

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of East London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Degree Apprenticeship, Work based learning BSc (Hons) Podiatry Degree Apprenticeship, Work based learning
Date submission received	01 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15047-X4Y3F2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
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 major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. 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:

Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04442

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1994

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 110
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04443

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes reported to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04619

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04618

The education provider is introducing a degree apprenticeship route to their existing approved BSc (Hons) Podiatry and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy provisions. The education provider has stated that the new programmes will commence in September 2020 and will follow the modular structure of the current traditional undergraduate programmes. However, they will have a blended learning approach with modules being delivered within the university, by distance learning and within the workplace.

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
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that our

standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors reviewed the UEL 2019 validation document for Physiotherapy and Podiatry as well as the programme specifications for both programmes. The visitors could see from their review the programmes' entry criteria is made available to applicants prior to them making a choice about taking up an offer of a place on the programmes. However the visitors could not see information about the process that the education provider has in place in situations where an applicant (Trust employee) does not meet the entry criteria for the programmes. The visitors could not be sure how the education provider and the employer would handle such cases as there was no information about this within the programme documentation. As such they could not determine that this standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Further information showing how prospective applicants will be made aware of what would happen to their employment status if they do not meet the entry criteria for the programmes, so they can informatively decide whether or not to apply in the first place.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: The visitors noted within the validation document that the education provider is anticipating a cohort size of 20 learners on each of the programmes. However from email correspondence within the programme team, the visitors noted a statement suggesting there will be a maximum of 30 learners on each programme. The visitors considered that the information provided within the submission around learner numbers is conflicting. As such they could not determine the commitment of partner organisations to the programmes, and as a result they could not determine whether the programmes will be sustainable or not.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification around the maximum number of learners expected on the programmes.

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

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

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

Reason: In their review of the documentation the visitors could see a description of the processes and the committee in place for monitoring and evaluating the programmes. However the visitors were unclear how the learners will fit into this. For instance, the visitors were not clear about what would happen if there was a dispute between a learner and their employer or in a case where a learner fails to progress. The visitors also noted that the programmes are four year programmes which means learners in their fourth year may be out of synchronization with other learners on the traditional route. This could also mean that they may not have the traditional year representatives and as such may not be able to feed into the student representative system and meetings about programmes through the traditional academic year committees. The visitors therefore would require to see further evidence showing there are systems in place to regularly and effectively monitor and evaluate the degree apprenticeship programmes. The education provider will also need to further demonstrate how learners on this programme will be able to contribute to the overall programmes and that there is an effective system for receiving and managing their complaints.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of learners' involvement in the programme. This should demonstrate how learners on the programmes will be able to feedback on the programme and how their feedback/complaints will be evaluated/responded to.

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

Reason: The visitors were made aware from their review of the documentation that the education provider intends to use some of the practice education providers for the traditional provisions also for the degree apprenticeship programmes. However, the visitors could not see how the education provider will manage the impact that the additional learners may have on availability and capacity of practice-based learning (PBL) for all learners. The visitors therefore require that the education provider provides further clarity around how they will manage the impact of the increased number of learners on PBL by evidencing the effective systems they have in place to ensure availability and capacity of PBL for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Information that shows how the education provider will ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to pages 53-55 of the validation document. The visitors reviewed these pages as well as other pages within the document. The visitors noted that page 28 of the document states, "Our apprenticeships involve approximately 40% off the job training, this being a combination of day release to University and protected self - directed/tutor directed study time in the workplace". However, the visitors noted that page 55 of the document talks about a 26 weeks of full time practical work which appeared to be in conflict with the timetable. They also noted that the timetable demonstrates that learners would have one day a week studying. As such, it was not clear to the visitors when learners' protected study time with the employer would be. The visitors considered that they will need further clarity around the structure and duration of practice-based learning and how these will

support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) before they can determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification around the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning to ensure it supports the achievement of learning outcomes and the SOPs for physiotherapists and podiatrists.

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.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the "Preparation and Support of Clinical Educators" section of the validation document as evidence for this standard. The visitors could see that practice educators (PEs) would have the opportunity to access regular training and workshops which may be targeted at PEs with different levels of experience or which may focus on different aspects of supervision. However, the visitors were unclear if the education provider had any plans to provide specific training for staff that will supervise and assess degree apprenticeship learners. The visitors considered that the progression of a degree apprentice may differ from that of learners on the traditional route, taking into consideration possibility of differing expectations or possible issues about workplace modules that may be different. As such, the visitors considered that they will need to see further evidence that clarifies whether practice educators will undertake any special training which is appropriate to the learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme before they can consider this standard as met.

Suggested evidence: Further information that shows that PEs will undertake specific training appropriate to their role, learners' need and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 March 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).