

Approval process report

Health Sciences University, Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, 2023-2024

Executive Summary

This is a report of the approval process to approve the Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme at Health Sciences University. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme are fit to practice.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Reviewed the programme(s) against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area.
- Recommended all standards are met, and that the programme(s) should be approved
- Decided that all standards are met, and that the programme(s) is approved

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The programme(s) meet all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.

Previous consideration	N / A as this case did not emerge from a previous process
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide whether the programme is approved.
Next steps	If the Education and Training Committee (Panel) approves the visitors' recommendation, the programme will be approved and added to the Register. The education provider will next go through performance review in 2028-29.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	3
About us	3
Our standards.....	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The approval process	3
How we make our decisions	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: Institution-level assessment	4
The education provider context	4
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	5
Institution performance data	5
The route through stage 1	8
Admissions.....	8
Management and governance	9
Quality, monitoring, and evaluation	11
Learners.....	13
Outcomes from stage 1	16
Section 3: Programme-level assessment.....	16
Programmes considered through this assessment.....	16
Stage 2 assessment – provider submission	16
Quality themes identified for further exploration	16
Section 4: Findings.....	16
Conditions.....	16
Overall findings on how standards are met.....	17
Section 5: Referrals.....	18
Recommendations.....	19
Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes	19
Assessment panel recommendation.....	19
Education and Training Committee decision	19
Appendix 1 – summary report	20
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution	21

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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.

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme detailed in this report meets our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme approval.

Our standards

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

Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

The approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:

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

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

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 design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

Jim Pickard	Lead visitor, Supplementary / independent prescribing
Wendy Smith	Lead visitor, Supplementary / independent prescribing
Louise Winterburn	Education Quality Officer
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers seven HCPC-approved programmes across six professions. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2020.

The education provider engaged with the approval review process in the current model of quality assurance in 2021. They were introducing the MSc Occupational Therapy; MSc Speech and Language Therapy; MSc Dietetics, and MSc Podiatry programmes. We were satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to demonstrate

that our standards were met, and that the programmes were approved by the Education and Training Committee in 2022.

The education provider engaged with the approval review process in the legacy model of quality assurance in 2020. They were introducing the BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology), and BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging) full time programmes. This review involved consideration of documentary evidence and a virtual approval visit, to consider whether the programmes meet our standards for the first time. After considering the education provider’s response to the conditions set, we were satisfied that the conditions were met, and the programme was approved in 2020.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Chiropodist / podiatrist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2023
	Dietitian	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2023
	Occupational therapy	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2023
	Physiotherapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2021
	Radiographer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2020
	Speech and language therapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2023

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Bench- mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	180	200	2023	<p>The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is proposing through the new provision.</p> <p>The value number shows an increase in their total learner numbers. I recommend we pay close attention to the resources in place to ensure they have capacity to support these learners and also the ratio of academic staff to learners.</p> <p>We considered this issue and were satisfied that they met the relevant standards.</p>
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	2%	2020-21	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 3%</p>

Data Point	Bench- mark	Value	Date	Commentary
				<p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider was supporting learners, and determined that they would be supported well on the new programme.</p>
<p>Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study</p>	<p>93%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>2020-21</p>	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has been maintained.</p> <p>We did not consider any need to explore this area given the high score.</p>
<p>Learner positivity score</p>	<p>75.2%</p>	<p>66.8%</p>	<p>2023</p>	<p>This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is Subject – for HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p> <p>We explored this area by considering how well learner experience would be monitored and developed on the new programme. We determined that they had</p>

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
				clear plans to ensure learners were able to benefit from their experience.
HCPC performance review cycle length				They will next go through performance review in 2026-27

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Information for applicants –**
 - The education provider has explained how all their programmes have a course-specific downloadable document on the programme website. This document outlines the specific information learners need for the programme.
 - The education provider explained how their Recruitment, Selection, and Admission Regulations and Policy are set at the institution level and will apply to all programmes. This policy contains information on Admissions principles and the Application process, information for applicants on deferred entry, and applicants requiring a visa to study in the UK.
 - The education provider has stated that the website is the main source of information for applicants. The programme will be made live on the system once approval of the proposed programme has been confirmed.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health –**
 - The education provider has stated that specific information for programmes will be in the 'Admissions regulations and entry requirements' section of the course specification document.
 - The 'Recruitment, Selection and Admission Regulations' and the 'Recruitment, Selection and Admission Policy and Procedure: Taught

Courses' documents contain information on English language proficiency. They also contain information on English language details which are on individual course pages. The policy includes information for applicants with disabilities and additional support needs.

Admissions are subject to the receipt of a satisfactory enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) certificate or National Police Certificate for those living outside of the UK.

- Each programme webpage and applicant information pack contain information on the health requirements of learners, including vaccination and occupational health assessments.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)**
 - Information on this area is outlined in the education provider's 'Recruitment, Selection and Admission Policy' document. The document sets out the education providers' position with sections for individual programmes should this need to be varied from the standard position.
 - The education provider has stated that it is unlikely that an applicant for the proposed new programme will request APEL due to the nature of the programme and the required hours for annotation as a prescriber.
 - All applicants undergo a thorough initial assessment process.
 - The policy is set at the institution level and will apply to all programmes.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion**
 - The education provider has referred to their 'Equality, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging Policy' in support of this area.
 - They explained how they are committed to fostering a diverse and inclusive culture which offers equality and opportunity for all. This is achieved by eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity, and promoting respectful relations on campus.
 - The education provider also refers to their 'Criminal Convictions Procedure' policy which refers to promoting a duty of care to ensure the safety of all stakeholders. All applicants who have a criminal conviction will be assessed against any potential risk to the education provider's staff and learners.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register¹**
 - The education provider has policies which they reference in support of this area. The 'institution wide Course Design Framework' policy

¹ This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

includes information on how the education provider ensures that programmes are delivered at the appropriate level.

- The education provider has annual report and course monitoring reporting mechanisms whereby all programmes have steering groups that meet regularly to discuss and develop the programmes. The proposed new programme is also underpinned by the Royal Pharmaceutical Society competency framework and the HCPC standards for prescribing.
- The education provider has had full taught degree awarding powers since 2017 and they have a wide range of HCPC accredited provision at Level 7 with annual monitoring in place.
- The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Sustainability of provision**
 - The education provider has a 'Business Continuity Management (BCM) Policy' which states that apprentices will be taught by Health Sciences University academic staff and qualified professional practitioners with relevant expertise. The staff base is supported by a visiting faculty approach through partnership with local healthcare providers.
 - They stated that a business case must be presented to the University College's Senior Management Group for internal consideration and approval as part of the overall programme consideration process. The provider also has a periodic review process to ensure that the curriculum is contemporary, and the programme is fit for purpose and sustainable.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Effective programme delivery**
 - The education provider uses their 'Course and Unit Monitoring Policy' to support effective programme delivery. All programmes have steering groups who meet regularly to discuss, develop and deliver the programme action plan. There is also an annual monitoring and reporting process for individual programmes.
 - Appropriate qualification and experience (being HCPC registered and a member of the relevant professional body) are articulated as essential criteria in the job description for all academic staff appointed to the programme.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Effective staff management and development**
 - The education provider has a 'People Policy' and 'Staff Development Policy' which sets out their approach to staff management. This contributes to effective management and development of staff.
 - The education provider states how staff development includes all policies, practices, and procedures to support and develop the capabilities of staff. This aims to improve the quality of their work and to ensure success of the provider. It is an ongoing process, closely linked to their annual appraisal process.
 - To ensure that learners are taught and guided in their learning by appropriately qualified staff, all non-clinical academic staff are expected

to have, or be working towards, a PhD or other doctoral qualification. Clinical staff must have full registration with the relevant Professional and Statutory Reporting Body (PSRB) and conform to the continuing professional development (CPD) requirements of the relevant regulator and/or professional body.

- New staff without teaching experience are encouraged to complete a Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching or equivalent, with support for achieving recognition as a Fellow of Advance HE.
- The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level**
 - The 'Course Consideration, Approval and Periodic Review Policy and Procedure' document functions to establish the procedure all new programme proposals must adhere to before being accepted for development and validation. This policy is set at the institution level and will apply to all programmes.
 - The education provider has an institution wide 'Placement Policy' that outlines the process for the identification, approval, and ongoing monitoring of practice placements.
 - Placement provider partnerships and agreements are coordinated by the University College Executive Team and signed off by the Vice-Chancellor.
 - To be admitted to this programme, applicants will be required to have a suitable workplace alongside employer support for completion of the required hours, a suitable prescribing supervisor, and access to a prescribing budget.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality**
 - The education provider has policies and mechanisms in place to manage and monitor academic quality. These include their 'Course Design Framework' policy and the 'Education Strategy.' Academic quality monitoring is an ongoing process and is key to the continuous enhancement of learners' experiences of their programmes.
 - All programmes undergo continuous monitoring and course leaders complete an annual monitoring report form. The forms are considered through an internal review process and received by Academic Standards and Quality Committee, which is a committee of Academic Board. Annual monitoring leads to the development of a course action plan that is monitored by the relevant Course Steering Committee throughout the year.
 - The Course Action Plan (CAP) accompanies the annual course monitoring reports and is a live working document to record actions and changes as they occur.

- All programmes are reviewed every six years. Review forms are considered through an internal scrutiny process and received by Academic Standards and Quality Committee, which is a committee of Academic Board. The procedure is the same as for new programmes, but also includes consideration of a range of qualitative and quantitative monitoring data.
- Changes to programmes between reviews are managed through the institutional 'Course and Unit Modification' policy. To ensure institutional oversight, any changes to programmes approved at programme level are reported to the institutional Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
- The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments**
 - The education provider uses their 'Placement Policy' to outline the requirements and expectations for course teams involved in the organisation, approval, and ongoing management of placement learning. This ensures a high-quality learning experience.
 - The education provider's institutional 'Placement Policy' sets out arrangements for learner concerns and whistleblowing, emphasising its importance, and the need to support learners. At the programme level, specific arrangements covering 'whistleblowing,' etc., are included in each Placement Handbook. Guidance on conduct and ethics is embedded in the curriculum, which focuses on expectations regarding reporting concerns. Raising concerns is also covered in the Placement Handbook.
 - The education provider outlined the specific role and responsibilities of the Practice Educator, including their level of experience and qualification in the Practice Educator Handbook. The education provider has also stated that they will run training and continuing professional development (CPD) for Practice Educators to further ensure the required knowledge, skills, and experience are developed in Practice Educators working with learners.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Learner involvement**
 - The education provider use their 'Course and Unit Monitoring Policy' and the 'Student Engagement Policy' to manage/support learner involvement in the programme. Learners at both mid and end points of individual units of study provide feedback on their programmes. All programme years of study have at least one learner representative who sits on the Course Steering Group and the university-wide Student Experience Committee.
 - The 'Course Design Framework' and 'Course Consideration Policy' include the institutional expectation that learners are involved in the design process for new programmes. This is tested as part of the course consideration and approval process. Groups of learners are invited to meet with the course consideration panel to give feedback on the learning experience.

- Student representatives for each programme are members of the Course Steering Committee. Their remit is to maintain the academic standards of the programme and to ensure it operates in accordance with the approved programme specification. The Committee also aim to maintain and enhance the quality of learning opportunities, ensuring that issues requiring improvement are addressed, and good practice shared.
- There is learner representation on all committees of the Academic Board and on the Board of Governors. The Student Experience Committee has the specific remit to promote and facilitate a two-way channel of communication between learners and staff. This relates to learner experience and enhancement, support services, and learner engagement in academic governance.
- The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Service user and carer involvement**
 - The education provider uses their 'Sharing Patient and Community Experience' (SPaCE) Group, along with other groups that contribute to this area, to demonstrate service user and carer involvement. The 'Friends of the Clinic' group of service users provides regular feedback and input into the delivery of services in the Health Sciences University Clinic. This feedback is reported directly to a Clinical Governance Group. In the clinic, the patient voice is also collected through annual questionnaires and comment cards.
 - The education provider has stated that by working with service users and carers, they can provide outstanding person-centred care to patients in the local community.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support**
 - The education provider offers a broad range of support services via their onsite Student Services Team. This provision also includes well-being advice and counselling services. Learners are also able to talk to their assigned Personal Tutor regarding pastoral issues, as well as any tutor they feel they can confide in.
 - The institutional 'Placement Policy' sets out overarching arrangements for learner concerns and whistleblowing, emphasising its importance, and the need to support learners.
 - The 'Student Complaints Policy and Procedure' is set at the institutional level and applies to learners on all programmes leading to Health Sciences University awards. The policy considers the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) good practice guidance. Learners are encouraged to raise and resolve complaints informally in the first instance. If this does not address their concerns, there is a three-stage

complaints procedure. At the end of the process, learners may take a complaint to the OIA.

- The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Ongoing suitability**
 - The education provider has referred to several mechanisms as being in place to determine learners' ongoing suitability. This includes the 'Fitness to Study' and the 'Fitness to Practice' (FtP) policies, as well as the 'Student Disciplinary Policy.' Any concerns relating to the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character, and health will be addressed institutionally through these policies.
 - The education provider has an established Student Monitoring and Wellbeing Group that meets regularly for each programme. They consider matters related to individual learner progress, including academic performance, skills attainment, attendance requirements, and wellbeing issues. This group considers and helps to identify learners who perform below the required standard or are in danger of doing so, makes recommendations, and monitors outcomes.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)**
 - The education provider has a specific guidance document for learners within the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, providing information on interprofessional education and learning. This involves shared learning with other relevant healthcare profession-focused programmes, as well as in-placement learning.
 - Placement Handbooks and unit descriptors are utilised to introduce learners to concepts of interprofessional learning and interprofessional practice at the start of all programmes. There is joint delivery of units across health profession-focused programmes to foster interprofessional education, and interprofessional learning forms a core part of the placement experiences of learners.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion**
 - The education provider has stated that they are committed to fostering a diverse and inclusive culture that offers equality and opportunity for all by eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity, and promoting respectful relations on campus. This commitment is evidenced through their 'Equality, Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Policy.'
 - The education provider utilises its Changing the Culture working group, a joint University College/Students' Union group, to collaborate on bringing about cultural change and undertaking activities to promote an inclusive culture. This includes initiatives related to Black Lives Matter, disability, LGBTQ+, mental health, and well-being.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity**
 - To ensure objectivity in assessments, the education provider has existing policies, procedures, and regulations in place, including the 'Course Design Framework' policy, 'Assessment Criteria' policy, and 'Academic Misconduct' policy. The education provider stated that all assessments align with these policies, as well as with the 'Assessment Regulations' and the 'Marking and Moderation Policy,' which are institutional-wide policies.
 - The institutional 'Setting and Scrutiny of Assessments Policy and Procedure,' referenced in the baseline document, guides the scrutiny of assessments to ensure validity, reliability, and accurate assessment documentation. Implementation occurs at the School level, where all assessments have clear criteria objectively mapped to institutional generic assessment criteria.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Progression and achievement**
 - The education provider has confirmed that assessment regulations operate institutionally, outlining requirements for progression and awards. If necessary, specific regulations for individual programmes are approved separately. Learner progress aligns with Assessment Regulations and the Marking and Moderation policy.
 - Course Specifications and the University College Student Handbook direct learners to approved assessment regulations for details on progression and achievement.
 - The Course Handbook will convey information on programmes with specific minimum attendance requirements. Failing to meet these requirements will impact the learner's ability to pass the unit and proceed with their studies.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Appeals**
 - The education provider has stated that appeals across the institution are managed in accordance with the referenced policies, which include the 'Academic Appeals Policy and Procedures (Taught Awards),' 'Disciplinary Policy,' and 'Employer and Apprentice Complaints Policy (Apprenticeships).' This process is already in place and in use for their existing provision.
 - Appeals follow a two-stage process: stage 1 involves an informal discussion, and stage 2 includes a panel review. At the end of this process, learners may escalate a complaint to the OIA.
 - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section.

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- Teaching and learning suites
- Collaboration and seminar rooms
- Virtual and physical library
- Virtual learning environment

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing	PT (Part time)	Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	40 learners, 2 cohorts	23/09/2024

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

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

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. We did not consider that quality activity was necessary.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's

approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

The visitors were satisfied that no conditions were required to satisfy them that all standards are met. The visitors' findings, including why no conditions were required, are presented below.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **A Admissions –**
 - The education provider set out their admissions requirements in the mapping exercise.
 - They noted the academic and personal requirements. This includes evidence of HCPC registration, as well as an affirmation of commitment to the programme. This affirmation required learners to demonstrate employer support for their application. The education provider is also linked to the relevant webpages that would enable learners to understand the programme and its requirements.
 - The visitors agreed the education provider had appropriate academic and professional entry standards. This should enable those admitted to the programme to have a strong likelihood of completing the programme.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met at threshold level.
- **B Programme governance, management and leadership –**
 - The education provider set out their approach to this area in their mapping document and supporting evidence.
 - With regards to collaboration and capacity, they demonstrated how learners' employers would have to be committed to their learners undertaking the programme, and to supporting those learners' clinical learning. Additionally, they noted that learners will be assigned a practice supervisor who will support the learner throughout the programme.
 - With regard to staff, the education provider submitted the programme handbook, which set out how staff would be used on the programme. The visitors requested clarification of the number of staff and the range of expertise available, and considered that the additional information they received was sufficient to confirm the relevant standards were met.
 - With regards to resources, the education provider submitted a link to their virtual learning environment and a narrative of how it would be used. The visitors considered that this demonstrated the standard was met because it gave a clear view of how the education provider would distribute resources.

- **C Programme design and delivery –**
 - The education provider submitted a module specification, as well as a standards of prescribing mapping exercise which will be integrated and assessed on the programme. They also provided a competency framework which was part of the design of the programme.
 - They also submitted a programme handbook and other guidance documents for learners which set out the structure and requirements of the programme.
 - The visitors considered that this was appropriate evidence, as it set out in detail how the education provider will ensure that the programme is aligned with professional expectations and will be updated as necessary. They therefore considered the relevant standards to be met.
- **D Practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider submitted as evidence several documents to demonstrate that the practice-based learning requirements were integrated with the programme's delivery. These were to demonstrate how the education provider planned to ensure that clinical supervision on the programme was carried out by appropriately qualified and experienced staff.
 - The visitors considered that this was useful evidence, because it set out in some detail the expectations and requirements of all relevant stakeholders.
 - In light of all the evidence reviewed, the visitors considered the relevant standard was met, because it was clear how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning was appropriate to the programme.
- **E Assessment –**
 - The education provider submitted a prescribing assessment policy as key evidence in this area. This set out the various approaches and methods of assessments they will use on the programme.
 - The visitors considered that this was useful evidence, and demonstrated the education provider's assessment approach. The policy demonstrated that there was a well-defined and appropriate assessment strategy in place.
 - Following the submission of additional evidence, the visitors considered the standards in this area to be met.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Section 5: Referrals

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval, focused review, or performance review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

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. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

The visitors did not set any recommendations.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that all standards are met, and therefore the programme should be approved.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that the programmes are approved.

Reason for this decision: The Panel agreed with the visitors' recommended monitoring period, for the reasons noted through the report.

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on approval. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation, and the nature, quality and facilities of the provision.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
Health Sciences University	CAS-01496-Q5N7N1	Jim Pickard Wendy Smith	Through this assessment, we have recommended all standards are met, and that the programme should be approved.	<p>Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:</p> <p>The education provider has a comprehensive process to enhance staff capabilities and ensure institutional successes. Staff development is an ongoing process linked to annual appraisals, involving various practices to improve work quality</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Suites which are equipped to support various teaching methods, from lectures to interactive group work.</p> <p>Collaboration and Seminar Rooms which are designed for group work, discussions, and seminars, featuring interactive whiteboards, video conferencing, and ample</p>

				<p>seating to foster teamwork and communication.</p> <p>Virtual and Physical Library which offers a wide range of resources in both physical and digital formats, including books, journals, e-books, and databases, ensuring access to information for all users.</p> <p>Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) which supports the education provider's educational content delivery and communication, featuring course materials, discussion forums, assignment portals, and assessment tools for flexible and interactive learning.</p>
Programmes				
Programme name			Mode of study	Nature of provision
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing			Part time	• Taught (HEI)

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist			16/01/2023
MSc Dietetics (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			16/01/2023
MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			09/01/2023
MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/01/2021

BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2020
BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology)	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Therapeutic radiographer		01/09/2020
MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			09/01/2023