in the document 'applicant guide' which states "several methods of assessment throughout the course" followed by a list of the core modules on the programme. At the visit, the visitors heard from the programme team that all prospective applicants for the programme would attend open evenings where they also have

opportunities for one to one discussions with members of staff, which will cover information on assessment. However, the visitors could not determine how all prospective applicants would have this information if they did not attend open evenings. As such, the visitors require evidence that prospective applicants are provided with sufficient information on the assessment load on the programme, to enable them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

In addition, from their review of the documentation, the visitors noted some errors and incorrect terminology. In various places, the documentation refers to "eligibility to register with HCPC". Completing an approved programme does not guarantee someone will become registered, the graduates are eligible to apply for registration and the HCPC need additional information from them in order to be able to register them. The visitors also noted that in places, the documentation refers to HCPC as a 'professional body' rather than a regulator. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the admissions procedures clearly outline to applicants what the health requirements are.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the applicant guide document that the education provider requires all learners "to show a completed Hepatitis B vaccination prior to starting the placement component of the programme". However, at the visit, the visitors heard from the programme team that applicants must go through the education provider's external occupational health company, who will check if the applicants are up to date with vaccinations, and if not refer them to a GP. As such, the visitors understand that if an applicant is not up to date they may require a range of vaccinations, in addition to the Hepatitis B vaccination requested by the education provider. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how applicants are made aware of, and comply with all potential health requirements for the programme. The visitors require further information regarding the health requirements for the programme, and how applicants are informed of them.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how there will be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Reason: In the documentation, the visitors read that there has been some involvement of practice education providers in developing the programme. They were involved in the 'Focus group' that included stakeholder representatives and service users and carers. The group met once to discuss what they would like to see on the new programme. At the visit, the visitors heard from the practice education providers that they had also been involved in the interview process for admissions, and that there had been meetings with the programme leader to discuss the programme. The practice education providers also told the visitors that there have been discussions about meetings going forward. The programme team told the visitors that they plan to invite practice educators

to be on the programme board, which meets once a semester and is currently formed of staff and learners. However, because the visitors were provided with verbal reassurances / plans, and have not seen this in documentation, the visitors were unclear how the information provided demonstrates that regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice education provider would be undertaken on an ongoing basis. As such, the education provider needs to demonstrate that there is a plan in place to address how they intend to maintain regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there are processes in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors were not clear how service users and carers would be involved in the programme, as they could not see any clear reference to service user involvement. The SETs mapping document referenced the 'Focus group' that service users and carers were involved in, however no further information was provided. At the visit, the visitors heard from the service users and carers that were involved in the 'Focus group' that met once to discuss what they would like to see from the programme, and one of the service users and carers had been involved in putting together questions for the interview process for admissions. When the visitors asked about future involvement in the programme, the service users and carers said that they have committed to be involved in talking to and teaching learners on the programme about their experiences, though no formal plan has been put in place yet. The visitors heard that the service users and carers expect there to be an ongoing relationship, and are confident there will be more discussions going forward. The visitors heard from the programme team that they are planning to introduce service users and carers to the programme board, which currently involves staff and learners. However, the visitors have not seen a process in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement on the programme. As such, the education provider will need to demonstrate the process in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in 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 education provider must revise reading lists for modules where the reading lists are outdated, and demonstrate that these are accessible to all learners and educators.

Reason: Prior to the visit, on review of the documentation the visitors noted that some of the modules, for example PHP 7004 and PHP 7005 had out dated reading lists under the 'essential reading list' section. The visitors are unclear whether the books from the required reading lists are contained in the library. As such, the visitors are not clear whether the resources to support learning are accessible to learners and educators. The education provider must revise essential reading lists for modules to ensure they are up to date and relevant to current practice, and demonstrate that these are accessible to all learners and educators.

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 the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users is readily accessible and clear to learners.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors note that the education provider referenced the 'Safeguarding Policy' in the SETs mapping document to evidence this standard. However, the visitors noted that there was no information about this in the placement handbook, to which learners may refer should they have any issue or concern in regard to service user safety and wellbeing in the practice-based learning environment. At the visit, the visitors heard from the programme team that the process for learners to raise concerns would be addressed in lectures and discussed with learners before they begin practice-based learning. However, as the relevant information is not included in the placement handbook, the visitors were not clear how learners would know how or where to find this information easily. Therefore, in order for the visitors to make a judgement about whether this standard is met, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users is readily accessible and clear to learners.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is a process in place to ensure the curriculum remains relevant to current practice on an ongoing basis.

Reason: On review of the documentation, the visitors note that the education provider referenced the PHP7003 module descriptor (learning outcomes 5, 6 and 7) in the SETs mapping document to evidence this standard. The learning outcomes refer to the learners being able to take account of new developments or changing contexts, plan continuing professional development and critically engage in evidence-based practice. However, from the information provided in the SETs mapping document, the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure the curriculum is kept up to date on an ongoing basis. In addition, the visitors noted that some of the modules, for example PHP 7004 and PHP 7005 had out dated reading lists under the 'essential reading list' section. At the visit, the visitors mentioned the out of date reading lists to the programme team who agreed that these could be updated, however the visitors are not clear how or why the out of date reading lists were put there in the first place. While the education provider has referred to learning outcomes where learners will be expected to keep up to date with current practice; the visitors could not determine that the education provider has a process in place to consider current practice to develop the curriculum on an ongoing basis. As such, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure the curriculum remains relevant to current practice on an ongoing basis.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there are processes in place for service users to give consent when working with learners in the academic setting.

Reason: Prior to the visit, on review of the documentation the visitors could see there were consent process in place for service users and learners in the practice-based learning settings. However, the visitors were not clear if there is a process in place to obtain consent from service users if they were to be involved with learners in the academic setting. At the visit, the visitors heard from the programme team that they are putting together a consent form for service users in the academic setting, and will be involving service users in creating this form. However, as the visitors have not seen the consent procedure for the academic setting, the education provider must demonstrate that there is a process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users in the academic setting.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of South Wales
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Full time
	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Part time
Approval visit date	15-16 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-12246-F7V4G8

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 Packwood	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Deirdre Keane	Lay
Jai Shree Adhyaru	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
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.

Diane O'Sullivan	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of South Wales
Rachael Farmer	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of South Wales
Sue Whitcombe	BPS Representative	British Psychological Society
Helen Nicholas	BPS Representative	British Psychological Society
Susan Quinn	BPS Representative	British Psychological Society

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01822

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
Proposed First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01823

We undertook an assessment of a new part time and full time 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 programmes 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 11 May 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, to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider requires the applicant to have a confirmed placement before they can take up a place on the programme. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that this was not a requirement of the programme and the education provider intends to support potential applicants in finding a placement, if necessary. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification as to what information is available to potential applicants. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine how prospective applicants are able to make an informed choice about whether to apply for a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they plan to monitor, evaluate and support service user and carer involvement in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider planned to involve service users and carers through a steering group where they can explore issues, relevant to the course. At the visit, the visitors met with representatives from the Mental Health Service User Involvement Project (MHSUI). During discussions, the visitors learned that the steering group meeting with service users was not due to take place until April 2018. The visitors considered that as this had not taken place, and as they did not see a terms of reference for this group, it was difficult to determine the full involvement of service users within the programme. The service users explained that they received extensive amounts of information about the steering group. However, the visitors considered that the information provided was not appropriate in explaining what to expect as a member of the steering group, or the support available to them including aspects such as claiming travel expenses. Additionally, as there was no information provided about how the education provider plans to implement, monitor and evaluate service user feedback into the programme the visitors were unable to determine how this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence demonstrating that the education provider will implement, monitor and evaluate the continued involvement of service users and carers in 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 demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors learned the education provider is in the process of recruiting a placement officer who would be able to oversee the setting up of all the trainee's practice-based learning and would be the main contact regarding practice-based learning. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned that they are proposing the placement officer to be in place by August 2018. However, the recruitment plans have not been finalised, and the job description is yet to be drafted. As there are, only a small number of teaching staff involved in the programme, the visitors considered that this is an essential administrative role, and that therefore it is paramount that recruitment plans are in place. The visitors considered that if for any reason this recruitment did not happen, there would be implications for the programme, including a strain on staff resources, and on learners being able to source their own placement. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has plans in place to recruit to this role, thus ensuring there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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 process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners is effective.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that the process for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and carers was contained within the placement handbook. The education provider did not provide any information regarding

this standard in relation to learners. As such, the visitors did not see evidence of the formal protocols to obtain consent from learners. As such, the visitors were unclear, for example, how the education provider manages situations where learners decline from participating as service users in practical sessions. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence:

- of the formal protocols for obtaining consent from learners, including how records are maintained;
- to demonstrate how learners are informed about the requirement for them to participate,
- to show what alternative learning arrangements will be put in place where learners do not consent to participating as a service user.

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 reviewing the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine what training would be available for practice educators and when this training would be provided as this information was not available within the programme documentation. At the visit, during the programme team meeting the visitors learned that the education provider would hold a 'supervisor forum' twice a year to help practice educators become familiar of what their role requires. However, it is not clear what criteria the education provider will use in determining what training is required of practice-based learning staff, for example, when initial training would need to be completed, how frequently refresher training would need to be completed, or about the content of this training. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate 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.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Worcester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Approval visit date	10-11 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12178-P3Y3K4

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:

Diane Whitlock	Lay
Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
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.

Marie Stowell	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Worcester– Director of Quality and Educational Development
Sara Gibbon	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Worcester – Quality Officer
Marie Jenkins	Student Representative	University of Worcester – Worcester Business

		School (BA (Hons) Entrepreneurship)
Anita Watson	External Adviser	University of Salford – Associate Dean (Academic) School of Health Sciences
Rebecca Khana	External Adviser	Sheffield Hallam University – Assistant Dean, Academic Development
Liz Hancock	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education representative
Nina Patterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education manager
Maureen Shiells	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapist – Education manager
Lynn Summerfield-Mann	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Jackie Taylor	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 34 collectively for this programme and Integrated Masters in Occupational Therapy with Business and Organisation Development
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01851

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 34 collectively for this programme and Integrated Masters in Physiotherapy with Business and Organisation Development
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01852

We undertook the assessment of the following programmes via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programmes continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programmes 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 12 June 2018.

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 ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to ensure the programmes are delivered effectively.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors reviewed various documents including the staff curriculum vitae s and HPL (Hourly paid lecturers) Flow Chart, highlighting the staff experience and process for recruiting hourly paid lecturers. From the discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that there are currently two temporary, part-time placement coordinators who source and help organise practice-based learning opportunities for the programme. The programme team also explained that the coordinators will be responsible for finding the work-based projects for the Service Improvement Project and Dissertation module. The visitors noted that the placement coordinator roles are temporary and from the conversations could not determine what will happen to these positions after this current academic year (2017-18). As such, the visitors could not determine that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate what the education provider's plans are to support the delivery of the programme once the contract for the placement coordinators end at the end of the academic year.

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 ensure practice educators undertake regular and appropriate training.

Reason: The visitors reviewed various documents including the "Practice Educator Training Outline" and "Practice Educator Handbook". From the documentation and conversations at the visit, the visitors were clear that practice educators undertake appropriate initial training before supervising learners. However, in the meeting with the practice educators the visitors were informed any training beyond the initial training is not compulsory to attend. Furthermore, from the discussions the visitors were unsure whether the attendance of the initial training was recorded or monitored. Therefore the visitors could not determine how the education provider would know who had attended the mandatory training and who needed to attend further training. The visitors were therefore unclear how the education provider ensures practice educators undertake appropriate, regular training. As such, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure practice educators undertake initial and regular training, in order for them to carry out their roles as effective educators for this programme.

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 physiotherapists or occupational therapists.

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 physiotherapists or occupational therapists. However, during the meeting with the programme team and the informal feedback meeting at the visit the visitors noted that the internal validation panel and professional bodies (Chartered Society for Physiotherapy and Royal Society of Occupational Therapists) for the respective professions, will require the programme team to make some changes to parts of the assessment strategy and design. These changes include reviewing the assessment workload. 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 physiotherapists or occupational therapists. 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 determinations about whether the programme meets this standard.

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.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how feedback is provided to practice education providers to help them implement changes if required.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit, the visitors were made aware of a variety of communication methods used between the education provider and the practice education providers. From the review of these communication methods the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. In the practice education provider meeting however, the visitors were informed that the practice educators do not receive individualised feedback on their practice-based learning area but do receive feedback about placements in general when they attend the annual Practice Learning Evaluation Day. The practice-based learning providers stated that they find it difficult to make specific changes to their areas based on this form of learner feedback. The programme team responded, expressing they had received that feedback from the practice-based learning providers but find it difficult to provide individualised feedback to each practice area, as learners would not be able to give anonymised or confidential feedback. The education provider should therefore consider how they would provide

learner feedback to individual practice-based learning areas to enable them to implement changes and improve their service if required.