
Approval process quality report

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

Summary of findings from this assessment

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training and standards for prescribing respectively. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

The outcomes of this process were as follows:

- Further Stage 1 assessment was not required based on the new programme(s) being proposed for delivery.
- The visitors recommended the programme(s) be approved as all programme level standards were met through their Stage 2 assessment.

The Education and Training Committee will now meet to consider the visitors recommendations and make a decision regarding programme approval.

The areas we cover in this report

| | |
|--|---|
| Approval process quality report | 1 |
| Summary of findings from this assessment | 1 |
| Section 1: Background information | 3 |
| Who we are | 3 |
| Our standards | 3 |
| Our approach to quality assuring education | 3 |
| The approval process | 3 |
| How we make decisions | 4 |
| Section 2: Our assessment | 5 |
| Stage 1 assessment: The institution | 5 |
| Assurance that institution level standards are met | 5 |
| Stage 2 assessment: The programmes | 6 |
| Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment | 7 |
| Assessment of the proposal | 7 |
| Summary of visitor findings | 7 |
| Section 3: The visitors' recommendations | 8 |
| Programme approval | 8 |
| Recommendation to other process | 9 |
| Section 4: Committee decision on approval | 9 |

Section 1: Background information

Who we are

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

Our standards

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

Our standards are divided into two levels based on their relevance to the institution and programme(s). The following considerations were made when splitting standards between institution and programme level:

- Where accountability best sits, with either the accountable person for the institution or programme
- How the standard is worded, with references to the education provider and processes often best sitting at the institution level, and references to the programme or profession often best sitting at the programme level
- We have preferred seeking assurance at the institution level, to fit with our intention to put the institution at the centre of our quality assurance model.

Our approach to quality assuring education

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of institution and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards

Institutions and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

The approval process

We take a staged approach to quality assurance, as we need to understand practices which will support delivery of all programmes within an institution, prior to assessing the programme level detail. The approval process is formed of two stages:

- Stage 1 – we assess to be assured that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)
- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the process we will initially review the proposal and then design our assessment based on the issues we find. As such the assessment methods will be different based on the issues which arise in each case.

How we make decisions

We make independent evidence-based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

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

Section 2: Our assessment

Stage 1 assessment: The institution

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Education provider | University of Winchester |
| Key contact | Justine Clements |

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

- Dietetics
- Occupational therapy
- Physiotherapy

In previous standards assessments of these programmes, visitors have established the institution level standards are met. The provider has also demonstrated this through ongoing monitoring carried out by the HCPC.

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

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

Assurance that institution level standards are met

As part of this stage we considered how the proposed programmes fit into the named institution by considering any notable changes to the policies, procedures and processes related to the areas above.

We considered how the proposed programmes are assimilated with the management of existing approved programmes in the institution. We determined the proposed programmes would be managed in way that was consistent with other programmes within institution. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate to take assurance the institution level standards will continue to be met by the introduction of this programme.

Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

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

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

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

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

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

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

Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment

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

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

Assessment of the proposal

Initial review:

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

Summary of visitor findings

Standards for prescribing A: Admissions

The visitors noted that there was clear information provided about the academic and professional entry and selection criteria onto the programme. They were confident that the entry criteria laid out are appropriate to the level and content of the programme.

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

Standards for prescribing B: Programme governance, management and leadership

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

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

Standards for prescribing C: Programme design and delivery

The evidence submitted by the education provider demonstrated how the curriculum delivers the standards set out in the Competency Framework for all Prescribers. As such, the visitors were satisfied that learners who successfully complete the programme would be equipped with the necessary skills to practice as autonomous professionals.

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

Standards for prescribing D: Practice-based learning

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

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

Standards for prescribing E: Assessment

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

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

Section 3: The visitors' recommendations

Based on these findings the visitors made the following recommendations to the Education and Training Committee:

Programme approval

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

Section 4: Committee decision on approval

At their meeting on 7 December 2021, the Education and Training Committee agreed with the visitors recommendation and approved the programme(s)