

## Approval process visitor report

Education provider	Coventry University
Institution	School of Nursing Midwifery and Health
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time MSci Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Date Assessment commenced	07/12/2021
Visitor recommendation made	05/03/2021
Case reference	CAS-01029-R5S0J4

### Summary of findings from this assessment

This a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the Coventry University, School of Nursing Midwifery and Health - BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and MSci Diagnostic Radiography 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, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

The outcomes of this process were as follows:

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

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

## The areas we cover in this report

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

## Section 1: Background information

### Who we are

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

### Our standards

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

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

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

### Our approach to quality assuring education

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

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

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

### The approval process

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

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

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

## How we make decisions

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

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

## Section 2: Our assessment

### Stage 1 assessment: The institution

Education provider	Coventry University
Institution	School of Nursing Midwifery and Health
Accountable person	Patricia Bluteau

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

- Dietetics
- Occupational Therapy
- Operating Department Practice
- Paramedic Science
- Physiotherapy
- Prescribing

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

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

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

## Assurance that institution level standards are met

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

We considered how the proposed programmes are assimilated with the management of existing approved programmes in the institution. We determined the proposed programmes would be managed in a way that was consistent with the definition of their institution. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate for the programme to sit as part of the School of Nursing Midwifery and Health and take assurance the institution level standards will continue to be met by its introduction.

## Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

Education provider	Coventry University
Institution	School of Nursing Midwifery and Health
Accountable person	Meera Sharma
Programmes	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography MSci Diagnostic Radiography
Profession	Radiography
Modality	Diagnostic
Mode of study	Full time
Type of programme	Pre-registration
Qualification level	Undergraduate
Start date	01/09/2021

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.

## Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment

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

Registrant visitors	Shaaron Pratt – Radiographer, Diagnostic
	Rachel Picton – Radiographer, Diagnostic

## Assessment of the proposal

### Initial review:

- The visitors reviewed the education provider's submission and considered their approach to each standard.
- This first review culminated in a virtual HCPC meeting in which the visitors discussed and made decisions around the standards they considered to be met and the areas they required further information around.

- Following the finalisation of areas to explore the visitors discussed and finalised the most appropriate quality activity to undertake this investigation.

#### Quality activity: Written questions

We design our assessment to be proportionate and appropriate to the issues identified and to seek input from relevant stakeholders when necessary. The issues we explored are as follows:

- Working with practice placement partners – visitors could see much work had been carried out in collaboration with practice partners, but needed to clarify how this would continue and grow in future years.
- Ensuring practice placement capacity – visitors noted that the proposed programme is entering into a competitive landscape for placement capacity and noted other local providers that would draw on radiography placements. As such the visitors sought to understand the collaboration undertaken with other local education providers to ensure that capacity could be maintained for all programmes. The visitors also requested an outline of timeframes to formalise and finalise work with practice partners.
- Staffing capacity and ensuring appropriate experience and expertise – the visitors sought to understand the provider’s current profession specific teaching resources and if plans were in place to increase them.
- Teaching and profession specific spaces – the visitors were able to see comprehensive plans for Radiography teaching and equipment spaces, but explored when this work would be completed.

From their detailed documentary review and group discussions, the visitors were satisfied with the provider’s approaches in most areas. The issues identified above did not constitute major risks in the provider’s approach to meeting the standards. Rather, the visitors considered a further investigation or clarification of their approach related to the above issues was needed, to ensure any risks had been mitigated. How these risks are mitigated did not require input from external stakeholders so the visitors considered the education provider to be appropriate and sufficient to clarify their approach in written form.

The visitors considered that the issues identified would require a formal written response to highlight that the education provider had recorded and documented mitigation around the risks identified. As such they considered written questions to be the most appropriate quality activity.

### Summary of visitor findings

#### **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register**

The visitors were satisfied that the programme aligns with the level of qualification expected for entry onto the register as a Diagnostic Radiographer. The programmes are also aligned to that of level 6 qualifications detailed in the Framework of Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awarding Bodies.

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

#### **SET 2: Programme admissions**

The visitors noted appropriate academic and professional entry and selection criteria to ensure learners would be appropriate for the programme. The visitors were also able to see the education provider's procedures to ensure that learners would meet their requirements related to profession-related values, attitudes and personal attributes.

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

### **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership**

The visitors were able to see strong links with practice education providers and could see how they had been involved in the development of the programme. Upon further information provided to visitors they were able to see how the education provider would collaborate frequently with partners and the plans for regular meetings. They were also able to see how practice partners would be able to feedback and be involved in the review of the programmes.

The visitors were also able to see signed agreements with various practice partner organisations as part of the submission. Therefore the visitors could take assurance that the education provider had undertaken considerable work with these key stakeholders in the development of the programme. However, the visitors noted some agreements would come to an end before the start of the programme and so enquired about the plans to replace or reconfirm them. The education provider confirmed to the visitors that the contracts were ending due to an administrative change in line with Health Education England (HEE) guidance rather than an ending of the working agreement. New agreements would be signed following the release of the new HEE Tripartite Agreement template. They also highlighted that numbers for the upcoming academic year had been finalised and future cohorts would be determined by work within local forums with other providers and practice based learning providers.

In the initial submission the visitors were able to see that one profession specific member of staff was in place supported by other teaching members of different professions. As such the visitors enquired around the plans to increase the profession specific expertise to support the programme. The education provider was able to give a detailed plan of the additional staff that would be in place for the start of the programme and have confirmed these staff members are now in post following our initial enquiry. The visitors were satisfied this would provide appropriate profession specific support for the first year and were confident with the plans to upscale the staff numbers as the programme grows.

For the physical teaching resources visitors were able to see comprehensive plans for extensive Diagnostic Radiography specific equipment and teaching spaces to be built to complement existing resources. The visitors enquired about the progress of this work and to determine if it would be ready in time for the first cohort. The education provider was able to confirm that the relevant specific teaching spaces and equipment would be in place well before the start of the programmes

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

### **SET 4: Programme design and delivery**

The visitors considered the programme curriculum to be suitably mapped to the SOPs and noted the link to professional body guidance highlighting its link to current practice. As such they considered that learners who successfully complete the programme would be equipped with the necessary skills to practice as autonomous professional in the current landscape.

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



### **SET 5: Practice-based learning**

The visitor could see how the learning outcomes would be delivered through the range of practice based learning opportunities. They were also able to see how the structure and duration of practice based learning would be sufficient for learners to be suitably prepared for practice after completing the programme.

The visitors were also able to see rigorous policies and procedures that are commonplace at Coventry University, to quality check practice based learning environments. This includes the appropriate number and experience of practice educators. To supplement this, the visitors were also able to see how the education provider would train and support practice educators as the programmes develop and increase learner numbers.

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

### **SET 6: Assessment**

The visitors were able to see how the assessment strategy aligned with curriculum and would enable learners to demonstrate the learning outcomes and SOPs. The education provider submitted detailed overview of the assessment methods throughout the programmes and highlighted robust institutional policies and regulations that underpin them.

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

## Section 3: The visitors' recommendations

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

### Programme approval

The programme is recommended for approval, without conditions.

## Section 4: Committee decision on approval

- We will record the decision of the Education and Training Committee here following their meeting on 26/05/2021.

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Winchester
Name of programme(s)	PGDip in Occupational Therapy, Full time PGDip in Occupational Therapy, Part time MSc in Occupational Therapy, Full time MSc in Occupational Therapy, Part time
Approval visit date	21-22 April 2021
Case reference	CAS-16304-K8Y3G6

### 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.....	5
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:

Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

### Other groups involved in the virtual approval visit

There were other groups involved with the approval process as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Lisa Harding	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Winchester
Amy Day	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Winchester
Theresa Baxter	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Nicola Spalding	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists

Caroline Grant	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Carolyn Hay	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists.

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PGDip in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across the Occupational Therapy provision
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02289

Programme name	PGDip in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across the Occupational Therapy provision
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02290

Programme name	MSc in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across the Occupational Therapy provision
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02291

Programme name	MSc in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25 across the Occupational Therapy provision
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02292

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

The education provider proposes to deliver a full and part time MSc in Occupational Therapy programme, with up to a total of combined 25 learners per cohort. The PGDip in Occupational Therapy will be an exit award, that will confer eligibility for learners to apply to the HCPC Register.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for 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.

Type of evidence	Submitted	Comments
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements	Yes	
Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning	Yes	
Proficiency standards mapping	Yes	
Information provided to applicants and learners	Yes	
Information for those involved with practice-based learning	Yes	
Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme	Yes	
Internal quality monitoring documentation	No	As these programmes have not yet commenced, this was not required

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the education provider decided to move this event to a virtual (or remote) approval visit. In the table below, we have noted the meeting held, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice educators	Yes
Programme team	Yes

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

### **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.

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

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should keep under review their staff planning to ensure there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that these standards were met at threshold level, considering the intention to use existing staff from other professions and timelines to recruit a further 2.6 work time equivalent staff (WTE) with occupational therapy expertise. Amongst these plans, the first step is to recruit 1.0 WTE staff by September 2021. Additionally, the visitors considered there is commitment for staff funding from the senior management along with interim measures to use hourly paid lecturers to meet the teaching responsibilities, to ensure all learners in year one will have the required support on the programme. As the proposed start date of the programme is not too far away, the visitors considered that there could be a risk to the effective future delivery of the programme should the staff recruitment plans, along with the interim measures not get actioned in a timely manner by September 2021. As such, the visitors considered that there was a potential risk that the standards may no longer be met at that time. Therefore the visitors suggest that, the education provider review and monitor staffing levels closely ahead of when applicants come onto the programme in year one, to ensure that their staff numbers continue to be appropriate, and with the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise, in line with the requirements of the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should integrate learning opportunities for interprofessional learning consistently, to ensure learners are learning with and from other learners throughout the programme on both the pathways.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the plans to have some shared modules delivered on this proposed programme, with learners from other professions. Additionally, the visitors also noted intentions and examples to develop further interprofessional learning (IPL) on this programme, which includes joint teaching and activity sessions with the Nursing and Physiotherapy professions. The visitors considered this standard was met at threshold level. However the visitors noted that learners will be spending minimal time on campus per semester, with a majority of learning taking place online as part of the blended learning approach of this programme. The visitors considered that there might be a possibility that not all IPL activities could be covered on this programme within the two weeks learners will spend on campus, because other professions such as Nursing

or Physiotherapy will not be delivered with the same level of blended learning. This potentially means that some of the shared learning and activities will involve learners on this programme to participate more virtually online, with less consistency of face to face learning as with other profession programmes. Based on this, the education provider will have to ensure IPL activities conducted online will need to be embedded in such a way that it ensures it will develop learners' ability to communicate and work with learners outside their profession. As such, the visitors considered there is a risk in the standard falling below threshold level if online learning does not give sufficient opportunity for learners to interact and work with learners from other professions. Therefore the visitors recommend the education provider ensures there are regular IPL opportunities integrated onto the programme within the timetabling to ensure there is consistency in learners being prepared to learn from other learners, on both the part time and full time pathways. This is so that IPL remains relevant and meaningful, allowing learners to learn with and from learners in other relevant professions.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the virtual approval visit, the visitors recommend that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met, and that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 26 May 2021 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## Approval process visitor report

Education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Institution	Institute of Health
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time
Date Assessment commenced	16/12/2021
Visitor recommendation made	01/03/2021
Case reference	CAS-01034-F6M1K7

### Summary of findings from this assessment

This a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the University of Wolverhampton, Institute of Health – BSc (Hons) Podiatry 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, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

The outcomes of this process were as follows:

- Further Stage 1 assessment was not required based on the new programme(s) being proposed for delivery.
- The visitors recommended the programme(s) be approved as all programme level standards were met through their Stage 2 assessment.
- The visitors recommended one area to be reviewed through Approved Education Provider monitoring related to the programmes expansion of practice education time.

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



## The areas we cover in this report

Section 1: Background information.....	3
Who we are.....	3
Our standards .....	3
Our approach to quality assuring education .....	3
The approval process .....	4
How we make decisions .....	4
Section 2: Our assessment.....	5
Stage 1 assessment: The institution.....	5
Assurance that institution level standards are met.....	5
Stage 2 assessment: The programmes.....	6
Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment .....	6
Assessment of the proposal .....	6
Summary of visitor findings.....	7
Section 3: The visitors' recommendations.....	9
Programme approval.....	9
Areas to follow up through monitoring.....	9
Section 4: Committee decision on approval .....	9

## Section 1: Background information

### Who we are

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

### Our standards

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

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

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

### Our approach to quality assuring education

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

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

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

## The approval process

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

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

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

## How we make decisions

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

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

## Section 2: Our assessment

### Stage 1 assessment: The institution

Education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Institution	Institute of Health
Accountable person	Sharon Arkell

As part of the initiation of the process the education provider indicated that the proposed programme would be part of the Institute of Health at the University of Wolverhampton. This institute is well established with HCPC and currently delivers programmes in:

- Paramedic Science
- Physiotherapy
- Prescribing

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

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

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

### Assurance that institution level standards are met

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

We considered there to be no notable changes to way these areas functioned in relation to the new programme. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate for the programme to sit as part of the Institute of Health and take assurance the intuition level standards will continue to be met by its introduction.

## Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

Education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Institution	Institute of Health
Accountable person	Joanne Carruthers
Programme	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Profession	Chiropody/Podiatry
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Mode of study	Full time
Type of programme	Pre-registration
Qualification level	Undergraduate
Start date	01/09/2021

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.

## Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment

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

Registrant visitors	Wendy Smith – Chiropodist/Podiatrist
	Sharon Weiner-Ogilvie - Chiropodist/Podiatrist

## Assessment of the proposal

### Initial review:

- The visitors reviewed the education provider’s submission and considered their approach to each standard.
- This first review culminated in a virtual HCPC meeting in which the visitors discussed and made decisions around the standards they considered to be met and the areas they required further information around.
- Following the finalisation of areas to explore the visitors discussed and finalised the most appropriate quality activity to undertake this investigation.

### Quality activity: written questions

We design our assessment to be proportionate and appropriate to the issues identified and to seek input from relevant stakeholders when necessary. The issues we explored are as follows:

- Liability insurance requirements for learners - The visitors sought clarification around the requirements for liability insurance. To ensure that this was appropriately reflected in the profession specific information for potential applicants.
- Numbers of staff involved in teaching - The visitors sought clarification around the numbers of staff involved in teaching the programme and how the established staff from other professions would be involved in the teaching.
- Curriculum terminology and multi-disciplinary working - The visitors had questions related to the terminology referenced in some of the modules and how learners would understand a reflection of working in multi-disciplinary teams.
- Practice-based learning structure and practice educator capacity - The visitor had questions related to the availability of practice educators and how the education provider would ensure they were appropriately registered. The visitors also enquired about how the education provider had consulted with practice education partners around the proposed structure of practice education.

The visitors were satisfied with the provider's approaches in most areas following their detailed documentary review and group discussions. The areas of further investigation listed above were to address medium level risks to the providers approach in certain SETs. The visitors considered the education provider's view around mitigating these risks to be sufficient and so didn't require input external stakeholders or the education provider's partners.

To ensure the education provider had formalised and documented appropriate mitigations for the risks identified, the visitors requested a written response.

## Summary of visitor findings

### **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register**

The visitors were satisfied that the programme aligns with the level of qualification expected for entry onto the register as a chiropodist / podiatrist. The programme is also aligned to that of level 6 qualifications detailed in the Framework of Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awarding Bodies.

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

### **SET 2: Programme admissions**

The education provider highlighted their requirements for direct entry onto the programme that the visitors considered appropriate and suitable for applicants to be best placed to undertake eh programme.

The education provider also highlighted an alternative pathway for entry onto the programme by way of a foundation year offered at the University of Wolverhampton. The visitors also considered this pathway to be suitable for the programme while also ensuring a widening access approach.

The education provider also confirmed their requirements around liability insurance following further enquiry from the visitors and the visitors deemed this approach to suitable.

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

### **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership**

The education provider was able to demonstrate strong links with practice education providers. They confirmed that established providers who had supported the programme when it was delivered by another provider will still provide opportunities when delivered at the University of Wolverhampton. The education provider has also highlighted work with new partners to establish further opportunities and a broader range of practice based learning.

The programme will be staffed by a specific university ratio of profession specific members of staff. The education provider also confirmed that staff from other professions are involved in teaching and delivery where non-profession specific sessions are delivered. As such the visitors were confident that the programme would be supported by sufficient numbers of staff with the relevant expertise.

The education provider also demonstrated the availability of sufficient physical resources that would effectively support learners in the delivery of the programme.

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

### **SET 4: Programme design and delivery**

The visitors considered the programme curriculum to be appropriate for learners to meet the SOPs and be suitably prepared for practice as an autonomous professional. They also noted its mapping to professional body standards highlighting the curriculum's relevance to current practice.

The education provider confirmed that the programme would include a reflection of working within multi-disciplinary teams that the visitors considered important in preparing learners for current practice.

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

### **SET 5: Practice-based learning**

The visitor considered the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning to be suitable for learners to meet the learning outcomes. The visitors also noted that learners would no longer have access to a university clinic as part of the move to a new site of delivery. In reaction to this change the education provider indicated their intention to introduce simulation sessions and an increase in time spent in practice based learning.

Upon further investigation of these plans the visitors were satisfied the types of simulation activities would be appropriate for developing learner's clinical skills. Furthermore, as the education provider has demonstrated strong links with practice providers and collaboration with new partners, they considered the small increase in practice education time to be proportionate and deliverable. However, as there is an element of risk in this area that is not immediate, they considered that the education provider should reflect on this in their next approved education provider monitoring engagement.

The education provider highlighted that practice educators currently involved in delivery would remain working with the programme as it is delivered with the University of Wolverhampton. As the visitors enquired about increasing this pool for the additional learners, the education provider was able to detail their work with new partners and requirements for practice education staff. Both

around suitability and numbers. They also confirmed that all practice educators would be required to attend training before interacting with learners.

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

#### **SET 6: Assessment**

The visitors were able to see how the assessment strategy aligned with spiral curriculum and would enable learners to demonstrate the learning outcomes and SOPs.

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

### Section 3: The visitors' recommendations

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

#### Programme approval

The programme is recommended for approval, without conditions.

#### Areas to follow up through monitoring

As part of the provider's documentary submission, they highlighted that the transition of delivery from Birmingham Metropolitan College to the University of Wolverhampton would mean that learners would no longer have access to the clinic. As such the Education provider highlighted plans to replace the time spent in the clinic with simulation exercises and an increase in time spent in clinical practice education. The plans would require an increase in practice education of a few weeks for each academic year.

The visitors were able to see plans for increasing the time in practice education and considered the collaboration with partners to be strong and effective. Therefore, they considered the standards to be met related to this issue. However, they recommend that the plans are considered as a theme in the institution's approved education provider monitoring portfolio. This will give the opportunity for a reflection on the implementation of the proposals and for the HCPC to consider any risks following the implementation.

In its next Approved Education Provider portfolio submission, the institution should address:

- The effectiveness of substituting time in a university clinic with increasing time spent in suitable clinical placements in podiatry.
- The effectiveness of the use of simulation to prepare learner which has effectively supported learners to enter practice based learning settings.

### Section 4: Committee decision on approval

- We will record the decision of the Education and Training Committee here following their meeting on 26/05/2021.