

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing (Exemptions) for Orthoptists, Part time BSc (Hons) Orthoptics, Full time
Approval visit date	22-23 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12175-D6V2D0

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation .....	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 and standards for the use by orthoptists of exemptions to sell and supply medicines (for education providers) (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:

Christine Timms	Orthoptist
David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Frances Ashworth	Lay
Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

### Other groups involved in the approval visit

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

Helen Gallagher	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Glasgow Caledonian University
Elaine Skea	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Glasgow Caledonian University

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Entitlement	Orthoptist exemptions
First intake	01 September 2016 This intake date pre-dates the visit date in order to include those learners who will transfer on to the new programme in year two of their studies. These learners will be assessed to meet the standards for orthoptists using exemptions for the sale and supply of medicines in the second and third years of the new programme. This will enable learners from the 2016 intake on the old programme, who successfully complete and graduate from 2020 onwards, to apply for the annotation on the register.
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01943

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

- meets the standards of education and training;
- delivers the standards of proficiency for orthoptists; and
- delivers the standards for orthoptists using exemptions for the sale and supply of medicines.

The education provider informed the HCPC that their currently approved BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme has taken its last intake. The learners from this programme will transfer onto the second and third year of the new programme subject to this programme being approved. As this programme has now taken the last intake, and as it was not being changed by the education provider, it was not assessed via this approval visit.

The proposed new programme is intended as a pre-registration programme for orthoptists, with a contained module to also allow for individuals who successfully complete the programme the orthoptist exemption annotation.

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing (Exemptions) for Orthoptists
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Orthoptist exemptions
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01854

We undertook this assessment of a new post-graduate module proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether, within the

standards for the use by orthoptists of exemptions to sell and supply medicines, the programme:

- meets the standards for education providers; and
- delivers the standards for orthoptists using exemptions in legislation for+ the sale and supply of medicines.

The module will be accessible to HCPC-registered Orthoptists who intend to train in the annotation, and integrated within the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme, as noted above.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

#### Recommendation of the visitors

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

## **Conditions**

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 09 July 2018.

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

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

**Reason:** For this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individual who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors noted that the staff member identified was appropriately qualified and experienced and, on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were also shown the university wide Quality Enhancement and Assurance handbook at the visit, which highlighted the specification for the person with overall professional responsibility. In the specification it states the individual would “monitor admissions, progression and completion rates in accordance with the University and the external requirements PSRBs [Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies]”. However, the visitors were not given the process for identifying the individual along with the requisite qualifications and experience. They also could not determine how the requirements highlighted would ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced, and unless other arrangements are appropriate from the relevant part of the Register.

### **B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that the resources to support teaching and learning are accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the Non Medical Prescribing (Exemptions) for Orthoptists Student Handbook provided prior to the visit and clarification at the visit, the visitors

noted various instances of inaccurate information. The information in the Student Handbook was identical to the information in the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics programme. Examples include:

- Information about the length of the programme. The Handbook states that “the programme is taught largely by staff within Health and Life Sciences although there are also contributions from ophthalmologists from local hospitals in the 3rd and 4th years”. However, this is a 3-month programme.
- The information around the attendance requirements does not apply to the programme. The Handbook for example states, “Where you have failed to attend classes over 5 timetabled days, we will send you an email to your University email account advising you that your attendance is of concern”. However, learners will not attend five timetabled days for this programme, as this programme is timetabled for two weekends.

These are only some examples of inaccurate information identified in the Student Handbook, which will be made available to both learners and educators. Considering these and other instances, the visitors were not satisfied the education provider has ensured that learners will have the accurate information they require in order to support their learning, and ensure that the resources are effectively used. The programme team must provide the visitors with the amended final version of the documentation, to enable them to determine that it is accurate and appropriate for all.

## Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 August 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).