

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Chichester
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, FT (Full time) BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship, FT (Full time)
Approval visit date	30-31 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13541-M0W8R4

Contents

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

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:

Dorothy Smith	Social worker in England
Susan Bell	Social worker in England
Rabie Sultan	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.

Mike Lauder	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Chichester
Margaret Guise	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Chichester
Nigel Horner	External panel member	University of Lincoln
Vida Douglas	External panel member	Brunel University
Ian Perkins	Internal panel member	University of Chichester
David Cleverley	Internal panel member	University of Chichester

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01999

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 via major change where it was identified that the current programme will have changes to a number of standards covering areas such as programme admissions, management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment.

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 August 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02014

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes

Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	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

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 programmes 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 April 2019

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

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

Reason: This condition relates to the degree apprenticeship programme. From the review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted there is clear information available for applicants applying to the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. For the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship programme, the visitors could not find any information specifically relating to admissions for this route and noted that the content was similar to the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. At the visit, the programme team explained the admissions process for the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship programme involved employers referring their employees to the

university as potential applicants. The education provider and, if required, the human resources representative, would then explain the admissions process, any associated costs and how the apprenticeship levy works, to the applicant. The programme team noted that this information will be added to the revised documentation, but since this information was not available anywhere in writing, the visitors were unable to make a judgement about how information relating to the admissions process will be available to potential learners. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrate what the admissions process is to apply to the apprenticeship programme. In this way the visitors can determine whether learners have all the information they require in order to be able to make an informed choice when deciding whether to take up a place on this programme.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating both the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship and BA (Hons) Social Work programmes are sustainable.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors reviewed the programme handbooks for both programmes. The visitors noted under the section entitled 'Programme Structure' that each credit equates to a total study time of around 10 hours. The 10 hours of total study time includes scheduled teaching, independent study and assessment activity. As per the module descriptors, most modules were 15 credits and some modules were 30 credits. With 10 hours per credit, the visitors interpreted that a 15-credit module would equate to one hundred and fifty hours. With one hundred and twenty credits each semester, the visitors could not determine if this is a realistic approach as the indicated total number of study hours will be significantly high. As such, the visitors could not determine how this could be achieved with the number of staff and with the current timetable for delivery of the programmes. The visitors were also unable to determine how it would be possible for learners to meet these requirements. This was discussed with the programme team and they informed the visitors that this information along with the contact time on module descriptors will need to be revised.. Based on the current documentary evidence, the visitors were unable to make a judgement about whether the programme will be sustainable and has sufficient resources to deliver the programme with the required number of contact and study hours with learners. Therefore, the education provider must provide accurate information about the total study hours required on the programme including the revised documentation highlighting the contact time clarified clearly in the module descriptors in order for the visitors to make a judgement on whether this standard is met.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must outline the roles and responsibilities of those who will be contributing to both the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship and BA (Hons) Social Work programmes to ensure they are effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme staff list which included senior team members responsible for the delivery and management for both programmes. They noticed there was information regarding the programme teams' contact details, work experience along with the roles and duties of programme co-ordinators and administrators'. However, from the information provided, it was not clear which members of the programme team would be responsible for which aspects of

programme management, or who would be delivering specific areas of the programme. The education provider intends to deliver the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship programme in partnership with West Sussex County Council, but the visitors noted that the information provided for the programme around this standard was similar to that provided for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. Therefore, to the visitors were unable to determine who will manage individual aspects of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide further information for both the programmes regarding the structure for the day-to-day management of the programme and the lines of responsibility of the teaching team. In this way, the visitors can determine how the management of the programme will work in practice, and how learners will be supported through the programme by members of the programme team.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a list of the core programme staff team and their curriculum vitae (CVs). They also discussed staffing with the senior team and programme team. From the evidence provided and from the discussions that took place, the visitors were satisfied that the programme team were appropriately qualified and experienced. However, as noted in the condition for standard 3.2, without information for both programmes regarding the structure for the day to day management of the programme and lines of responsibility of the teaching team, the visitors were not clear about how much time each of the core team would be able to commit to the existing BA (Hons) Social Work programme and the new programme. The visitors were also unable to determine how staff time would be allocated across each programme to deliver both programmes effectively and considering the numbers of learners on the programmes. Given these findings, the education provider must provide further evidence of the staff resourcing plan for both the programmes, which clearly articulates which staff members will be available to deliver the programmes and what arrangements are in place to review the staff numbers involved, if necessary.

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 for the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship programme.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the programme handbook and the whistle blowing policy document. The visitors noted there was a university wide complaints procedure for learners. Since the Apprenticeship programme is an employer led programme, from reviewing the documents and discussions with the programme team and practice educators, the visitors were unclear about what process learners on the Apprenticeship programme would use to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. As such, the visitors were not clear how learners would know how or where to find this information easily. Considering the nature of this work-

based learning programme, the visitors require the programme team to clearly articulate how learners on the apprenticeship route will report concerns about service user safety when taking part in the different elements of the programme. 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 on both programmes.

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 ensure that their attendance policy is clear and consistent in programme documentation, along with how these requirements are communicated to learners for both programmes.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the BA (Hons) Social Work programme had an eighty per cent attendance requirement, which includes a hundred percent attendance requirement on placement. However, the visitors could not determine the minimum attendance requirement for the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship Programme. Additionally, the documents for both programmes stated learners who miss 3 or more taught lessons, had to provide a valid reason or medical evidence, but there was no mention of the consequences or follow up steps when learners do not meet the requirement. Additionally, it was unclear in what timeframe the 3 or more lessons could not be missed and how this would apply. For instance, the visitors were unsure whether this would apply to learners who missed 3 or more lessons per module, per semester, per year or 3 consecutive days. From discussions with learners for the existing BA (Hons) Social Work Programme, the visitors felt that learners did not have clear information regarding the attendance policy. The learners mentioned that their attendance was not always recorded accurately at their work placement and they had to keep on asking for it to be corrected. Considering this information, the visitors were unable to determine what the clear attendance policy is, how it is communicated to learners and how it is monitored effectively. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence clearly articulating what the attendance requirements are, how attendance is monitored, what the consequences of not meeting the attendance requirement is and how this is communicated to learners for both the programmes.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how assessments will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement for the Degree Apprenticeship programme

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme handbook as part of the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors could not see information regarding the EPA module assessment. They noted that in the sections of the programme handbook entitled "outline assessment schedule", "draft plan", "intended learning outcomes" and the module information section the EPA section was either left blank or contained insufficient information. Additionally, the visitors noted that throughout the documentation, there were inaccuracies concerning the credit weightings for the EPA,

which stated it to be either thirty or sixty credits. At the visit, programme team told the visitors that they have recently finished drafting the EPA module, which contains all information associated with it including assessment. As the visitors have not seen the contents of the EPA module document or the associated assessment document, they could not make a judgement if the assessments throughout the programme will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. Therefore, the visitors require further information in order to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly communicate the specific requirements for progression and achievement on the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship programme.

Reason: From reviewing the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship programme handbook as part of the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors could not see relevant information regarding the EPA module assessment. They noted that the "outline assessment schedule", "draft plan", "intended learning outcomes" and module information section pertaining to the EPA was either blank or contained insufficient information. Additionally, the visitors noted that throughout the documentation, there were inaccuracies concerning the credit weightings for the EPA, which stated it to be either thirty or sixty credits. At the visit, the programme team mentioned that they have recently finished drafting the EPA module, which contains all information associated with it, including information about assessments. As the visitors have not seen the contents of the EPA module document or the associated assessments, it was not possible to determine how learners would progress on this apprenticeship programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clarify the number of credits associated with the EPA and demonstrate how they will clearly specify to learners the requirements for progression and achievement on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to show that the assessment methods used on the Degree Apprenticeship programme concerning the End Point Assessment are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Reason: From reviewing the programme handbook as part of the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors were unable to find information regarding the EPA module assessment. They noted that the "outline assessment schedule", "draft plan", "intended learning outcomes" and module information section pertaining to the EPA was either blank or contained insufficient information. At the visit, the programme team mentioned that they have recently finished drafting the EPA module, which contains all information associated with it, including information about assessments. Without having sight of the EPA module and assessment details, the visitors were unable to determine which learning outcomes are associated with the EPA and if the assessment methods to measure those learning outcomes are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring them. As such, the visitors require further information to determine which learning outcomes

are linked to the EPA to determine whether the EPA is an appropriate assessment method to measure those learning outcomes. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

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 monitoring its departmental team meetings' staff attendance to ensure regular and effective monitoring of the programme continues to take place.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met after reviewing the evidence provided for this standard. However, the visitors noted some of the team meetings of the Social Work and Social Care department held last year had low staff attendance. This was noted and acknowledged in the programme team meeting at the visit. The visitors would like to recommend that the education provider checks attendance numbers are sufficient and monitored regularly which will continue to ensure that the programme monitoring and evaluation systems are regular and effective.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening how they plan and monitor service user and carer involvement, including service user and carer contribution to the governance and continuous improvement of the programmes.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold level, as service users and carers have input in the programme through involvement in admissions and programme board meetings. However, after meeting the service users and carer, the visitors felt that their involvement was inconsistent and at times occurred on an ad hoc basis. The visitors recommend strengthening their involvement to ensure service user and carer involvement continues to be regular and consistent across both the programmes.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revising the documentation for both programmes

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors noticed that the programme documentation for the BA (Hons) Social Work Apprenticeship programme has similar content to the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. The visitors noted to the programme team that where the content for both programmes was so similar it may be difficult for learners to know what information relates to them as

learners on their programme. As such the education provider should consider how best to present the information to learners for ease of use. The visitors recommend that the documentation be revised and, where necessary, amendments are made to ensure that learners, and educators can distinguish between the programmes.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider clearly labelling the 'whistle blowing policy' document for both programmes so that learners will know how to find the appropriate information.

Reason: The visitors noted that the 'whistleblowing policy' document is available for learners to view on the visual learning environment as such the visitors determined that this standard was met. The visitors considered that the learners may have difficulty finding the document if they require to access the information contained within it. . Therefore, the visitors recommend the education provider consider clearly labelling the document with a relevant title and place it somewhere in the documentations for ease of access to the learners.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening how they ensure learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors noted that there were examples of interprofessional learning where learners can learn with and from others and therefore this standard was met at threshold level. However, to ensure that the programme continues to ensure learners benefit from learning with and from others in relevant professions, the visitors recommend that the education provider considers how they can develop opportunities for interprofessional learning.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	De Montfort University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedicine, Full time
Approval visit date	12 – 13 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13632-K8J2S3

Contents

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

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:

Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Louise Whittle	Lay
Gordon Pollard	Paramedic
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

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

Christine Fidler	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	De Montfort University
Sophia Welton	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	De Montfort University
Lisa Wakefield	Internal panel member	De Montfort University
Sally Lloyd	Internal panel member	De Montfort University
Jenny Coombs	Internal panel member	De Montfort University

Gemma Howlett	Internal panel member – External advisor	University of Worcester
Chris Moat	College of Paramedics panel member	College of Paramedics
Neil Larman	College of Paramedics panel member	College of Paramedics

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedicine
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02018

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required	This is a new programme, therefore external examiners' reports were not applicable.

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	We met with learners on the Certificate in Higher Education Emergency Medical Care and the Post Graduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing 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 17 May 2019.

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.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes will ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to two modules, and the practice assessment document (PAD). The education provider explained that this standard is covered in two distinct points in the programme; in year one and year three in the modules 'Accountable, legal and ethical care' and 'Paramedic law and legal practice'. The education provider also notes that this is assessed within the PAD. On review of the evidence, the visitors could not find specific reference within these modules or the learning outcomes that related to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

Page 53 of the PAD contains a checklist for assessing learners on 'Conduct, performance and ethics' which are a list of statements from the HCPC's SCPEs. The visitors could not see from this assessment how it was linked to any of the learning outcomes contained within the modules on the programme. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that the checklist was not linked to any learning outcomes on the programme. The programme team talked about how expectations of professional behaviour, including conduct, performance and ethics are taught within the two modules in year one and year three. From the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors could not determine how the learning outcomes, without specific reference to the SCPEs, would ensure learners understand and are able to meet them. We do not set how the SCPEs should be covered during the programme, however, the standards should play a prominent and structured role in the design of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to determine how the learning outcomes will ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 ensure learners are aware of attendance requirements in relation to progression on the programme, and how they ensure learners are aware of the implications of non-attendance.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider explained that they recognise learning can take place in a variety of settings, and as such do not have a mandated level of attendance for the taught sessions. The education provider also refers to the programme handbook for information about mandatory progression points on the programme. The visitors noted that one of the 'mandatory module passes' is Module one – Foundations of Ambulance Practice (Skills Passport) which learners are required to pass before they can progress onto practice-based learning. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that learners would be required to attend sessions for this module in order to attain a pass, which is required for learners to progress onto practice-based learning. From the information provided to learners, the visitors could not see how learners would be made aware the requirements of attending sessions for this module, in order to progress on the programme.

The visitors also read the 'Frequently Asked Questions' section of the programme handbook. In response to the question 'Do I have to have 100% attendance at university?' the education provider states 'Failure to attend scheduled lectures or skills will be reported on your reference when you go to apply for a job' and 'If you fail and you haven't engaged with the scheduled teaching, this will not be looked on favourably at any appeals'. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine that learners would have specific, detailed information about attendance requirements in relation to progression on the programme. Similarly, the visitors could not determine that learners would be aware of the implications of non-attendance in relation to progression on the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about how the education provider communicates to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and how they communicate to learners what the implications are for non-attendance. In this way, the visitors can determine whether the standard is met.

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 provide further evidence about the process for approving and ensuring the quality of ambulance practice-based learning settings.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document for this standard, the education provider stated “Placements will only be with approved providers and subject to inspection prior to students being permitted to undertake placement at that location”. The education provider referred to the ‘Mentor database’ which provides a list of practice educators and their mentor qualifications taken from the East Midlands Ambulance Service (EMAS) database. The document goes on to explain that ambulance based placements are audited by the paramedic team on a rolling-yearly basis. From the evidence provided, the visitors have not seen what system the education provider has for approving and ensuring the quality of the ambulance stations. At the visit, the practice education providers talked about the system that EMAS has for approving and ensuring the quality of all their ambulance stations, and how this is recorded. The practice education providers confirmed that the education provider had already completed some initial visits of practice-based learning settings, and have plans in place to visit the settings for ongoing quality audits. The programme team also clarified that all of the ambulance stations they will be using for this programme have had audits undertaken in the last month. The visitors have heard verbal reassurances that the education provider has undertaken a process of approving and ensuring the quality of ambulance practice-based learning settings. However, the visitors have not seen evidence of this process, or that it has taken place. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the education provider’s system for approving and ensuring the quality of ambulance settings for practice-based learning, which demonstrates it is thorough and effective.

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

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider stated “As part of the agreement between DMU and EMAS an appropriate number of qualified mentors have been agreed”. The education provider referred to the mentor database, which provides a list of practice educators taken from the East Midlands Ambulance Service (EMAS) mentorship database. The visitors agreed there was sufficient information to demonstrate adequate staffing for practice-based learning in the ambulance setting. However, the visitors understand learners will also be placed in non-ambulance settings for practice-based learning. The visitors were not provided with any information about the number of staff involved in the non-ambulance setting, or information about who these staff were, which would enable them to determine whether they are appropriately qualified and experienced.

At the visit, the visitors met with a practice education provider responsible for delivering non-ambulance practice-based learning. The practice education provider currently takes learners from nursing programmes at the education provider as well as paramedic learners on other programmes in the region. They hold a ‘mentor register’ with up to

date information about which staff have completed their mentor training. The programme team also talked about meetings with the practice education providers in the non-ambulance settings to ensure there will be adequate and appropriately qualified staff for the number of learners on the programme. The visitors heard verbal reassurances about the staffing provision for the non-ambulance practice-based learning settings, and that they would be appropriately qualified and experienced. However, the visitors have not seen evidence which demonstrates this. As such, the visitors require further information about the staffing within the non-ambulance practice-based learning settings, to determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved.

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 practice educators in the non-ambulance practice setting, 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.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider stated “Practice educators are supported through a HEI based mentorship course or in-house EMAS training. A register of paramedic educators is held and maintained by the ambulance service.” The education provider referred to the mentor databased which is held by East Midlands Ambulance Service (EMAS). The visitors were not provided with evidence about the staff who would be involved in the non-ambulance settings. At the visit, the visitors met with a practice education provider who would deliver some of the non-ambulance practice-based learning. The practice educator provider explained that they currently take learners from nursing programmes at the education provider as well as paramedic learners on other programmes. The practice education provider noted they hold a ‘mentor register’ with up to date information about which staff have completed their practice mentor training. The visitors heard verbal reassurances about the staffing provision for the non-ambulance practice-based learning settings, that they would be appropriately qualified and experienced, and where appropriate on the relevant part of the Register. However, the visitors have not seen evidence which demonstrates this. As such, the visitors require further information about the staffing within the non-ambulance practice-based learning setting, to demonstrate that the practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, are on the relevant part of the Register.

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 provide further evidence about the non-registered practice educators, which demonstrates they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

Reason: On review of the evidence for this standard, the visitors noted a list of practice educators for the programme, taken from the East Midlands Ambulance Service (EMAS) database. The visitors noted that the list for each ambulance station contained both paramedics and technicians. The technicians listed all hold an EMAS practice

educator qualification. From this, the visitors understood that ambulance technicians, who are not registered with a regulatory body, could be a practice educator for learners on this programme. At the visit, the programme team discussed their plans to involve ambulance technicians as practice educators on year one of the programme. The programme team explained that there would be a 'lead practice mentor' who would be a HCPC registered paramedic and would be responsible for signing off a learner against the competencies. The ambulance technician practice educator would be the 'associate mentor' who, the education provider explained, would be used to support first year learners in their early levels of development, working on skills such as communication, moving and handling, decision making etc. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that most of the learners' direct supervision would be by the ambulance technician. While the paramedic practice educator will sign them off, this may be based on the recommendation of the ambulance technician who has been mentoring the learner.

The programme team explained that the ambulance technicians chosen for the practice educator role would have a minimum of nine months post-qualification experience, and they would have completed practice educator training before taking a learner. The visitors heard verbal reassurances about how the education provider will ensure the non-registered practice educators will have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning, and that they have quality assurance processes in place for these practice educators from a non-regulated profession. However, the visitors have not seen evidence of who the non-registered practice educators will be, that will demonstrate they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

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 from the non-ambulance settings undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider stated that "Practice educators are supported through a HEI based mentorship course. Mentors can access the DMU mentors hub which is a contemporaneous source of mentor information." The education provider referred to the mentor database which is held by East Midlands Ambulance Service (EMAS). From the information provided, the visitors were not clear whether the practice educators in the non-ambulance setting would receive the same training as the practice educators in the ambulance setting, or how this would be monitored to ensure ongoing training for those practice educators. At the visit, the practice education providers for the non-ambulance setting explained that they currently hold a 'mentor register' with up to date information about which staff have completed their mentor training. The visitors heard verbal reassurances that practice educators in the non-ambulance setting would undertake initial and update training which is appropriate to their role, however the visitors have not seen evidence of how the education provider will ensure this. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider will ensure that practice educators in the non-ambulance settings will

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

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to a number of learning outcomes in the programme which relate to expectations of professional behaviour, including conduct, performance and ethics. The education provider notes that professional aspects of behaviour including standards of conduct, performance and ethics are assessed throughout the programme. On review of the evidence, the visitors could not find specific reference within these modules or the learning outcomes that related to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

Page 53 of the practice assessment documents (PAD) contains a checklist for learners on 'Conduct, performance and ethics' which are a list of statements which relate to HCPC's SCPEs. The visitors could not see from this assessment how it was linked to any of the learning outcomes contained within the modules on the programme. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that the checklist was not linked to any learning outcomes on the programme. The programme team talked about how expectations of professional behaviour, including conduct, performance and ethics are taught within the two modules in year one and year three, and that this is assessed throughout the programme. The visitors note that there was one assessment relating to the SCPEs, however this was not linked to any learning outcomes on the programme. The visitors could also not see how this would be assessed throughout the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine how assessment throughout the programme would ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how learners are made aware of the process to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, to ensure information is clear and accessible.

Reason: Through their review of the documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors considered the standard is met. At the visit, the programme team explained the various ways that learners could raise concerns, including the education provider's

whistleblowing policy, the safeguarding policy at the ambulance settings, and how learners could raise concerns through either their practice educators, or their personal tutor from the academic setting. The visitors heard a number of policies (both from the education provider, and practice education provider) that learners could refer to for information about raising concerns. The visitors considered that this would be a lot of information for learners to consider if they were to seek out how to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The programme team explained that other programmes within in the Faculty use a generic flow chart for escalating concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and carers, and suggested that this could be included for learners on the paramedic programme. The visitors therefore recommend that this kind of information is put into the paramedic documentation for learners, so that learners will have clear and accessible information to enable them to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how effective the assessment methods used for some modules are at measuring the learning outcomes.

Reason: On review of the documentation, and through discussions at the visit, the visitors considered this standard is met. For some of the modules the visitors noted that the assessment method used was relatively low-level in comparison to the learning outcomes being assessed. For example, in the 'Paediatrics and Child Health' module the assessment is one presentation of ten minutes, where learners are expected to cover three learning outcomes in this one assessment. This was discussed at the visit, and the programme team explained this was approached with colleagues in midwifery provision, and it is scenario based to cover a range of aspects in the ten minute presentation. From the discussions, the visitors were satisfied this meets the standard at threshold. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider considers the effectiveness of the assessment methods on those modules, for example, consider the breadth and depth of assessments used in relation to the content and range of learning outcomes being assessed.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Leeds
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), Full time
Approval visit date	21 - 22 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13641-R5R0M2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	6

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:

Elizabeth Ross	Hearing aid dispenser
Manoj Mistry	Lay
David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

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

Janet Holt	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Leeds
Josie Mellor	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Leeds

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02019

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.

Although we are considering this as a new programme for the purposes of regulatory approval, the education provider has been running it since 2012. Successful completion of the current iteration of the programme does not lead to HCPC registration for current learners. Only learners starting following approval of the programme will be eligible to apply for HCPC registration.

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	This is a programme which is seeking approval for the first time. The panel met with learners from the currently unapproved BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) 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, 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 05 April 2019.

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 applicants are given appropriate, clear and consistent information that enables them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: From their review of the programme documentation, the visitors considered some of the information available to applicants was not clear or not correct. The documentation referred to "accreditation from the HCPC". The HCPC approves, and does not accredit, programmes. Reference was made in the student handbook to the programme being based in the School of Healthcare. Other documents stated the programme was based in the School of Medicine and, in the senior team meeting, the visitors were given assurances the programme sat in the School of Medicine. The visitors were not able to determine whether the information provided was accurate to

enable applicants to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. They therefore require the education provider to review all relevant materials to ensure that accurate and complete information about the programme is provided to applicants.

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

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curricula vitae of the programme leader and the audiology group lead. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individuals who have overall professional responsibility of the programme. The visitors noted the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed there is a process in place to ensure they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed this process includes selecting a programme leader based on a role description, and the role is recruited to on a rotating basis for a term of three years and a maximum of five years. However, the visitors were not provided with the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate they have an effective process for ensuring the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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 the programme documentation to ensure that the resources to support learning is accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From their review of the programme documentation, the visitors were made aware that information is provided during induction sessions on the programme. The visitors noted information was to be added to the programme handbook if the programme was to be approved by HCPC. The programme handbook is made available by the education provider during the induction sessions for learners registered on the programme. This additional information proposed to state graduates from the programmes will be “eligible for HCPC registration”. This statement could be misleading for learners, as learners are only “eligible to apply for registration” with HCPC. The visitors were not able to determine whether accurate and complete information about the programme is provided to learners. They therefore require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure the resources to support learning are accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

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 learners, educators and others are aware that exit awards do not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that learners have the option to exit the programme with a named award. These exit awards were a Certificate of Higher Education and a Diploma of Higher Education. The programme handbook stated neither awards are “recognised as professional audiological qualifications”. From the information provided, the visitors were unsure what the names of these exit awards were as there were no programme titles attached to the award, and it was not unambiguously clear whether these exit awards would lead to eligibility to apply for entry onto the Register. From reviewing the documentation, the visitors could not determine whether learners would be aware of their eligibility to apply for admission to the Register if they did not complete the approved programme and received an exit award. As such, the visitors require the education provider to amend the documentation relating to the exit awards to ensure learners, educators and others are aware these exit awards do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the process for appointing an external examiner for the programme.

Reason: From their review of programme documentation, the visitors were made aware of the role of the external examiner. During meetings at the visit, the visitors were made aware the education provider’s plans to appoint an external examiner. However, the visitors were not clear from the documentation or discussions what the process was for appointing one and were not able to see evidence relating to the specific requirements for an external examiner for this particular programme. The visitors were therefore not able to be satisfied at least one external examiner for the programme would be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, a registered hearing aid dispenser. They require the education provider to submit evidence clarifying the appointment process and requirements for the role, including information about how it is ensured external examiners from a different professional background are suitable.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Middlesex University and Think Ahead
Validating body	Middlesex University
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work Practice (Think Ahead), Full time accelerated
Approval visit date	05 – 06 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13660-S4Y7T5

Contents

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

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
David Ward	Social worker
Anne Mackay	Social worker
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

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

Celia Bell	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Middlesex University
Ruth Wood	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Middlesex University

Debbie Jack	Middlesex University representative (internal panel)	Middlesex University
Stefano Porrelli	Student representative (internal panel)	Middlesex University
Christine Cocker	External assessor (internal panel)	University of East Anglia
Clare Parkinson	External assessor (internal panel)	Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work Practice (Think Ahead)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 160
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02022

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.

Think Ahead is a national charity funded by the Department of Health and Social Care to deliver fast-track social work training. Previously, Think Ahead delivered a Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work Practice (Think Ahead) with University of York, this programme has taken the last cohort in 2018 and will be closing when this final cohort has completed the programme. Middlesex University secured the contract as the new Higher Education Institute provider for the Think Ahead programme, with planned delivery to the first cohort of learners commencing in July 2019.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes

Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	We met with learners on HCPC approved programmes at Middlesex University, the MA in Social Work (Full time) and the Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Full time accelerated).
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 March 2019.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider provided information about the programme team from Think Ahead, and information about the social work teaching staff at Middlesex University. The visitors understood that the staff from Middlesex University also contribute to the current social work provision at Middlesex University. From the documentation provided, the visitors were not clear how much input the staff from other social work programmes would have on the proposed new programme, and how much of their workload would be dedicated to the new programme. The visitors were also not clear whether staff that were involved with delivering the previous Think Ahead programme with University of York, would now be involved in this programme. As a result, they were unclear how their work load cross-over would be managed between the previous programme closing, and the new one starting.

At the visit, the senior team explained that that there will be a 'core team' among the social work staff at Middlesex University who will contribute to the new programme, but will also remain involved in the other social work programmes at Middlesex University. The senior team also clarified that by the beginning of July, when the programme is due to commence, they will have up to eight full time equivalent staff in place for the programme, with the recruitment for new posts beginning in May. The team have agreed to have a staff student ratio of 1:25 for the 'summer institute' and for placements a ratio of 1:4. The plan is to have this in place in time for the programme to commence in July. The visitors heard verbal reassurances of the plans the education provider has in place to ensure adequate staffing for when the programme is due to commence in July. However they require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will ensure this plan will be in place for when the new programme is due to commence. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will ensure there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

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

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to one of the learning outcomes in the 'Placement stage one' module, which states "Operate effectively within multi-agency and inter-professional partnerships and settings". The documentation also includes a statement that on year one, most of learner's time will be "working on cases assigned to a multi-disciplinary community mental health service which supports adults with mental illness. You will work alongside a variety of other professionals including psychologists and psychiatrists". From their review of the documentation, the visitors understood that interprofessional education (IPE) on the programme would take place solely in practice-based learning through learner's opportunities to work in multi-disciplinary teams.

At the visit, the programme team explained that Middlesex University offers a series of interprofessional seminars, where all learners within the health and care professions are expected to attend two out of 12 available seminars. On these seminars, learners will be learning with and from, other learners and professionals in other relevant professions. The programme team explained that learners on the proposed new

programme will have the opportunity to attend at least two of the seminars when they attend Middlesex University for teaching and re-call days. The programme team gave reassurance that they would ensure there is some cross-over between learners attending the teaching days, and the interprofessional seminars, to ensure that learners are able to attend at least two. While the visitors agree that the seminars would be appropriate to ensure IPE, they were not clear how the education provider would ensure that all learners attend two seminars, when they have limited time in the academic setting, due to the nature of the accelerated programme. The visitors have heard verbal reassurances about how IPE will be delivered on the programme, however they have not seen documented evidence of this, or how they plan to structure and monitor this in order to ensure all learners will attend at least two seminars. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how IPE is structured within the programme, to ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors understood that learners on the programme will complete two placement stages. For both of those stages, learners will be based in a community mental health team in the same 'host organisation'. During the second placement stage learners will spend 30 days, in either children and family social work, child and adolescent mental health services, or a third sector provider offering the opportunity for direct work with children and families. The education provider calls this the 'Contrasting Learning Experience (CLE)'. The visitors read within the documentation that 'Direct observation' is part of the assessment of practice-based learning. The documentation notes this may not be achievable on the CLE. From this information, the visitors could not determine whether learners would be assessed on the CLE.

At the visit, during the practice education provider meetings it was explained that the CLE is integrated into the practice learning agreement, and in the final placement report there is a section for the CLE. While the documentations suggests that there may be a direct observation for the CLE, the education provider gave reassurance that the direct observation on the CLE would be mandatory, and perhaps needs to be made more clear in documentation. From the information provided, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were not clear how learning on the CLE is recorded and assessed for learners, which would ensure that all learners complete the CLE, and have been assessed within this setting to ensure the learning outcomes can be met. As the visitors were not clear how this would be recorded and assessed, the visitors could not determine that learners have access to a range of practice settings of the profession, which support the learning outcomes on the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the CLE, to determine whether the range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

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 all practice educators undertake initial and update training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document for this standard, the education provider states that "All CSWs will hold a practice educator award, or will be supported and funded to do so". From this statement, the visitors were not clear whether the Consultant Social Workers (CSWs) would be able to take learners before they have undertaken practice educator training, and note that the statement suggests not all CSWs have undertaken practice educator training at this stage. At the visit, the visitors asked for further information about the process the education provider has to ensure that all CSWs have undertaken practice educator training, and how they continue to monitor this to ensure regular training. The senior team explained that part of the role of the 'Practice Specialist' on the programme, is to make sure that CSWs have undergone practice educator training. At the practice education provider meeting it was explained that the 'host organisations' would work collaboratively with Think Ahead to ensure that the CSWs who had not yet undergone the practice educator training were supported appropriately until they had completed the training.

From these discussions, the visitors were not clear what role Middlesex University has in ensuring that all CSWs will have undergone training, or how they monitor that practice educators are continuing regular training. The team explained that Middlesex University have their own practice educator workshops and training, and will work with Think Ahead in terms of induction workshops for CSWs for this programme. The visitors were provided with some verbal reassurances about how the education provider would ensure all practice educators undertake training appropriate to their role. However, the visitors have not seen evidence of what process the education provider, including both Middlesex University and Think Ahead, has in place to record and monitor which practice educators have undergone initial training, and how they monitor this to ensure practice educators undertake regular training. As such, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider develops and implements their plans to engage the two groups of service users and carers, and involve these groups in the programme.

Reason: From their review of the documentation and through discussions at the visit, the visitors considered this standard is met at threshold level. The visitors met with two groups of service users and carers at the visit; those who have been involved on the current social work programmes at Middlesex University, and those who have been

involved with the programme previously delivered by University of York and Think Ahead. Both of these groups will be involved in this new programme. The visitors heard from the group involved with the previous Think Ahead programme, they had been involved in the admissions stage and the 'summer institute' where learners spend their first six weeks in the academic setting. The group explained that after the first six weeks, their involvement then ceased to continue until the next cohort began. The service users and carers expressed great interest in continuing this involvement throughout the entire programme, rather than being involved only in the initial stages. The visitors heard that they had fed this back to the team at Think Ahead, and that this would be reflected in the new programme, though there were not yet sure what the plan was for them.

Additionally, the visitors note that with this new partnership there are now two different groups of service users and carers involved. The service users and carers from both groups expressed great interest in having a partnership between the two groups, to work together through their involvement on this programme. At this stage, the service users and carers were aware that there were some plans in place for the groups to work together on the programme, however it was not clear exactly how this would work in practice. The visitors heard the service users and carers had hopes for engagement between the groups and further involvement throughout the programme, but were not completely reassured. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider considers strengthening their plan to support the engagement of the two groups of service users and carers, and further involves the groups in the programme, to ensure ongoing and meaningful involvement from service users and carers on the programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Approval visit date	22-24 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13561-B7S2D4

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Bernadette Waters	Occupational Therapist
Kathyrn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Joanne Watchman	Lay
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work
- Panel 2 – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
- Panel 3 – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science

For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and College of Occupational Therapists. For the paramedic and operating department

practice programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, College of Paramedics and College of Operating Department Practitioners. The education provider appointed an internal panel who reviewed each of the programmes.

Internal panel members		
Elaine Buckley	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Chloe Corbett	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
David Owen	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Claire Lockwood	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Mary Dawson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Jill LeBihan	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Lorraine Cookson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Professional body panel members		
Paul Townsend	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Bob Willis	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Barry Pryer	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Alison Hampson	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Suzie Boyd	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Mike Donnellon	Professional body representative	College of Operating Department Practitioners
HCPC Social work panel members		
Richard Barker	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Roseann Connolly	Lay	HCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive	HCPC – observer
HCPC Diagnostic Radiography and Therapeutic Radiography panel members		
Shaaron Pratt	Diagnostic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Burgess	Therapeutic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HCPC visitor
John Archibald	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
HCPC Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel members		
Bernadette Waters	Occupational therapist	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist	HCPC visitor
Joanne Watchman	Lay	HCPC visitor
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead

HCPC Operating Department Practice and Paramedic panel members		
Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner	HCPC visitor
John Donaghy	Paramedic	HCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HCPC visitor
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 72
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02003

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 140
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02002

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 education provider informed the HCPC through the major change process that they were making several changes to the programmes to accommodate further curriculum integration. From the information provided, the education provider's approach to the way the programmes will be managed, resourced, delivered and assessed will be significantly different from the currently approved programmes. We decided that the introduction of an integrated curricula could have significant impact on the way the standards will continue to be met. Therefore, we decided the most appropriate way to assess changes to the programmes was via the approval process.

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 28 March 2019.

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 potential applicants to the programme are given full and clear information about how the foundation year works.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. In meetings, the senior team and the programme team gave some verbal assurances that applicants would be given information about this year. However, from these conversations, the visitors were not clear about what information would be provided, in what format, at what stage of the application process. The initial documentary submission had not included evidence relating to the information about the foundation year provided to applicants. In particular, it was not clear how the education provider would clarify for applicants that there were no credits, and no award, available at the completion of the foundation year, and that it was intended solely as a route on to the degree-level programmes. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit evidence showing how applicants will have access to all appropriate information about the foundation year.

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

Condition: In relation to the proposed foundation year, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programmes have appropriate academic entry standards.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. Information about this had not been included in the initial documentary submission. It was therefore not clear to the visitors how the foundation year would be integrated into the programmes as a whole. During the visit, the programme team and the senior team gave verbal reassurances about how the foundation year would work. This included clarifying that the foundation year was intended to provide an access point to the programmes for learners who did not achieve the necessary grades but who were judged to have the potential to complete the programme. The visitors considered that what they were told about the foundation year seemed appropriate, but as they had not been provided with documentary evidence relating to the foundation year they were unable to determine whether the standard was met. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating that learners coming on to the programmes via the foundation year will meet appropriate academic standards.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware the design of the programmes builds on pre-existing inter-professional education and moves towards an integrated care curricula (ICC). Under ICC there will be an integrated approach to the

programmes' learning, teaching and assessment strategies. Themes which underpin the concept of the ICC will be threaded into the programmes. From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the responsibilities of the various roles within the programmes, such as course leader and clinical liaison officer, and the skills and expertise of those staff members involved in the programmes. However, from the information provided beforehand and discussions at the visit, the visitors could not determine whether there was a programme management structure in place with clear roles and responsibilities for the ICC constituents of the programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the programme was effectively managed. The visitors require more information about the lines of responsibility for decisions relating to ICC components of the programmes.

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

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leaders for the programmes. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility of the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes selecting a programme leader from the current staff provision, and the role is recruited to on a rotating basis. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced

3.9 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 the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors noted varying maximum learner numbers for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme as per the information on the visit request form and various other documentation. The current existing programme has an approval of 105 learners. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that there would be a maximum of 140 learners per cohort with an annual intake and the student staff ratio will be twenty two to one. During the meeting with learners, the learners in year one commented that there were twenty-four learners in each practical group. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear how the education provider plans to

manage and support this increase in learner numbers, in relation to staffing resources on the programme. On review of the documentation provided as evidence for this standard, including staff curricula vitae (CV), the visitors note that not all of the information appears to be up to date, as present staff were not included. In addition to this, the visitors were not clear what the roles and responsibilities of each staff member on the programme were, or which staff members are contracted full time or part time. The visitors also did not see evidence about current staff vacancies, and what plans were in place for recruitment. Additionally, the CVs for module leaders Amy France, Sue Dale and Gerry Scott were not included in the documentation. Considering the increase to learner numbers for this programme, without having sufficient information about staffing for the programme as mentioned above, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on how the programme will remain sufficiently staffed. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme for all learners, in the first and subsequent years.

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) Occupational Therapy programme, the education provider must revise their documentation to ensure that learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programmes leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme and noted that page 6 of the programme specification under section 1.2.6 states 'This is a full time BSc honours degree leading to eligibility for professional registration with the UK Health and Care Professions Council as an Occupational Therapist.' This could be misleading for the learners as it is not clear that graduates of the programme must apply to HCPC for registration, and submit further information through this process. The visitors noted that interim exit awards for this programme include a Certificate of Higher Education Occupation and Wellbeing and a Diploma of Higher Education Occupation and Wellbeing. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors established that neither of the exit awards – or any aegrotat or posthumous awards would confer eligibility for learners to apply for HCPC registration. However, from the documentation, it was not clear how learners, educators and the public is made aware that those exit awards will not lead to eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. As such, the education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that successful completion of the BSc programme confers eligibility for HCPC registration and if an exit award is awarded to any learner, it does not confer eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates the assessment load for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module is a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: At this multi-professional visit, the social work panel from HCPC raised with the programme team for the social work programmes that they found the assessment

load for learners for some 40 credit modules, at level four and level five, were comparatively low to other modules on the programmes. One of the modules the visitors were referring to is the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module at level five, which is a shared module for all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula. This was not picked up at the visit by the other HCPC panels, and so it was not discussed at the visit for these programmes. However, on reflection, considering the broader impact of the condition required by the social work visitors, we found it appropriate to require a response relating to all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula.

For the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module, the social work visitors noted the assessment for this module was a poster presentation and an essay of 1500 words. The social work visitors discussed this with the social work programme team at the visit, who acknowledged they were unaware of the details of assessment load on the module and could not give a rationale without looking further into it. As such, from the information provided, the visitors could not determine what the rationale was for the assessment load on the module, which would ensure a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. By 'reliable' we mean that assessments are consistent and thorough enough to allow learners to demonstrate how far they have progressed during the course of the programme and achieve the learning outcomes. Without understanding the rationale for the assessment on this module, the visitors could not determine how the assessment load would ensure a thorough enough assessment. As this is a shared module, we now require further evidence on this for these programmes. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the rationale for the assessment load for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module, which demonstrates that the assessment will provide a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise their documentation to ensure it clearly specifies the requirements for progression and achievement for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme.

Reason: On page 7 of the course handbook for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme, the visitors read that if a learner fails their placement, they would be exempted from 're registration', meaning they cannot progress further on the programme. However, the programme team confirmed at the visit that new arrangements are in place that will allow learners to be able to re-register for the placement, to continue on the programme if they fail the placement the first time. From the information provided on the schedule for the programme, the visitors were not clear how a learner would have sufficient time to re-take the full eight week placement. . As information regarding the new arrangements was not available to view, nor was this reflected in the documentation provided, the visitors were unable to determine how learners will be aware of the requirements for progression on this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that the programme documentation clearly reflects the requirements for progression and achievement within the programmes and how this will be communicated to learners. In this way, the visitors 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.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider should consider monitoring and auditing the progression of learners with lower academic level intake for both programmes.

Reason: The visitors noted that the admissions criteria for both programmes is 112 UCAS points with a minimum 3 GCSE passes. Though the visitors were satisfied that this entry criteria was met at threshold level, the visitors note this is quite low as compared to general entry requirements for similar programmes elsewhere in the UK. The visitors recommend if progression of learners with lower academic levels could be monitored and audited on a regular basis by the education provider to note any learners with lower academic entry levels do not struggle progressing through the programme and if required might reconsider the minimum entry criteria required to join these 2 programmes.

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

Recommendation: For this standard, the visitors recommend the education provider considers clearly labelling the 'student behaviour' document for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme so that learners will know how to find the appropriate information.

Reason: The visitors noted that the student behaviour document for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme is labelled as 'appendix 5 in the student handbook'. The visitors felt that this is a very important piece of information which addresses this standard, however as it does not have a clear label, the visitors found the learners may have difficulty finding the document if they require the information contained within it. Therefore, the visitors recommend the education provider consider labelling the document with a relevant title for the student behaviour.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Approval visit date	22-24 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13575-F2R5S2

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
John Donaghy	Paramedic
Manoj Mistry	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive
Jamie Hunt	HCPC observer

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work
- Panel 2 – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
- Panel 3 – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science

For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and

College of Occupational Therapists. For the paramedic and operating department practice programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, College of Paramedics and College of Operating Department Practitioners. The education provider appointed an internal panel who reviewed each of the programmes.

Internal panel members		
Elaine Buckley	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Chloe Corbett	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
David Owen	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Claire Lockwood	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Mary Dawson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Jill LeBihan	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Lorraine Cookson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Professional body panel members		
Paul Townsend	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Bob Willis	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Barry Pryer	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Alison Hampson	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Suzie Boyd	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Mike Donnellon	Professional body representative	College of Operating Department Practitioners
HCPC Social work panel members		
Richard Barker	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Roseann Connolly	Lay	HCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive	HCPC – observer
HCPC Diagnostic Radiography and Therapeutic Radiography panel members		
Shaaron Pratt	Diagnostic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Burgess	Therapeutic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HCPC visitor
John Archibald	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
HCPC Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel members		
Bernadette Waters	Occupational therapist	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist	HCPC visitor
Joanne Watchman	Lay	HCPC visitor

Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
HCPC Operating Department Practice and Paramedic panel members		
Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner	HCPC visitor
John Donaghy	Paramedic	HCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HCPC visitor
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead

Section 2: Programme details

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP02004

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02007

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 education provider informed the HCPC through the major change process that they were making several changes to the programmes to accommodate further curriculum integration. From the information provided, the education provider's approach to the way the programmes will be managed, resourced, delivered and assessed will be significantly different from the currently approved programmes. We decided that the introduction of an integrated curricula could have significant impact on the way the standards will continue to be met. Therefore, we decided the most appropriate way to assess changes to the programmes was via the approval process.

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 28 March 2019.

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 potential applicants to the programme are given full and clear information about how the foundation year works.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. In meetings, the senior team and the programme team gave some verbal assurances that applicants would be given information about this year. However, from these conversations, the visitors were not clear about what information would be provided, in what format, at what stage of the application process. The initial documentary submission had not included evidence relating to the information about the foundation year provided to applicants. In particular, it was not clear how the education provider would clarify for applicants that there were no credits, and no award, available at the completion of the foundation year, and that it was intended solely as a route on to the degree-level programmes. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit evidence showing how applicants will have access to all appropriate information about the foundation year.

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

Condition: In relation to the proposed foundation year, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programmes have appropriate academic entry standards.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. Information about this had not been included in the initial documentary submission. It was therefore not clear to the visitors how the foundation year would be integrated into the programmes as a whole. During the visit, the programme team and the senior team gave verbal reassurances about how the foundation year would work. This included clarifying that the foundation year was intended to provide an access point to the programmes for learners who did not achieve the necessary grades but who were judged to have the potential to complete the programme. The visitors considered that what they were told about the foundation year seemed appropriate, but as they had not been provided with documentary evidence relating to the foundation year they were unable to determine whether the standard was met. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating that learners coming on to the programmes via the foundation year will meet appropriate academic standards.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware the design of the programmes builds on pre-existing inter-professional education and moves towards an integrated care curricula (ICC). Under ICC there will be an integrated approach to the programmes' learning, teaching and assessment strategies. Themes which underpin the concept of the ICC will be threaded into the programmes. From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the responsibilities of the various roles within the programmes, such as course leader and clinical liaison officer, and the skills and expertise of those staff members involved in the programmes. However, from the information provided beforehand and discussions at the visit, the visitors could not determine whether there was a programme management structure in place with clear roles and responsibilities for the ICC constituents of the programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the programme was effectively managed. The visitors require more information about the lines of responsibility for decisions relating to ICC components of the programmes.

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

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leaders for the programmes. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility of the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes selecting a programme leader from the current staff provision, and the role is recruited to on a rotating basis. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that appropriate consent is obtained from learners, and service users who contribute to the programme.

Reason: From their review of programme documentation for both programmes, the visitors were not clear about how the education provider ensured that, where necessary, the informed consent of learners, and service users who contribute to teaching and learning activities, was obtained. They were given verbal reassurances

from the programme team that learners and service users were asked for consent when taking part in activities such as role play. From the meetings with learners and service users the visitors were aware that learners and service users generally felt that their consent was taken seriously on the programme. However, the visitors were not clear about how this consent was recorded. It was also not clear from the discussions whether learners or service users were able to opt out if they wished, or how often the consent was reviewed. This meant that the visitors were not able to determine whether the process was effective. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence demonstrating that their processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners is effective.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that assessment of practice competency at level 6 of the programme is aligned appropriately with assessment of practice competency at levels 4 and 5, to ensure reliability in measuring assessment.

Reason: From their review of programme documentation, the visitors noted that in the assessment of practice competency at level 6, learners were marked as either "Progressing" or "Achieved". In the same assessment at levels 4 and 5 the options were pass / fail. It was therefore not clear how this level six assessment related to earlier assessment. They considered that the changed wording introduced an element of ambiguity into what was expected of learners at this stage of the programme. It created a risk that assessment over the course of the programme would not be consistent and that learners would not understand how they were progressing through the programme. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure consistency of assessment in practice competency.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates the assessment load for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module is a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: At this multi-professional visit, the social work panel from HCPC raised with the programme team for the social work programmes that they found the assessment load for some 40 credit modules, at level four and level five, were comparatively low to other modules on the programmes. One of the modules the visitors were referring to is the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module at level five, which is a shared module for all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula. This was not picked up at the visit by the other HCPC panels, and so it was not discussed at the visit for these programmes. However, on reflection, considering the broader impact of the condition required by the social work visitors, we found it appropriate to require a response relating to all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula.

For the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module, the social work visitors noted the assessment for this module was a poster presentation and an essay of 1500 words. The social work visitors discussed this with the social work programme team at the visit, who acknowledged they were unaware of the details of assessment load on the module and could not give a rationale without looking further into it. As such, from the

information provided, the visitors could not determine what the rationale was for the assessment load on the module, which would ensure a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. By 'reliable' we mean that assessments are consistent and thorough enough to allow learners to demonstrate how far they have progressed during the course of the programme and achieve the learning outcomes. Without understanding the rationale for the assessment on this module, the visitors could not determine how the assessment load would ensure a thorough enough assessment. As this is a shared module, we now require further evidence on this for these programmes. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the rationale for the assessment load for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module, which demonstrates that the assessment will provide a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

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.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider producing clearer guidance for applicants about how the education provider will assess their prior learning and experience.

Reason: The visitors considered that the standard was met at threshold. It was clear from the programme documentation and from discussions at the visit that the education provider had an appropriate and effective process in place for assessing applicant's prior learning and experience (PLE), and that applicants and learners had access to appropriate information about this. However, the visitors did consider that it might not be clear to all potential applicants how the education provider would make decisions about PLE. If learners did not understand the process there may be a risk that it was no longer effective or appropriate. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider review how they provide guidance for applicants around PLE.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing their recruitment process for service users and carers to create a more joined-up approach.

Reason: The visitors considered that this standard was met, as there was strong service user and carer involvement across several different parts of the programme, and that this was well-planned and appropriately monitored. However, from their discussions with service users and carers, it appeared that the recruitment process for service users and carers was unsystematic, and reliant on existing service users or programme staff inviting people. The visitors considered that there might be a risk in future that this would impair the education provider's ability to recruit enough appropriate service users on to the programme, and that as a result the standard would no longer be met. This was particularly important in light of the introduction of the Integrated Care Curriculum, which the visitors understood would increase the demands

on the existing service users and carers. They therefore recommend that the education provider look again at how best to recruit service users and carers.

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.

Recommendation: For the paramedic programme, the education provider should consider reviewing module reading lists to ensure that they are as helpful as possible for learners.

Reason: The visitors considered that this standard was met, as the resources available on the programme were appropriate and accessible. However, the visitors also noted that on the reading lists for the Level 4 module Personal and Professional Development there were 54 books referenced, with no differentiation between what was core and what was supplementary, as has been done with other reading lists. Particularly in light of the fact that this was a first-year module, started early in the programme, when learners were still orienting themselves to the demands of degree-level education, they considered that this might create a risk that the reading list for the module was not accessible to learners. They therefore recommend that the education provider ensure that all reading lists are accessible.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how they ensure that all learners understand the details of how to raise concerns.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as the materials available to learners contained information about how to raise concerns, including reassurance about confidentiality and lack of impact on their studies, and the learners to whom the visitors spoke seemed confident that they would know where to find such information. However, the visitors did note that some of the learners seemed uncertain about what was meant by raising concerns, and about the details of how they might raise a concern in their practice-based learning settings, as distinct from at the university. They considered that this might create a risk that the standard was not met, as a process whose workings are not well understood might not be effective. They therefore recommend that the education provider continue to ensure that all learners understand how they will be supported and enabled to raise concerns.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, FT (Full time)
Approval visit date	22 – 24 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13574-B0C6Q7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Susanne Roff	Lay
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work
- Panel 2 – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
- Panel 3 – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science

For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and College of Occupational Therapists. For the paramedic and operating department

practice programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, College of Paramedics and College of Operating Department Practitioners. The education provider appointed an internal panel who reviewed each of the programmes.

Internal panel members		
Elaine Buckley	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Chloe Corbett	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
David Owen	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Claire Lockwood	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Mary Dawson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Jill LeBihan	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Lorraine Cookson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Professional body panel members		
Paul Townsend	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Bob Willis	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Barry Pryer	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Alison Hampson	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Suzie Boyd	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Mike Donnellon	Professional body representative	College of Operating Department Practitioners
HCPC Social work panel members		
Richard Barker	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Roseann Connolly	Lay	HCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive	HCPC – observer
HCPC Diagnostic Radiography and Therapeutic Radiography panel members		
Shaaron Pratt	Diagnostic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Burgess	Therapeutic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HCPC visitor
John Archibald	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
HCPC Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel members		
Bernadette Waters	Occupational therapist	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist	HCPC visitor
Joanne Watchman	Lay	HCPC visitor
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead

HCPC Operating Department Practice and Paramedic panel members		
Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner	HCPC visitor
John Donaghy	Paramedic	HCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HCPC visitor
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02005

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02006

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 education provider informed the HCPC through the major change process that they were making several changes to the programmes to accommodate further curriculum integration. From the information provided, the education provider's approach to the way the programmes will be managed, resourced, delivered and assessed will be significantly different from the currently approved programmes. We decided that the introduction of an integrated curricula could have significant impact on the way the standards will continue to be met. Therefore, we decided the most appropriate way to assess changes to the programmes was via the approval process.

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 28 March 2019.

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

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

Reason: From their review of the programme documentation, the visitors considered that some of the information available to applicants was not clear or not correct. For example, reference was made in the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology student handbook to the programme “leads to professional registration” as a therapeutic radiographer. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation did not reflect the number of learners that were anticipated for this programme, as a lower number had been stated for both programmes. The visitors were therefore not able to determine whether the information provided was sufficient to enable applicants to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and education provider.

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 potential applicants to the programme are given full and clear information about how the foundation year works.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. In meetings, the senior team and the programme team gave some verbal assurances that applicants would be given information about this year. However, from these conversations, the visitors were not clear about what information would be provided, in what format, at what stage of the application process. The initial documentary submission had not included evidence relating to the information about the foundation year provided to applicants. In particular, it was not clear how the education provider would clarify for applicants that there were no credits, and no award, available at the completion of the foundation year, and that it was intended solely as a route on to the degree-level programmes. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit evidence showing how applicants will have access to all appropriate information about the foundation year.

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

Condition: In relation to the proposed foundation year, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programmes have appropriate academic entry standards.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. Information about this had not been included in the initial documentary submission. It was therefore not clear to the visitors how the foundation year would be integrated into the programmes as a whole. During the visit, the programme team and the senior team gave verbal reassurances about how the foundation year would work. This included clarifying that the foundation year was intended to provide an access point to the programmes for learners who did not achieve the necessary grades but who were judged to have the potential to complete the programme. The visitors considered that

what they were told about the foundation year seemed appropriate, but as they had not been provided with documentary evidence relating to the foundation year they were unable to determine whether the standard was met. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating that learners coming on to the programmes via the foundation year will meet appropriate academic standards.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware the design of the programmes builds on pre-existing inter-professional education and moves towards an integrated care curricula (ICC). Under ICC there will be an integrated approach to the programmes' learning, teaching and assessment strategies. Themes which underpin the concept of the ICC will be threaded into the programmes. From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the responsibilities of the various roles within the programmes, such as course leader and clinical liaison officer, and the skills and expertise of those staff members involved in the programmes. However, from the information provided beforehand and discussions at the visit, the visitors could not determine whether there was a programme management structure in place with clear roles and responsibilities for the ICC constituents of the programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the programme was effectively managed. The visitors require more information about the lines of responsibility for decisions relating to ICC components of the programmes.

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

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curricula vitae of the current programme leaders for the programmes. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility of the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes selecting a programme leader from the current staff provision, and the role is recruited to on a rotating basis. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: Prior to the visit the education provider provided documentation which explained the staff roles which provide support for learners while on practice-based learning and the learning expectations of the various parties involved with practice-based learning, for example, clinical staff, learners, university staff and carers. From discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that the education provider ensures practice educators involved in practice-based learning would be appropriately qualified and experienced. However, from the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors were not clear how many staff would be involved in practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for the number of learners on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider justifies what they consider a suitable number of staff for the number of learners on practice-based learning to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates the assessment load for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module is a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: At this multi-professional visit, the social work panel from HCPC raised with the programme team for the social work programmes that they found the assessment load for some 40 credit modules, at level four and level five, were comparatively low to other modules on the programmes. One of the modules the visitors were referring to is the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module at level five, which is a shared module for all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula. This was not picked up at the visit by the other HCPC panels, and so it was not discussed at the visit for these programmes. However, on reflection, considering the broader impact of the condition required by the social work visitors, we found it appropriate to require a response relating to all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula.

For the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module, the social work visitors noted the assessment for this module was a poster presentation and an essay of 1500 words. The social work visitors discussed this with the social work programme team at the visit, who acknowledged they were unaware of the details of assessment load on the module and could not give a rationale without looking further into it. As such, from the information provided, the visitors could not determine what the rationale was for the assessment load on the module, which would ensure a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. By 'reliable' we mean that assessments are consistent and thorough enough to allow learners to demonstrate how far they have progressed during the course of the programme and achieve the learning outcomes. Without understanding the rationale for the assessment on this module, the visitors could not determine how the assessment load would ensure a thorough enough assessment. As

this is a shared module, we now require further evidence on this for these programmes. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the rationale for the assessment load for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' module, which demonstrates that the assessment will provide a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work, Full time
Approval visit date	22-24 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13576-Z8X9D2

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Kate Johnson	Social worker
Richard Barker	Social worker
Roseann Connolly	Lay
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work
- Panel 2 – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
- Panel 3 – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science

For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and

College of Occupational Therapists. For the paramedic and operating department practice programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, College of Paramedics and College of Operating Department Practitioners. The education provider appointed an internal panel who reviewed each of the programmes.

Internal panel members		
Elaine Buckley	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Chloe Corbett	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
David Owen	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Claire Lockwood	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Mary Dawson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Jill LeBihan	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Lorraine Cookson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Professional body panel members		
Paul Townsend	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Bob Willis	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Barry Pryer	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Alison Hampson	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Suzie Boyd	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Mike Donnellon	Professional body representative	College of Operating Department Practitioners
HCPC Social work panel members		
Richard Barker	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Roseann Connolly	Lay	HCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive	HCPC – observer
HCPC Diagnostic Radiography and Therapeutic Radiography panel members		
Shaaron Pratt	Diagnostic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Burgess	Therapeutic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HCPC visitor
John Archibald	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
HCPC Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel members		
Bernadette Waters	Occupational therapist	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist	HCPC visitor
Joanne Watchman	Lay	HCPC visitor

Rabie Sultan	HPCPC executive	HPCPC – panel lead
HPCPC Operating Department Practice and Paramedic panel members		
Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner	HPCPC visitor
John Donaghy	Paramedic	HPCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HPCPC visitor
Niall Gooch	HPCPC executive	HPCPC – panel lead

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 51
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02008

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02009

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 education provider informed the HCPC through the major change process that they were making several changes to the programmes to accommodate further curriculum integration. From the information provided, the education provider's approach to the way the programmes will be managed, resourced, delivered and assessed will be significantly different from the currently approved programmes. We decided that the introduction of an integrated curricula could have significant impact on the way the standards will continue to be met. Therefore, we decided the most appropriate way to assess changes to the programmes was via the approval process.

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 28 March 2019.

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 potential applicants to the programme are given full and clear information about how the foundation year works.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. In meetings, the senior team and the programme team gave some verbal assurances that applicants would be given information about this year. However, from these conversations, the visitors were not clear about what information would be provided, in what format, at what stage of the application process. The initial documentary submission had not included evidence relating to the information about the foundation year provided to applicants. In particular, it was not clear how the education provider would clarify for applicants that there were no credits, and no award, available at the completion of the foundation year, and that it was intended solely as a route on to the degree-level programmes. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit evidence showing how applicants will have access to all appropriate information about the foundation year.

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

Condition: In relation to the proposed foundation year, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programmes have appropriate academic entry standards.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. Information about this had not been included in the initial documentary submission. It was therefore not clear to the visitors how the foundation year would be integrated into the programmes as a whole. During the visit, the programme team and the senior team gave verbal reassurances about how the foundation year would work. This included clarifying that the foundation year was intended to provide an access point to the programmes for learners who did not achieve the necessary grades but who were judged to have the potential to complete the programme. The visitors considered that what they were told about the foundation year seemed appropriate, but as they had not been provided with documentary evidence relating to the foundation year they were unable to determine whether the standard was met. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating that learners coming on to the programmes via the foundation year will meet appropriate academic standards.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware the design of the programmes builds on pre-existing inter-professional education and moves towards integrated care curricula (ICC). Under ICC there will be an integrated approach to the programmes' learning, teaching and assessment strategies. Themes which underpin the concept of the ICC will be threaded into the programmes. From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the responsibilities of the various roles

within the programmes, such as course leader and clinical liaison officer, and the skills and expertise of those staff members involved in the programmes. However, from the information provided beforehand and discussions at the visit, the visitors could not determine whether there was a programme management structure in place with clear roles and responsibilities for the ICC constituents of the programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the programme was effectively managed. The visitors require more information about the lines of responsibility for decisions relating to ICC components of the programmes.

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

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leaders for the programmes. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility of the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes selecting a programme leader from the current staff provision, and the role is recruited to on a rotating basis. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence which demonstrates there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the BA (Hons) Social Work programme effectively.

Reason: For this standard, the SETs mapping document explains that members of the Department of social work, social care and community studies play key roles in the design and delivery of the programme. The documentation also noted that the teaching team are all registered social workers. From the information provided, the visitors noted that the staff profiles presented on the website were inconsistent in terms of amount of information about the members of staff on the programme. For example, minimal information was given regarding Jane Foggin, Caroline Mulrooney and Louise Whitehead, who were identified as part of the teaching team. In addition to limited information provided about the staff, the visitors did not have information about how much of each individual's workload is dedicated to the programme, or which modules they contribute to. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with the full teaching team for the

programme, so the visitors were still unclear who was delivering what parts of the programme, and how much of their workload was dedicated to the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the staffing resources on the programme to determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective 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 submit further evidence which demonstrates there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme effectively.

Reason: For this standard, the SETs mapping document explains that members of the Department of social work, social care and community studies play key roles in the design and delivery of the programme. The documentation also noted that the teaching team are all registered social workers. For this programme, the SETs mapping notes that there are two members of the teaching team who are also registered nurses (learning disability). The visitors found that the information presented on the website for teaching staff did not precisely match the curricula vitae that were provided as part of the documentary submission. The documentation provided showed five staff, two of whom are registered social workers and nurses, whilst the other three appear to be nurses, not social workers. It was not clear to the visitors whether other members of the social work teaching team also have any involvement on this programme. In addition to not being provided with clear information about the staff, the visitors did not have information about how much of each individuals' workload is dedicated to the programme, or which modules they contribute to. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with the full teaching team for the programme, so it was still unclear who was delivering what parts of the programme, and how much of their workload was dedicated to the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the staffing resources on the programme to 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.

Condition: For the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, the education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: For the BA (Hons) Social work programme, the visitors noted that the staff profiles presented on the website were inconsistent in terms of amount of information about the members of staff on the programme. For example, minimal information was given regarding Jane Foggin, Caroline Mulrooney and Louise Whitehead who were identified as part of the teaching team. In addition to not being provided with detailed information about the staff, the visitors did not have information about how much of each individuals workload is dedicated to the programme, or which modules they contribute to. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with the full teaching team for the programme, so it was still unclear who was delivering what parts of the programme, and how much of their workload was dedicated to the programme. Without sufficient detail about the staff who are contributing to the programme, and without information about

which modules the staff contribute to, the visitors could not determine whether subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: For the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme, the education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: For the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social work programme, the visitors found that the information presented on the website for teaching staff did not precisely match the curricula vitae that were provided as part of the documentary submission. The documentation provided showed five staff, two of whom are registered social workers and nurses, whilst the other three appear to be nurses not social workers. It was not clear to the visitors whether other members of the social work teaching team also have involvement on this programme. In addition to not being provided with detailed information about the staff, the visitors did not have information about how much of each individual's workload is dedicated to the programme, or which modules they contribute to. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with the full teaching team for the programme, so it will still be unclear who was delivering what parts of the programme, and how much of their workload was dedicated to the programme. Without sufficient detail about the staff who are contributing to the programme, and without information about which modules the staff contribute to, the visitors could not determine whether subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Recommendation: For the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme, the education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: On review of the submission document for the BA (Hons) Social work programme, the visitors noted that the section on 'Learning outcomes for all intermediate awards...' includes a 'Pre-amble', which at the end clearly states that none of the awards would enable a graduate eligibility to apply for admission to the Register. On review of the submission document for BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme, the visitors note that under the same section, the 'Pre-amble' is not included, and it therefore does not clearly state that these intermediate awards do not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the HCPC register as a social worker in England. Therefore, the visitors found this document would not ensure that learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register. The validation document also states that graduates have only 5 years to apply for registration with the HCPC

after completing the programme, which is not correct information. Therefore, the education provider must revise their documentation to demonstrate that learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide clarification about the process for learners who wish to withdraw their consent, to demonstrate how this is effective.

Reason: On their review of the documentation, the visitors read in the programme handbooks for both programmes, section 15 under consent, that if learners “have a genuine reason for not wishing to participate as a model in a particular session or in general then you need to discuss this with your course leader as soon as possible. You may withdraw that consent at any time in writing to the course leader”. On reading this, the visitors agreed that withdrawing consent for personal reasons may be a sensitive topic for learners, one which they may not feel comfortable discussing with their course leader directly. The visitors found this could impact on a learner’s ability to withdraw their consent, if they did not feel they could do this in any other way. As such, the visitors found this could impact on the effectiveness of the consent procedure for learners. At the visit, the visitors discussed this with the programme team. The programme team explained that learners would have the opportunity to discuss with other staff if they did not feel comfortable discussing this with the programme leader, and agreed that the wording in the programme handbook could explain that more clearly. The visitors therefore require further information that this is made clear to learners, which demonstrates an effective consent procedure for learners on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for both programmes.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider explains that arrangements agreed with the local authority partners, and the teaching partnership includes a commitment to provide practice-based learning for learners on the programmes along with appropriately trained staff. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear on what number of staff would be involved in practice-based learning for each programme. From discussions at the visit, it was clear that the education provider ensures that practice educators involved in practice-based learning would be appropriately qualified and experienced. However, from the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors were not clear how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of staff involved in practice-based learning for both programmes, which is appropriate to the number of learners. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for the number of learners on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the number of staff involved in practice-based learning on both programmes to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates the assessment load for the 40 credit modules is a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: On their review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the assessment load for the 40 credit modules, at level four and level five, were comparatively low to other modules on both the programmes. For example, a poster presentation and an essay of 1500 words being the assessment load for some modules. The visitors noted this for the 'Preparing for social work practice module' at level four, and for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' modules at level five, which is a shared module for all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula.

The visitors discussed this with the programme team at the visit, who acknowledged they were unaware of the details of assessment load on those modules and could not give a rationale without looking further into it. As such, from the information provided, the visitors could not determine what the rationale was for the assessment load on the 40 credit modules, which would ensure a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. By 'reliable' we mean that assessments are consistent and thorough enough to allow learners to demonstrate how far they have progressed during the course of the programme and achieve the learning outcomes. Without understanding the rationale for the assessment on these modules, the visitors could not determine how the assessment load would ensure a thorough enough assessment. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the rationale for the assessment load for the 40 credit modules, which demonstrates that the assessment will provide a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

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.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider consider offering continuing professional and academic development to on-site supervisors that is appropriate to their role in the programme.

Reason: On review of the documentation, and through discussions at the visit about continuing professional and academic development of staff on the programme, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met. However, through discussions with the practice educators at the visit, the visitors heard their concerns about on-site supervisors not receiving adequate training about the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF). The visitors heard that while the on-site supervisors are not asked to assess learners on the PCF, it would be appropriate for their role on the programme to have a better understanding of it. From these discussions with the practice educators, the visitors recommend that the education provider consider offering continuing

professional and academic development to on-site supervisors that is appropriate to their role in the programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Sunderland
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) in Physiotherapy, Full time
Approval visit date	10-11 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13590-V7Z7C9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	13

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Deirdre Keane	Lay
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

As we were considering the approval of two different professions including Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy, there were representatives from their respective professional bodies including the Royal College of Occupational Therapists and Chartered Society of Physiotherapy. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at this approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Adrian Moore	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Sunderland
Margaret Young	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Sunderland
Susan Alexander	Quality Assistant	University of Sunderland
Professional body panel members		
Julie Taylor	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Claire Brewis	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Georgina Callister	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Caroline Grant	Representative of Royal College of Occupational Therapists	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Nina Paterson	Representative for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Jackie Waterfield	Representative for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02010

Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
Proposed First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02012

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	No	As we are considering approval of a new programme this document is not required.

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 08 March 2019.

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 clear and accurate information about the programmes are provided to potential applicants, to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that pertinent information about admissions related to criminal conviction checks, health checks and associated costs incurred to learners on the programmes was contained within the programme specification. Although the information was clear, the visitors were unsure how applicants would have access to the information contained within the programme specification when considering whether to apply for a place on the programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how applicants would have access to this information prior to applying to the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification about how applicants can access this information to ensure they have all the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on these programmes. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they will inform applicants about admissions, criminal convictions checks and occupational health checks and the costs incurred to learners on the programmes. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the entry requirements regarding International English Language Testing System (IELTS) for the programmes were due to be amended to “level 7, with no element below 6.5”. The visitors were happy that this amendment would meet SOP 8.2 for physiotherapists and occupational therapists as required by the HCPC. However, as this entry requirement had not been finalised within the programme documentation, the visitors were unclear how the admissions process ensured that applicants had a good command of spoken English to communicate effectively with service users and carers, educators and others. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the documentation to ensure accurate information is provided for applicants concerning English language requirements for these programmes.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there are appropriate support systems in place to effectively support the new programme leaders to manage the programmes.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. In the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors learned that there are named programme leaders, for each programme, who have overall professional responsibility. At the visit, the visitors were provided with the curriculum vitae for the programme leaders appointed to those roles. They were also provided with a role profile for the Senior Lecturer in Occupational Therapy and for Physiotherapy role. From reviewing these documents, the visitors noted that there were certain criteria within the role profiles which did not match the experience of the new programme leaders. The visitors heard how the programme leaders might be supported by members of the staff team at the education provider. However, they were unclear of the details of what management and support structures would be in place to support programme leaders in their roles should a programme leader be recruited who does not meet the role profile. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the support structures which will routinely be put in place to support new programme leaders in their role, who do not meet the role profile for the position. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme would be effectively managed.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there is a robust process in place to ensure that the individual holding overall professional responsibility for the programmes is appropriately qualified and experienced unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. For this standard, the visitors were made aware of the individuals who currently have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. In discussions with the senior team, they confirmed that there is no formal process in place to ensure that the person who is recruited to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. The visitors heard that a process is yet to be written however, the visitors were told that the programme leaders would be supported by “critical friends”. In this instance, the education provider provided role profiles. However, the individuals appointed did not meet all the criteria within the job profiles. The visitors noted that as they do not meet the role profile they may not be in a position to fulfil the role unless there are support mechanisms in place to ensure the function of the role is performed satisfactorily. As such the visitors require further information about the effective process which is in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programmes will be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register and if they do not meet the job role specification, how they are supported to perform their role effectively.

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

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

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors understood that learners will undertake practice-based learning as part of the programme. In discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider is in the process of agreeing where the practice-based learning will take place. As the agreements have not yet been confirmed, the visitors could not determine what arrangements are in place. Therefore, the visitors could not determine whether there is an effective process in place, which ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the programmes. As such, visitors require further information regarding the process the education provider has in place, to ensure there are sufficient practice based learning opportunities for all learners, across the three years, including the agreements in place between the education provider and the practice education providers. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a plan for how it intends to recruit staff to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. In a review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme and senior teams, the visitors heard that new staff will be recruited to these programmes. The visitors heard that there would be one more staff member for each programme recruited in January 2019 and another staff member for each programme in Summer 2019. However, the visitors were unable to ascertain what the education provider required in regards to the newly recruited team members qualifications and experiences and how this relates to the curriculum taught on these programmes. As such, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the education provider's plan to recruit a sufficient number of staff who are suitably qualified and experienced to deliver the curriculum. The visitors also require information as to how the required experience and qualification profiles of the new staff members will complement the team to ensure they can support the delivery of the breadth of knowledge taught on these programmes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that subject areas will be taught by staff with the specialist knowledge and expertise for the physiotherapy programme.

Reason: This condition applies to the physiotherapy programme. In a review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme and senior teams, the visitors heard that new posts will be recruited for this programme. However, the visitors were

not able to ascertain what the education provider's requirements are in regards to the newly recruited team members' qualifications and experience and how this relates to the curriculum taught on these programmes. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the education provider's rationale about how they intend to support the delivery of the programme through ensuring that subject areas such as neurological and cardiorespiratory practice are delivered by those with the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. As such, the visitors require information as to how the required experience and qualification profiles of the new staff members will complement the staff team to ensure they have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver the subject areas and can support the delivery of the breadth of knowledge taught on this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that, subject areas will be taught by staff with the specialist knowledge and expertise for the occupational therapy programme.

Reason: This condition applies to the occupational therapy programme. In a review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme and senior teams, the visitors heard that new posts will be recruited for this programme. However, the visitors were not able to ascertain what the education provider's requirements are in regards to the newly recruited team members' qualifications and experience and how this relates to the curriculum taught on this programme. Additionally, it appeared from the module descriptors that much of the programme would be delivered by sports professionals rather than occupational therapists. As such, the visitors require information as to how the profile of the new staff members will complement the staff team to ensure they have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver the subject areas, and can support the delivery of the breadth of knowledge, within the context of the occupational philosophy, taught on this 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 the programme documentation to ensure that the resources to support learning is accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted various instances of inaccurate and inconsistent information. For example, in the appendices the programme is referred to as an "Occupational Health" programme rather than Occupational Therapy. The visitors also noted that there were inconsistencies across the documentation whereby there were different module names, numbers and credit values. Furthermore, the visitors noted that the programme specification states "The HCPC standards require that student achieve at least 1000 hours practice placement to develop threshold competency to enter the register". This statement is inaccurate and could be misleading to learners as the HCPC does not specify a requirement for the number of practice-based learning hours a learner must complete before they are eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. Therefore, the education provider must

ensure that that they revise the programme documentation to ensure that the resources to support learning is accurate and appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify what changes have been made to the programmes, and how the changes to the programmes ensure the learning outcomes meet the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists and physiotherapists.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. From reviewing the information provided, the visitors deemed that this standard was met, however through discussions at the visit it was evident that the education provider was considering revising the learning outcomes and assessments associated with the programmes. As such, the visitors considered that the changes which included reducing the number of assessments and introducing new assessment methods, could impact upon this standard being met along with 6.1 and 6.5. Therefore, the education provider must provide information about any revisions to the learning outcomes and assessments introduced into the programme, so the visitors can assess if the standard is met.

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 articulate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Reason: For the Occupational Therapy programme, the visitors noted that there was a lack of occupational therapy philosophy throughout the programme. For example, in the documentation the modules OCC103 Functional Anatomy and Movement for Occupational Therapy and OCC102 Physiology and Pathology for Occupational Therapy did not have an occupational therapy focus. As such, the visitors could not identify how the programme reflected relevant occupational therapy philosophy applicable to the profession. Additionally the visitors noted that on this programme the learners complete an occupational assessment in year one but they do not cover any content about this until year two so the visitors were unable to establish how learners would attain the skills to prepare them to complete this assessment. As such, the visitors were unable to establish how the programme would reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance to ensure the content is relevant to the profession of occupational therapy. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence, which demonstrates that this standard is met.

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: For the Occupational Therapy programme, the visitors read the documentation prior to the visit and noted that there was a range of modules, which did not take account off and reflect the current practice to ensure the curriculum remains relevant. For example, OCC103 Functional Anatomy and Movement for Occupational Therapy and OCC102 Physiology and Pathology for Occupational Therapy. The

programme team acknowledged this was the case and they would need to review the modules to ensure they contained content, which reflects current practice. The visitors noted that the issue of currency related to a lack of input from those with expertise in current occupational therapy practice. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the revised modules to ensure the curriculum is relevant to current practice in addition to any plans to ensure the curriculum remains relevant to current practice.

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: For the Physiotherapy programme, the visitors read the documentation prior to the visit and noted that there were a range of modules which did not take account of and reflect the current practice to ensure it remained relevant. For example, these included PTY302 Contemporary Perspectives in Physiotherapy Practice and PTY304 the Emerging Graduate Physiotherapist. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and they acknowledged that they would need to review all the modules in more detail to ensure the curriculum remained relevant to current practice. Additionally, the visitors pointed out to the programme team that the reading lists provided were out of date, they agreed that these should have been updated. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the modules ensure that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice and the reading lists are updated to reflect current practice within the profession.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programmes, and how they will ensure that learners learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. For this standard, the visitors were referred back to the module descriptors. From reading the module descriptors, the visitors were unable to determine where in the programmes learners would be involved in learning with and from others in other relevant professions. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that interprofessional learning would be mandatory however they were unclear on the details of how this would be delivered or the rationale behind the design and delivery of interprofessional education. Additionally, the visitors were unclear how the education provider intends to ensure that it is relevant for learners on these programmes. From the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the following:

- what interprofessional education will take place on the programmes;
- why the professions and learners selected are relevant for each programme and;
- how learners will be able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Therefore, the education provider is required to articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programmes, and how they will ensure that learners on these programmes will learn with, and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify which system will be in place for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning for both programmes.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. In a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine the system used to approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning for both programmes. At the visit, the visitors were provided with a quality control audit tool which is currently used for nursing programmes and existing approved programmes. In discussions with the programme teams and the senior teams, the visitors understood that the education provider would like to introduce the ARC placement management system which is used by other education providers within the region. There were also further discussions about a number of different systems the education provider would like to have in place such as the programme leader being responsible for visiting and approving role emerging placements. However, there was no confirmation provided as to which systems would be in use for these programmes. Therefore, the visitors would like further clarification of the system which will be used to approve and ensure the quality of all practice-based learning and how the education provider ensures it is thorough and effective, so they can determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for the number of learners on the programme.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. The visitors were directed to the practice placement handbook for this standard. From the information provided they were unable to establish how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. In discussion with the practice education providers, the visitors were told that the agreements in principle had not been finalised between the education provider and the practice education providers regarding the provision of practice-based learning. As such, the visitors were unable to determine what arrangements are in place which ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence which articulates the confirmed arrangements in place between the education provider and the practice educators which ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. Additionally, the visitors require evidence which clearly outlines the process used by the education provider to ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for these programmes, including how these arrangements are agreed and reviewed going forward. In this way the visitors can determine whether there is an effective process for ensuring that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in all practice-based environments.

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 practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners on the practice-based learning element of the programme.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. The visitors were directed to the practice placement handbook for this standard. From the information provided, they were unable to establish how the education provider ensures practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. In discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the agreements in principle had not been finalised between the education provider and the practice education providers regarding the provision of practice-based learning. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that all practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence which articulates the arrangements in place between the education provider and the practice educators which ensure that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. Additionally, the visitors require evidence which clearly outlines the process used by the education provider to ensure that all practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify what changes have been made to the assessment strategy and design, and how the changes continue to ensure the programmes meet the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists and physiotherapists.

Reason: This condition applies to both programmes. From reviewing the information provided, the visitors deemed that this standard was met, however through discussions at the visit it was evident that the education provider was considering revising the assessment strategy and design associated with the programmes. As such, the visitors considered that reducing the number of assessments and introducing new assessment methods could impact upon this standard being met. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence of any revisions to the learning outcomes and assessments introduced into the programmes, so the visitors can assess if the standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate which assessment policy will apply for the Occupational Therapy programme.

Reason: This condition applies to the Occupational Therapy programme. From reviewing the programme specification the university regulations state, "The study load for a full-time student is 120 credits per year. The maximum load is 140 credits per year, including any failed module trailed under 4.3.3". The visitors noted that a

programme specific regulation was requested. In other areas of the programme specification it mentions that a programme specific regulation has been granted. From reading this, the visitors were unclear on whether this regulation is in place or if this is still under review. Therefore, the visitors need further clarification on whether a programme specific regulation has been agreed and what that might be in order to make a judgement as to whether or not the assessment policies clearly specify the requirements for progression and achievement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	York St John University
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate of Counselling Psychology (DCounsPsy), FT (Full time)
Approval visit date	15-16 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13559-S7Z2D5

Contents

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

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:

Antony Ward	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Jai Shree Adhyaru	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

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

Jane Rand	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	York St John University
Jo Morgan	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	York St John University
Helen Nicholas	Joint panel	British Psychological Society

Laura Winter	Joint panel	British Psychological Society
Ian Ascroft	Joint panel	British Psychological Society

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate of Counselling Psychology (DCounsPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02001

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.

Prior to the visit, the education provider informed us that they were recruiting learners to this programme from September 2018. We do not offer retrospective approval, and so informed the education provider that we would not be able to backdate their approval so these learners would be eligible to apply for HCPC registration. Through these conversations, the education provider noted that they would make arrangements to transfer current learners to the programme once it is approved.

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	The programme visited is a new programme, which is the reason why reports for the last two years are not available.
---	--------------	---

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	Met learners, who the education provider plans to transfer to the programme if it receives HCPC approval.
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 21 March 2019.

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

Condition: The education provider must show how they use equality and diversity data related to applicants, to demonstrate that these policies are implemented and monitored.

Reason: In the documentation, there is evidence to support the policies in place to apply during the application process. The programme team mentioned Tableau (software) used as a tool to collect and analyse equality and diversity data at the end of the academic year when there is a review of every programme. However, from

conversations, the visitors were unclear what actions the team would take following data collection from applicants. The visitors underlined the fact that even though there are quality and diversity policies in relation to the applicants in place, they must ensure that these policies are implemented and monitored. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on how data relating to equality and diversity collected through the admissions process is used by the programme team within the equality and diversity policy.

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 provide further evidence which clarifies the role and responsibilities of the clinical supervisor.

Reason: In the documentation the education provider noted that each trainee is allocated to a specific clinical supervisor. The visitors noted that a practice coordinator will review suitability of the placement and supervision arrangements before a clinical supervisor is allocated. In the documentation there is information on supervisor allocation “as an adjunct supervisor” independent to staff on the programme. From discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that in terms of ethics for trainees the programme team has plans on avoiding staff being in dual roles as an academic staff and a clinical supervisor at the same time. The visitors were unable to understand the core elements of a clinical supervisor’s role and responsibilities during discussions in the programme team meeting. Thus, the visitors require further evidence which articulates the role and responsibilities of the clinical supervisor.

3.14 The programme must implement and monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to learners.

Condition: The education provider must show how they use equality and diversity data related to learners, to demonstrate that these policies are implemented and monitored.

Reason: In the documentation the visitors noted equality and diversity policies are present for current learners on the programme. While discussions at the visit, the visitors discussed how the education provider ensure implementation and monitoring of these policies in relation to learners is done. The programme team underlined that data collection is done. The visitors noted that there is a software tool in place to facilitate data collection. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensure these policies in relation to learners are implemented and monitored. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on how data relating to equality and diversity collected while learners are recruited on the programme is used by the programme team within the equality and diversity policy.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the cohort of learners admitted in September 2018 will be transferred onto the approved programme, to ensure that they are eligible to apply for admission to the Register.

Reason: In the post visit process, the visitors identified that the education provider recruited a set of learners in September 2018 who they intend to be eligible to apply for registration if the programme is approved. The education provider considers that these learners are already on the programme, as it has started running. However, for the purposes of regulatory approval, the programme's first approved intake date will be September 2019, if it is approved. Therefore, as the visitors currently understand the situation, these learners would not have started on an approved programme, and would not be eligible to apply for registration should they complete the programme. The visitors noted that there was no information about this proposal in the education provider's documentary submission, and were therefore unable to determine how these learners would commence the programme from September 2019, as we would require as a regulator should these learners be eligible to apply for registration. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will admit the cohort of learners recruited prior to HCPC approval onto the programme from September 2019, should it be approved.

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 their system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning is effective.

Reason: From the documentation which was relevant to learners' performance of practice-based learning the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider approves and ensures the quality of practice-based learning. The visitors noted that the education provider are in partnership with three NHS trusts to provide practice-based learning to learners. From discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that there is an audit process in place to ensure quality in practice-based learning, which is implemented in the Clinical Psychology programme. The visitors understood that evidence of an audit tool in relation to the Counselling Psychology programme will be produced, but that this tool does not yet exist for this programme. Therefore, the visitors are unclear how the education provider approves and ensures the quality of practice-based learning for this programme, as they have not seen information about the system that will be used. Thus, the visitors require further evidence of the process to ensure quality of practice-based learning.

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 training which practice educators undertake is appropriate to their role, learner's needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: In the documentation, the education provider state that all clinical supervisors in practice-based learning are "appropriately trained psychologists". From discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that practice educators gain the qualification of a supervisor only when they attend training on supervising trainees in the clinical placement setting. The visitors understood that the education provider has made arrangements for provision of training to practice educators. In discussions at the programme team meeting the education provider mentioned that evidence around placements will not be ready until trainees go on their first placement. Therefore, the

visitors were unclear what training practice educators undertake and how the education provider ensures it is regular and appropriate to the programme. The visitors require further evidence of training practice educators undertake which happens on a regular basis.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how assessment throughout the programme ensure that the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are met, and must ensure that they are directly referenced in each module.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors noted reference to HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics as part of the programme handbook. Additionally, the visitors noted that expectation of professional behaviour is noted in the programme specification listed among the programme aims and learning outcomes. Similarly, expectation of the behaviour of the learners is mentioned on the placement handbook as part of the objectives of practice-based learning. Additionally, the visitors noted that assessment on learners' behaviour is mentioned under modules DCP110 and DCP323. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider will ensure that learners' behaviour is assessed throughout the programme. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors understood that assessment of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics throughout the modules of the programme is under development. Thus, the visitors require further evidence on how learners' behaviour is assessed throughout the modules on the programme and further evidence on the standards of conduct, performance and ethics being directly referenced in each module.

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 maximising the impact of the Programme Advisory Group to achieve more regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice education providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit, the visitors were made aware of the Programme Advisory Group (PAG) used to facilitate collaboration between the education provider and the practice education providers. From the evidence provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met at threshold level. In the practice education meeting however, the visitors understood that even though practice educators were part of the PAG meeting they were unclear on what the education provider expects of them for the new programme. The visitors noted that PAG is happening annually, with the next one being held in January 2020. The education provider should therefore consider arrangements for holding the PAG meeting on a more regular basis, to ensure information is shared in a timely manner.

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

Recommendation: Service users and carers should be more actively involved in the programme and their level of involvement on the programme should be made clear from the start.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold level, as service users and carers did have input on the new programme. However, from discussion with the service users and carers, the visitors noted that their level of involvement on the programme is limited. The visitors understood that service users and carers are willing to take part in the programme actively through direct involvement in the admissions process and possibly through sharing experiences with the learners. Additionally, the visitors noted that the information on their involvement in the programme was communicated to them only via email. Therefore, the visitors recommend strengthening involvement of service users and carers by widening participation in the areas of the programme while making their level of involvement clear through further communication with them.