

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	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning
Approval visit date	11 - 12 December 2018
Case reference	CAS-13304-M7K2Z3

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	7

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:

Anne Gribbens	Social worker
Dorothy Smith	Social worker
Mohammed Jeewa	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive
Tracey Samuel-Smith	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.

Zoe McClelland	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Leeds Beckett University
Claire Eatough	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Leeds Beckett University
Janet Walker	External panel member	University of Lincoln

Linda Asquith	Internal panel member	Leeds Beckett University
Paul Mackreth	Internal panel member	Leeds Beckett University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed first intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01957

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	Comments
Learners	Yes	The programme has not yet started so we met with learners from the existing HCPC-approved social work programmes: BA (Hons) Social Work and MA Social Work
Senior staff	Yes	

Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 12 February 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 applicants are aware of any possible impact on their employment status when accepting a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a programme handbook, and discussed admissions with the senior team. From these discussions the visitors clarified that the programme would only be open to individuals already employed in social work settings, for example as social work support staff. They asked the senior team whether it was possible that failure to successfully complete the programme for any reason could have an adverse effect on these individuals' employment status, and how applicants would be fully informed of any possible changes to their status resulting from entry to the programme. The senior team stated that different local authorities were going to handle the provision of this information differently, and that they did not have a way of monitoring what applicants would be told, or a way of ensuring that applicants were given full information. The visitors were therefore not clear that the education provider was, at present, able to give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. They require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure that all learners are fully aware of any possible impact on their employment of their failing to complete the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure Disclosure and Barring Service checks are carried out for all learners.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including the programme specification and an Apprenticeship Commitment Statement. They also discussed admissions with the senior team. From this evidence and from the discussions the visitors were aware that the education provider was relying on employers to carry out Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks, and did not appear to have a mechanism for ensuring that this had been undertaken for all learners. The visitors considered that this arrangement did not meet the standard as the education provider currently cannot assure themselves that these checks have been undertaken. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure DBS checks are carried out on all learners.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have an appropriate finalised version of the agreement with programme partners in place, which will enable the programme to proceed on a sustainable basis.

Reason: The evidence submitted for this standard included a draft agreement between the education provider and the various members of the local Social Work Teaching Partnership, whose employees would be eligible for admission to the programme. The visitors considered that this agreement was appropriate as it stood, and demonstrated appropriate support for the programme from partners. However, they also noted that it had not yet been signed by all parties and so might still be amended. The visitors considered that this possibility of amendment meant that they could not yet regard the agreement as definitive evidence. The senior team stated in discussion that the parties would not be able to sign the agreement until HCPC approval was given to the programme. The visitors understood this and still considered it would be reasonable for the education provider to submit evidence demonstrating an unsigned but finalised agreement, ready for the programme to start, was in place before a recommendation of approval could be made. They reminded the education provider that the version of the agreement seen by visitors as part of the HCPC approval process would be regarded as the final agreement, and that further amendments may have to be reviewed through the HCPC major change process. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing that the final version of the agreement with employers will enable the programme to be sustainable and fit for purpose.

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

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping and the placement handbook. They also discussed the modules and their learning outcomes with the programme team. From the documentation and from these discussions, it was not clear to the visitors how the

programme learning outcomes were aligned to specific SOPs in practice-based learning and clinical skills modules. In the practice placement handbook, on page 15, learners are directed to read the SOPs but it was not clear to the visitors how this would ensure that they met the SOPs, as it did not link to the learning outcomes. The visitors were therefore unable to be clear how the learning outcomes would ensure that learners met the SOPs. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that all the SOPs are appropriately aligned to programme learning outcomes.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including module specifications. They also discussed the modules and their learning outcomes with the programme team. From the documentation and from these discussions, it was not clear to the visitors how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) were integrated throughout the programme to ensure that they had a prominent and structured role. The SCPEs were mentioned in some of the modules but the visitors could not see how this would mean that learners were enabled to understand the nature and importance of the SCPEs. They were therefore unable to be clear how the learning outcomes would ensure that learners met the SCPEs, and require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that the SCPEs are appropriately addressed throughout the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping and the programme specification. They also discussed assessment with the programme team. From the documentation and from these discussions, the visitors were not clear how learners would be enabled to understand how to meet the SOPs in their practice-based learning. The learning outcomes were mapped to the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) but the visitors considered that it might not be clear to learners how the PCF differed from the SOPs, and what they would be expected to do to meet the SOPs. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that assessment of learning outcomes in practice-based learning will ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

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 in all parts of the programme will ensure that learners are able to demonstrate that they meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard, including module specifications and placement handbook. They also discussed assessment of professional expectations with the programme team. From the documentation and from these discussions, it was not clear to the visitors how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) were assessed throughout the programme. The SCPEs were mentioned in some of the modules, but without more detail the visitors could not see how the learners would be given a clear idea of what they needed to demonstrate. They were therefore unable to be clear how assessment throughout the programme would ensure that learners met the SCPEs, and require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that learners' ability to meet the expectations of behaviour, including SCPEs, is appropriately assessed throughout the programme.

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
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation	8

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 cares, and further involves the groups in the programme, to ensure ongoing and meaningful involvement from service users and carers on the programme.

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	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), 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
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	8

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.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors 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](#).