hcpc | health & care professions council

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (hons) Social Work (Uxbridge), FT (Full time)
Approval visit date	21 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13533-P9J4T0

Contents

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Anne Mackay	Social worker in England
David Ward	Social worker in England
Roseann Connolly	Lay
Tracey Samuel-Smith	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a joint visit with another HCPC panel, who were considering approval of the BSc (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning programme. The education provider appointed an internal panel who reviewed each of the programmes. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we came to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Ellie Smith	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Buckinghamshire New University

Leah Hill	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Buckinghamshire New University
Anne Followell	Internal panel member	Buckinghamshire New University
Ashley Church	Internal panel member	Buckinghamshire New University
Steven Pearce	Internal panel member	Buckinghamshire New University
Stephanie Davies	External panel member	Birkbeck College
HCPC BSc (Hons) Social Work (Uxbridge) panel members		
Graham Noyce	Social worker	HCPC
Patricia Higham	Social worker	HCPC
Frances Ashworth	Lay visitor	HCPC
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work (Uxbridge)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed first intake	01 February 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02028

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	This is a new programme, so we met with learners currently on the approved BSc (Hons) Social Work programme delivered at High Wycombe.
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 17 July 2019.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure appropriate, clear and consistent information is available to applicants which enables them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: In their mapping, the education provider referenced the Programme specification, which included information about the typical applicant profile and programme-specific entry requirements. From reviewing the website, the visitors noted a second Programme specification (dated April 2013, October 2018) which the programme team confirmed, was relevant to the current programme and academic year, rather than the new programme. The minimum UCAS tariff points outlined in the web version differed to the version submitted in the documentation. The visitors were

unclear how applicants would gain the information they required around academic entry standards, to be able to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer.

In addition, the visitors noted that the programme specifications did not make a distinction between the programme currently offered in High Wycombe, and the new programme being approved in Uxbridge. The senior team informed the visitors that information about the Uxbridge programme would be available on the website once the programme gained approval. The programme team confirmed the High Wycombe and Uxbridge programmes would run separately, with a cohort being recruited specifically for Uxbridge. This would mean the cohort at High Wycombe starts in October, while the cohort at Uxbridge starts in February. The visitors were unclear how applicants would gain the information they required around where the programme was delivered, to be able to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer on the new programme.

Therefore the education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates the information which will be available to potential applicants for the Uxbridge programme. This evidence must demonstrate it is sufficient for applicants to make a considered choice about whether to apply to and accept a place on the programme.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the equality and diversity policies, in relation to applicants to the programme, are implemented and monitored.

Reason: In their mapping, the education provider referenced Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policies available on their website. From their review of these policies, the visitors noted these related to students, employees or visitors. They could not find a policy applicable for applicants to the programme. The mapping also referenced the Annual monitoring policy published by the Academic Registry. From this, the visitors learnt of the School Annual Monitoring Meetings (SAMMs). One theme of the SAMMs is marketing, applications and recruitment which covers the application numbers for the coming year and enrolment numbers for the current year. The senior and programme teams informed the visitors about how the SAMMs work for retention and achievement. The visitors received a copy of a SAMM report from 2017-18 and identified in section SAMM 1, discussions about application, recruitment and marketing. Within this section, the visitors noted the comment 'The School of Health Care and Social Work demonstrates a significant widening participation demographic'. However, the visitors were unable to identify what this meant specifically for the social work programme. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the policy laid out by the Academic Registry is translated and implemented by the programme, including how the policies are monitored. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored, at a programme level, in relation to applicants.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the programme management structure in place for the Uxbridge programme and how this ensures the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the Programme handbook which identified five key role descriptions for the management of the programme. Lecturers were not identified within this, nor were names provided to match these roles to individuals delivering and managing the programme. For example, from the Programme handbook, and the programme team meeting, the visitors were unable to identify who the programme leader would be for the Uxbridge programme.

The senior team confirmed that staff (academic and support) would need to be based at Uxbridge, though it was fairly routine to travel between the High Wycombe and Uxbridge sites. The programme team confirmed that staff would be travelling between sites and that at the start of each academic year, it would be decided which staff were to be delivering the modules at both sites. They confirmed, that due to the different start dates for the High Wycombe (October) and Uxbridge (February) programmes, it would be possible to deliver the modules without potential clashes. The visitors also learnt that the process of determining who would be teaching which modules and when, had not been undertaken.

From this information, the visitors were unclear about the programme management structure in place for the Uxbridge programme, including who will be involved in leading, managing and delivering the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the programme management structure in place for the Uxbridge programme, and how this ensures the programme is effectively managed.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how regular and effective strategic collaboration occurs with practice education providers, around programme design and delivery.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referenced pages 29-31 of the Programme handbook. From their review of this document, the visitors noted it ended on page 22. The programme team confirmed the mapping should have referred to the Practice Curriculum First and Final Placements: Social Work document. On these pages, the visitors learnt about how quality assurance of practice-based learning is undertaken. For example, through placement audits, quality assurance of practice educators and work based supervisors, and work based learning courses for supervisors. The visitors recognised how the programme ensures the quality of practice-based learning on an ongoing basis.

However, they were unclear about the regular collaboration, at a strategic level, with practice education providers to influence the design and delivery of the programme. The senior team confirmed there was no regular forum in place for practice education providers and the programme team to discuss issues relating to the programme design and / or delivery. In addition, the practice educators confirmed they had not been involved in discussions about the development of the new programme. The programme team outlined the good relationships between the programme and practice-based learning, confirming these arrangements are currently informal between specific individuals. There is a move within the education provider for more senior management to meet with the local authorities and they are working on formulising these arrangements at a more strategic level.

From this information, the visitors were unclear how the programme undertakes regular collaboration which influences the design and delivery of the programme. In addition, they were unclear how the arrangements for more strategic involvement will ensure regular and effective collaboration. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: In the mapping, the visitors were referred to two curriculum vitea for individuals responsible for the development and administration of practice-based learning. The visitors were unclear from this, of the process used to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning. The programme team confirmed there would be 25 learners per cohort on this programme and the Degree Apprenticeship, also being visited. These learners are on top of the 158 learners currently on approved social work programmes at the education provider. The senior and programme teams confirmed that a major source of ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning was via individuals asking to complete Stage 1 and 2 Practice Educator Courses (PEPS). This was because the provider offered these courses for free, if the local authority committed to accepting a learner. The visitors recognised how this informal process had worked well for the provider previously. However, they were unclear about how, with the increased number of learners, this process would continue to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors received no further information about a formal process used to ensure there will be a sufficient number so that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs. Therefore the visitors require evidence which demonstrates how the programme ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to the module descriptor for SW622 Inter-Professional Practice. The module descriptor states that "This module will enable the student to engage effectively and meaningfully with colleagues from other professions." The visitors understood that this module would include lectures which would involve teaching from professionals in other relevant professions, and that learners would experience interprofessional learning while undertaking work based learning. The visitors were not clear whether the module would involve learners learning with and from learners in other relevant professions. At the visit, the programme team said that they have previously had sessions where learners on social work programmes would engage in learning with learners on the nursing programmes offered by the education provider. The programme team said that they no longer have these sessions, due to the challenges in the different schedules for these learners to find time for sessions together. The programme team highlighted that learners have opportunities to

work in interprofessional teams in the work place. The visitors did not hear any other examples of specific scheduled time for learners on this programme to learn with and from learners in other relevant professions. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions to determine whether this standard is met.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there is an effective process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to the Ethics Policy, which contains a section in relation to obtaining consent of vulnerable people or groups, or their representatives. The visitors did not see information about obtaining consent from learners on the programme, for situations where they take part as service users themselves in practical and clinical teaching. At the visit, the learners said that they were not aware of any explicit consent procedure, and suggested that consent is implied when you start the programme, as it is expected you will take part in those kind of activities. The programme team confirmed that there is no formal consent procedure for learners in place, and that they would look to develop one.

The guidance for this standard states that the education provider should not assume that the broad consent a learner gives at the beginning of the programme, will cover all situations. In some cases, it will be necessary to get explicit consent from learners in relation to them taking part in a specific activity, such as role play. The visitors have not seen or heard of a process for obtaining appropriate consent from learners, therefore they cannot determine whether this standard is met. The visitors require evidence that there is an effective process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they monitor practice educators attendance at, or completion of, refresher training to ensure they are up to date with information appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: In the mapping, the education provider referred to the Practice Learning Quality Assurance pages of the Practice Curriculum Handbook. This outlined the Work Based Learning Courses for Supervisors and the Practice Educator Courses (PEPS) run every year. The visitors recognised the initial training supervisors and practice educators undertake prior to receiving a learner. However, the visitors were unclear about how regularly refresher training was provided to ensure supervisors and practice educators remained up to date with the information necessary to support learning and assess learners effectively. The practice educators confirmed they attended refresher courses, though they did not elaborate on the timing or the content of these. They did confirm the education provider uses Blackboard to communicate changes about the programme to the practice educators. However, the visitors noted no additional information was provided about how regularly refresher courses / Blackboard messages

are utilised nor how the provider monitors these to ensure attendance at, or completion of, refresher training. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Approval visit date	21 - 22 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13696-V4F4C5

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:

Frances Ashworth	Lay
Graham Noyce	Social worker
Patricia Higham	Social worker
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a joint visit with another HCPC panel, who were considering approval of the BSC (Hons) Social Work (Uxbridge) programme. The education provider appointed an internal panel who reviewed each of the programmes. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Internal panel members		
Ellie Smith	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Buckinghamshire New University
Leah Hill	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Buckinghamshire New University

Anne Followell	Internal panel member	Buckinghamshire New University
Steven Pearce	Internal panel member	Buckinghamshire New University
Ashley Church	Internal panel member	Buckinghamshire New University
Stephanie Davies	External panel member	Birkbeck College
HCPC BSc (Hons) Social Work (Uxbridge) panel members		
Anne Mackay	Social worker	HCPC
David Ward	Social worker	HCPC
Roseann Connolly	Lay visitor	HCPC
Tracey Samuel-Smith	HCPC executive	HCPC

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02029

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	This is a new programme, so we met with learners currently on the approved BSc (Hons) Social Work programme delivered at High Wycombe.
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 17 July 2019.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the admissions process will give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to the Programme Specification document which contained information about the programme and admission requirements. In the programme specification, the visitors read that applicants will be required to have cleared the employer's selection process, which is usually undertaken jointly with the education provider. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear whether applicants for this programme would also undergo the standard admissions procedure for applicants, or what the selection process from

employers would include. At the visit, the programme team explained that there will be a selection process initiated by employers, and the selected applicants would then be invited to attend a selection day at the education provider, similar to the process for the current approved social work programmes. The programme team also highlighted that applicants for this programme will be required to undergo assessments to meet the employer's criteria and degree apprenticeship requirements.

The visitors understood that the admissions process would be a collaborative process between the education provider and employers, and that applicants would need to meet the requirements of both. However, the visitors have not seen how applicants will be informed of these requirements, which would give them sufficient information about the selection and application process. For example, the visitors have not seen any draft advertising material which would be presented to potential applicants. The visitors require further evidence information of the information provided to applicants, which demonstrates that applicants will have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme is sustainable.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider said that degree apprenticeships are a core part of the business plan, with a number of apprenticeships already being delivered and some being developed. The education provider did not submit evidence of the arrangements they have in place with the employers, who will be involved with delivering the programme. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with any senior members from the employers who will be involved in delivering the programme. The programme team discussed the arrangements they have with five local authorities, and the collaboration they have had so far in developing the programme.

The visitors heard verbal reassurances from the education provider that they have arrangements in place with the employers, who are committed to delivering the proposed programme. However, the visitors have not seen evidence of their commitment to the programme, and have not heard from senior members from the employers about their commitment. This standard requires that the education provider can demonstrate that the programme is secure and is supported by all stakeholders. The visitors have not seen evidence of support from the employers involved in delivering this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the collaboration and commitment between the education provider and employers which demonstrates the programme is sustainable.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there is an effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints, considering learners on this programme are both employees and learners.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to their student complaint policy and academic appeals process. Learners on this programme will be both learners and employees for the duration of the programme. The visitors were not

clear if learners would follow a different process if they made a complaint while undertaking work based learning at their place of employment. If the learners were to follow the employer's complaints process, the visitors were not clear how the education provider ensures this is a thorough and effective process, or how learners would be aware of what process to follow.

At the visit, the programme team explained that the process the learner should follow will depend on the nature of the complaint. For example, the education provider said if it is an issue at the workplace, the employer processes will take priority. The programme team said they are currently still working out the details of this process for apprenticeship learners. The visitors have not seen information about how the education provider ensures the employer's complaints process is effective, or how the learners are made aware of this process, should they need to use it while on the programme. The visitors were also not clear how learners would be aware of what process they should follow (whether it is the education provider's or employer's process) for a complaint made while on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information which demonstrates there is an effective process in place for receiving and responding to learners complaints for apprenticeship learners.

4.6 The learning and teaching methods used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning and teaching methods are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to the Programme Specification document and module descriptors. The education provider submitted a draft delivery schedule for the programme, which indicates that learners will be work based for four days a week, with scheduled teaching and study time on Friday each week. The visitors understood that Friday would be block teaching days, however it was not clear what the scheduled taught hours would be for those days. While there was some indication of assessment on those days, it was not clear what the assessment schedule will be.

At the visit, the programme team explained the core teaching hours, and that learners would be required to attend teaching sessions at the education provider each Friday for seven hours. The programme team also said that teaching hours will also depend on the number of hours allocated to each module. This standard is about making sure that the methods you use to deliver the programme support learners to achieve the learning outcomes. The schedule gives some indication of teaching time, independent study time and assessment, and the programme team further explained the details of delivery of the programme. However, the visitors were only presented with a draft copy with limited details in the initial submission. While the visitors had heard some verbal reassurances about the learning and teaching time on the programme, the visitors have not seen a detailed timetable or assessment schedule, they could not determine how this would work in practice. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the delivery of teaching and taught content, which demonstrates the learning and teaching methods are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to the module descriptor for SW607 Collaborative Working and Organisational Change. The module descriptor states that "This module will enable the student to engage effectively and meaningfully with colleagues from other professions." The visitors understood that this module would include seminars which would involve teaching from professionals in other relevant professions, and that learners would experience interprofessional learning while undertaking work based learning. The visitors were not clear whether the module would involve learners learning with and from learners in other relevant professions. At the visit, the programme team said that they have previously had sessions where learners on social work programmes would engage in learning with learners on the nursing programmes offered by the education provider. The programme team said that they no longer have these sessions, due to the challenges in the different schedules for these learners to find time for sessions together. The programme team highlighted that learners have opportunities to work in interprofessional teams in the work place. The visitors did not hear any other examples of specific scheduled time for learners on this programme to learn with and from learners in other relevant professions. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions to determine whether this standard is met.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there is an effective process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to the Ethics Policy, which contains a section in relation to obtaining consent of vulnerable people or groups, or their representatives. The visitors did not see information about obtaining consent from learners on the programme, for situations where they take part as service users themselves in practical and clinical teaching. At the visit, the learners said that they were not aware of any explicit consent procedure, and suggested that consent is implied when you start the programme, as it is expected you will take part in those kind of activities. The programme team confirmed that there is no formal consent procedure for learners in place, and that they would look to develop one.

The guidance for this standard states that the education provider should not assume that the broad consent a learner gives at the beginning of the programme, will cover all situations. In some cases, it will be necessary to get explicit consent from learners in relation to them taking part in a specific activity, such as role play. The visitors have not seen or heard of a process for obtaining appropriate consent from learners, therefore they cannot determine whether this standard is met. The visitors require evidence that there is an effective process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	City College Norwich
Validating body	University of East Anglia
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship, Full time
Approval visit date	23-24 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-14394-X9V5D6

Contents

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:

Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Christine Stogdon	Social worker
Joanne Watchman	Lay
John Archibald	HCPC executive
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive (observer)

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

Neil Cooper	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of East Anglia
Hannah Jackson	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of East Anglia
Mel Hughes	External panel member	Bournemouth University
Penny Black	Internal panel member	University of East Anglia

| Sharon Davies | Internal panel member | University of East Anglia |

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed first intake	01 January 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02071

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	The programme is not approved and has not run, so we met with learners from the CMI Operations / Departmental Manager Higher Apprenticeship programme, and the BA (Hons) Applied Social Work programmes, which was approved by HCPC and is now closed.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 12 July 2019.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify who will pay for the additional costs associated with the programme, and how this will be communicated to applicants.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation that applicants would have to provide proof of their DBS check. During the meeting with the senior team, the visitors were informed that the responsibility to carry out criminal conviction checks would lie with the employer. However, the visitors could not see any information about who was responsible for paying for the criminal conviction check. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that applicants to this programme have all the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on this programme. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they let applicants know about the costs associated with the programme, in particular the additional cost associated with criminal convictions checks.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide information to ensure applicants are aware that part of the admissions process would be a role play scenario, and about obtaining consent from applicants to participate in the role play.

Reason: The visitors were made aware that as part of the admissions process, those applicants shortlisted for a place on the programme had to participate in an observed role play scenario. The visitors considered the role play might act as a trigger of negative emotions for applicants. During the meeting with the senior team, the visitors were informed there was the intention of gaining consent from applicants to participate in the role play. However, the visitors could not see any information about this is in the information for applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure that applicants have all the information they require about the admissions process. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they let applicants know that a role play scenario is part of the admissions process, and obtaining consent to participate in the role play.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide information to demonstrate that the admissions procedures offer equality of opportunity to all applicants, especially those who may be in a protected category.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware the education provider has an equality and diversity policy in place. During the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that the education provider would want to facilitate those employed on a part time basis because of protected characteristics joining the programme. However, the visitors could not see how the education provider intended to achieve this, or any information related to this in the equality and diversity policy. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that the admissions procedures offer equality of opportunity to all applicants, especially those who may be in a protected category.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate their commitment to current and future staffing plans, to ensure the programme is sustainable.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware of the tender document which sets out the agreement between the education provider and Norfolk County Council (NCC), who will be providing the learners for the programme. The visitors noted the tender document between NCC and the education provider, which required the programme to be adequately resourced, with an appropriate number of suitably qualified and registered teaching staff, who are knowledgeable and skills in the areas they will be teaching. The education provider noted that by signing the contract, they had committed to the staffing and management of the programme. The visitors also heard the education provider was confident in providing the amount of staff resources according to the programme needs. However, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider would ensure that there would be appropriate staffing for the programme as it progresses and recruits each cohort of learners. The visitors were also not sure how the education provider would review and if required increase staff resources to deliver the programme, to ensure that the programme has enough resources for delivery. As such, the education provider must provide evidence on current and future arrangements that the education provider would be committed in regards to staffing that the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the lines of responsibility for the programme to ensure there is effective management.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware areas of the governance of the programme will include representatives from both Norfolk County Council (NCC) and University of East Anglia (UEA). From discussions at the visit, the visitors were informed that the education provider and NCC had held a number of meetings around programme management. However, from these conversations and from the documentation, the visitors were unsure who was responsible for the co-ordination of the programme and were not able to see that the education provider had clear oversight of the management systems and structures within NCC to ensure the programme will be effectively managed. The visitors therefore require clarification as to who is responsible for the coordination of the programme within the partnership to ensure there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the programme lead, the deputy director of HE and the academic lead for Health and Social Care to evidence this standard. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individuals who have overall professional responsibility of the programme. The visitors noted the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced. However, the visitors did not receive information to confirm how the education provider identifies a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As such the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate they have an effective process in place to ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how service users and carers will be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware the education provider will explore reforming their service user and carer involvement group. The service users and carers informed the visitors they had met with the programme lead and had discussed the planning of the programme. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were informed the programme had plans to use service users and carers in the programme. The education provider supplied further information about the service user and carer involvement on the programme at the visit

but the visitors did not have the opportunity to look at the information. The visitors did not see a defined plan of service users and carers' involvement, or how the involvement will be monitored and evaluated. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that service users and carers will contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme to ensure learners completing the programme are fit to practice.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From the documents provided, the visitors were made aware the education provider has two qualified and registered social workers who will lead and teach on the programme. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed the programme lead would be undertaking teaching on the first year, and the programme would use sessional lecturers if necessary. From the information, the visitors were unclear whether there was an adequate number of staff in place to undertake all requirements of the programme, the number of learners, their needs and the learning outcomes to be achieved. The visitors therefore require more information which demonstrates there is a sufficient number of staff to deliver the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively.

Reason: From the documents provided, the visitors were made aware the education provider has two qualified and registered social workers who will lead and teach on the programme. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed three staff are qualified in social work. One of these is a sessional lecturer and another is the programme lead on a separate programme. The visitors were unclear whether educators on the programme are suitable and have the required specialist knowledge and expertise to take part in teaching and to support learning in the subject areas they are involved in. The visitors therefore need further information to demonstrate educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure clear information is provided to learners about the process to raise complaints.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors were made aware the education provider have a student complaints procedure. However, due to the nature of this programme being mainly conducted in the workplace, the visitors were unclear as to what complaints process the learners should follow in different settings. In the learner meeting, the visitors were informed a learner complaint would be initially made with the

education provider. In the meeting with the practice educators, the visitors understood that learners would initially raise complaints with the practice educator tutor. From this information, the visitors were unclear which process the learners should be using or how learners, academic staff and practice educators would know what process to follow. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether the process for receiving learner complaints is thorough and effective. As such, the visitors require further evidence that clearly defines which process the learners will use should they need to raise a complaint and how all parties involved are informed of this process so that it is clear to all who could be involved.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware of some topics within modules which were described as 'enhancement / extra-curricular topics'. These topics were:
- Induction;
- The social worker;
- Digital skills;
- Ethics and values;
- Embracing diversity;
- Anti-oppressive practice;
- Cultural competence;
- Domestic violence;
- Substance misuse;
- Professional resilience;
- Learning disabilities / autism;
- Poverty and social justice;
- Contemporary issues in social work;
- Preparation for the EPA gateway; and
- EPA preparation and support

The visitors considered these topics to be among core topics in the professional experience of a social worker and if they were not studied learners would not be able meet the SOPs for social workers in England. For example, the visitors considered if a learner chose not to undertake the topic of digital skills in the Higher Learning Skills and / or Introduction to Social Work Practice modules, they would not meet SOP 14.8, that Registrant social workers in England must:
- be able to demonstrate a level of skill in the use of information technology appropriate to their practice.

Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how the learning outcomes ensure that learners will meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure the SOPs are covered by the learning outcomes in the programme so learners meet the SOPs.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programmes, and how they will ensure that learners learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were made aware staff from other degree apprenticeship programmes will be involved in teaching on the programme. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were informed the education provider proposed to group learners from different programmes to learn together if appropriate for them to do so. However, with this limited amount of detail, the visitors were unable to see definite plans for interprofessional learning on the programme and were unsure whether interprofessional learning on the programme was relevant as possible for learners and for the most benefit for their future professional practice. The visitors therefore require further information about what types of interprofessional learning will take place on the programme, and the professions and the length of time involved, to ensure learners are prepared to work with other professionals and across professions.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must ensure there is an effective process for obtaining consent from service users in all settings on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware the programme has an effective process for obtaining consent from service users within practice-based learning. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed an addendum about gaining consent from service users in the teaching setting had been submitted internally for approval. However, the visitors had not had sight of this document in its approved and final form. Therefore, the visitors could not be sure there was a system in place for obtaining consent from service users who interact with learners in circumstances outside of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure service users who interact with learners give appropriate consent in all settings on the programme.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that their attendance policy is clear and consistent in programme documentation, along with how these requirements are communicated to learners.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted learners have to attend a minimum of 90 per cent of the taught modules, and 100 per cent of the assessed practice placement days. In the programme team meeting, the visitors understood there were two separate policies in regards to attendance, one owned by the education provider and one by Norfolk County Council (NCC). Although the education provider supplied information of the attendance policies of both bodies at the visit, the visitors did not have the opportunity to review them. The visitors could not be sure that the systems in place to monitor attendance (and to take appropriate action if learners fail to attend the compulsory parts of the programme) are appropriate and clear to the programme's stakeholders. The visitors therefore need to review the attendance policies, and consider how these policies would work in practice, to ensure stakeholders are aware of

the requirements on the programme and any consequences of missing compulsory parts of the programme.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the practice educators have the necessary knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware Norfolk County Council (NCC) holds a list of those individuals who are registered as practice educators and has responsibility for identifying suitable practice educators. In the meeting with practice educators, the visitors understood practice educators undertake initial and ongoing training through UEA. However, the visitors were not clear whether the education provider has access to this information, to ensure practice educators have the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to be able to support safe and effective practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further information to show the education provider has processes in place to check that practice educators have the necessary knowledge, skills and experience and are appropriately registered.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice educators undertake regular training appropriate to the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted Norfolk County Council (NCC) holds a list of those individuals who are registered as practice educators and have responsibility for identifying suitable practice educators. In the meeting with practice educators, the visitors were informed practice educators undertake initial and ongoing training through UEA. However, the visitors were not clear whether the education provider has access to information regarding who is trained and who has undertaken ongoing training. The visitors therefore require further information, which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice educators are appropriately prepared to be able to support learning and assess learners effectively.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Lincoln
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning
Approval visit date	11-12 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14441-C0X8G4

Contents

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:

Graham Noyce	Social Worker
Sheila Skelton	Social Worker
Susanne Roff	Lay
Lawrence Martin	Education Officer
Tracey Samuel-Smith	Education Manager (Observer)

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

John Slack	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Lincoln
Louise Thompson	Secretary Day 1 (supplied by the education provider)	University of Lincoln

Tanya Spratt	Secretary Day 2 (supplied by the education provider)	University of Lincoln
Martin Pinnick	Internal validation member (on day 2)	University of Lincoln

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
Proposed first intake	01/09/2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02079

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

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

Group	Met	Comments

Learners	Yes	As the programme was new, we met with learners from the MSc Social Work programme
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 22 August 2019.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate they give the applicant the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the standards mapping document stated that the website was currently in progress. The visitors noted the education provider referred to a programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors also noted the programme specification provided an outline of the admissions process, including the interview process and the desired skills applicants should have before applying. The programme handbook did not discuss the admissions process. The visitors were unclear whether the programme specification would be available to applicants prior to applying for the programme. During the senior and programme team meetings, the visitors learnt that information about the programme will be available on their website, and that information is currently given through employers as the programme is employer led. The programme team went on to clarify how they felt it was important to host information on the website due to the geographic range of the programme. This

way they could ensure potential applicants from the East Riding of Yorkshire to Rutland, could receive the same information prior to applying to the programme.

As no information about the website was available from the education provider, the visitors were unclear what information would be available to potential applicants to ensure they had all the information they required to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates the information which potential applicants will be given to make an informed decision regarding the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify who the programme lead and deputy are, and what their roles and responsibilities will be within the programme.

Reason: The education provider made reference in the standards mapping to the Programme Management Structure and staff curriculum vitae's (CV's). In the CV's, the education provider named two individuals as the joint programme leader and one Deputy Head of School. The Programme Management Structure outlined to the visitors the roles and responsibilities of all staff, including the Deputy Head of School and programme leaders. However, from the documentation provided, the visitors were unclear on how the roles and responsibilities would be divided between the joint programme leaders or if, one individual held sole responsibility for the programme.

In the senior and programme team meetings, the visitors learnt the education provider had recently come to the decision to appoint one of the two individuals to the programme leader role and the second as the deputy programme leader. However, the visitors remained unclear about how the roles and responsibilities of the programme leader role would be shared between these individuals. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the programme was effectively managed and therefore, require clarification of the programme lead, the deputy and their roles and responsibilities within the programme.

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 clarify the process for ensuring 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

Reason: To evidence this standard, the standards mapping document referred to a document entitled Application Guidance on Leadership Duties – Programme Leader. The document discussed the process for appointing a programme leader and provided information about the skills and attributes that would be beneficial for the role. As part of this, the guidance included an expression of interest form which potential applicants would use to apply for the role.

In the senior and programme team meetings, the visitors learnt the education provider had recently come to the decision to appoint an individual to the programme leader role

and a second as their deputy. From their review of the curriculum vitae for the appointed programme leader, the visitors noted they were currently not on the relevant part of the HCPC Register. Upon seeking further clarification regarding this, it was suggested that the programme leader could be adjusted if necessary.

In addition, from their review of the Application Guidance on Leadership Duties – Programme Leader document, the visitors identified that potential applicants would be required to have relevant qualifications and knowledge related to the programme content. However, they were unable to identify what this would mean in relation to this particular programme. For example, the visitors were unclear as to whether the programme leader would need to be on the HCPC Register. Alternatively, if the programme leader was not on the HCPC Register, how the education provider ensured they were appropriate for the role and had access to the necessary information and resources for social work.

From this information, the visitors were unclear about how the process for appointing a programme leader works, within the programme, to ensure the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to The Together Group documents. These documents discussed how service users and carers are given a range of opportunities to participate on other programmes within the university but did not talk about the degree apprenticeship programme. A feedback document also provided, showed that service users and carers were able to express their views and concerns about these programmes. Upon their review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the module descriptors and information on the End Point Assessment (EPA) did not go into detail about how service users and carers would be involved. For example, module descriptors, such as for Professional Social Work Practice, stated there will be a focus on service users, carers and citizens' perspectives. However, it was unclear to the visitors how service users and carers would be involved within the module.

During the service user and carers meeting, the visitors learnt about the wide range of activities being undertaken in other programmes and the Human Library project being run across the university which allows learners the opportunity to meet service users and carers, listen to their stories and ask questions. However, when asked, the service users and carers confirmed they currently had no information about how or if they will be involved with the degree apprenticeship programme.

During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that service user and carer involvement will be negotiated with employers as many employers have their own groups. The programme team recognised that service users and carers could be involved in the programme in areas such as assessment and broader strategic thinking.

From this information, the visitors are unclear on the broader strategy to involve service users and carers throughout the degree apprenticeship programme. Therefore, the visitors will need to see further evidence of how service users and carers will be included within the programme to ensure this standard is met.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the resources to support learning in all settings are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

Reason: Upon a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted instances of incomplete and out-of-date information. In the module descriptors, the visitors noted that the range of legislation cited in Social Work with Adults was not always contemporary, consistent or correct. Furthermore, within the module descriptors, the visitors noted assessment methods such as 'Practice learning 0% (pass/fail) LO1' (Professional Development Review One) and 'Reflective analysis LO1 – LO4' (Using Knowledge in Practice). The programme team explained their overall approach to assessment and acknowledged that detail within the module descriptors could be expanded upon to include further details about the assessment method to ensure learners are fully aware of what is expected of them. The visitors were therefore unclear how learners would be provided with effective and appropriate information about relevant legislation and assessments throughout the programme.

In addition, from the programme team, the visitor's learnt that the universities internal structure made it difficult for the modules and assessments to be amended once they were 'locked' into the system. The programme team confirmed that more detailed information will be in the student handbook which will be available after the programme receives internal validation. From this information, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider ensures that learners have the complete and up-to date information they require in order to support their learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that the resources to support learning are complete and up to date to demonstrate how they are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the process / processes for receiving and responding to learner complaints, including:
- Who is responsible for these; and
- How they work together to ensure they are thorough and effective.

Reason: From the standards of education and training mapping document, the education provider referred to the programme handbook. The document discussed the university Student Complaint Procedure in place for learners. In the learners meeting, which consisted of individuals from the MSc programme, the visitors were told how they had been informed of the complaints procedure and that they had some experience of using it. Due to the different model of delivery, the visitors were unclear whether the degree apprenticeship programme would follow the same university process as the MSc programme and how the process would work in conjunction with the employers.

During the practice educators meeting, the visitors were informed that learners can raise complaints through both the education provider and their employer and how learners are provided with documentation surrounding this before starting the programme. The practice educators also confirmed that, as every learner is allocated a personal tutor, they could speak to their tutor rather than raise a concern through their employer's process.

The visitors established that both the university and employers have processes and procedures in place for responding to learner complaints. However, it was unclear who an apprenticeship learner should complain to and in what circumstances. The visitors therefore require further evidence about the process / processes for receiving and responding to apprentice learner complaints, who is responsible for these, and how they work together to ensure they are thorough and effective.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the process / processes in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, including:
- Who is responsible for these; and
- How they work together to ensure they are effective.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to the module descriptors, the programme handbook and the memorandum of understanding. The documents discussed the university 'whistle blowing' process in place for raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and carers. In the learners meeting, which consisted of individuals from the MSc programme, the visitors were told how they had been informed of the whistleblowing process and that they had some experience of using this and had found the process to be efficient. Due to the different model of delivery, the visitors were unclear whether the degree apprenticeship programme would follow the same university process as the MSc programme and how the process would work in conjunction with the employers.

During the practice educators meeting, the visitors were informed that learners can raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users through both the education provider and their employer. The practice educators also confirmed that, as every learner is allocated a personal tutor, the learner could speak to their tutor rather than raise a concern through their employer's process.

The visitors established that both the university and employers have processes and procedures for reporting concerns surrounding the safety and wellbeing of service users. However, it was unclear who an apprenticeship learner should raise any concerns with and in what circumstances. The visitors therefore require further evidence about the process / processes in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, who is responsible for these, and how they work together to ensure they are effective.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum remains relevant to current practice on an ongoing basis.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider discussed that considerable research takes place within the School which helps to inform teaching and learning. They also submitted staff curriculum vitae for this standard, to demonstrate those who are engaged in continuing professional development in a number of ways. The visitors recognised the research and CPD activities being undertaken. However, upon a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted instances of out-of-date information. In the module descriptors, the visitors noted that the range of legislation cited in Social Work with Adults was not always contemporary, consistent or correct. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the research and CPD activities ensured the curriculum remained relevant and updated in line with developments in the profession.

During the programme team meeting, the visitor's learnt that the university's internal structure made it difficult for the modules and assessments to be amended once they were 'locked' into the system. The programme team confirmed the updated information will be in the student handbook which will be available after they receives internal validation. However, this information was not available at the visit and therefore the visitors were unsure about how the research and CPD activities ensures the module content reflects current practice. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the revised modules to ensure the curriculum is relevant to current practice, in addition to any plans to ensure the curriculum remains relevant to current practice.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how learners learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to the programme specification document and the programme handbook. These documents outlined that learners will have one day a week of protected learning time which will include interprofessional learning events. It also outlined that other learning days will be untimetabled and the learner is expected to proactively identify and agree learning needs through activities such as insight days (e.g. the opportunity to explore the work of other professionals). The documentation did not provide further details about which other professional groups might be involved in the interprofessional events.

In the senior team meeting, the visitors heard that learners are increasingly exposed to learning as part of a multi-disciplinary team within practice-based learning and that each learner will have an individual training plan which may including shadowing an individual from another profession. In addition, the senior and programme teams outlined that visiting speakers regularly deliver lecturers and that these speakers are from a wide variety of professions. The visitors were therefore satisfied learners would be able to learn with, and from, other relevant professions.

The senior team also confirmed that workshops are being developed for the degree apprenticeship learners to learn with learners from other professions. However, due to the limited time spent within the university, there were timetabling difficulties in arranging these. The senior team recognised they would have to be very mindful about

how to involve degree apprenticeship learners in interprofessional learning. From this information, the visitors were unclear how learners will learn with, and from, learners from other relevant professions. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification on how this will occur within the programme, to demonstrate this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures an individual is able to meet the standards of proficiency upon successful completion of the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to the programme specification. The programme specification outlines the assessment and feedback strategy and explains how the module handbooks should include all learning outcomes, details about the assessment task, specific and general assessment criteria and detailed marking criteria. Upon a review of the module descriptors, the visitors noted assessment methods such as 'Practice learning 0% (pass/fail) LO1' (Professional Development Review One), 'Reflective analysis LO1 – LO4' (Using Knowledge in Practice) and 'Written Critical Case Study (Being a Social Worker/End Point Assessment). The visitors were unable to identify from the module descriptors detailed information about the assessment task, assessment criteria, marking criteria and in some cases, the particular learning outcomes being assessed.

The programme team explained their overall approach to assessment and acknowledged that detail within the module descriptors could be expanded upon to include further information about assessments. They also confirmed that the university's internal structure made it difficult for the modules and assessments, to be amended once they were 'locked' into the system. In addition, the visitors received confirmation the updated information will be in the student handbook which will be available after they receive internal validation. However, this information was not available at the visit.

From this information, the visitors were unclear about the assessment task, assessment criteria, marking criteria and in some cases, the particular learning outcomes being assessed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the assessment design and strategy ensures an individual is able to meet the standards of proficiency upon successful completion of the programme.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how assessments, throughout the programme, ensure learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to the programme specification document. The programme specification outlines the assessment and feedback strategy and explains how the module handbooks will include all learning outcomes, details about the assessment task, specific and general assessment criteria and detailed marking criteria. Upon a review of the module descriptors, the visitors

noted assessment methods such as 'Practice learning 0% (pass/fail) LO1' (Professional Development Review One), 'Reflective analysis LO1 – LO4' (Using Knowledge in Practice) and 'Written Critical Case Study (Being a Social Worker/End Point Assessment). The visitors were unable to identify from the module descriptors detailed information about the assessment task, assessment criteria, marking criteria and in some case, the particular learning outcomes being assessed. The visitors were therefore unclear about which assessments ensured that learners demonstrated they would be able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

The programme team explained their overall approach to assessment and acknowledged that detail within the module descriptors could be expanded upon to include further information about assessments. They also confirmed that the universities internal structure made it difficult for the modules and assessments, to be amended once they were 'locked' into the system. The programme team confirmed the updated information will be in the student handbook which will be available after they received internal validation. However, this information was not available at the visit,

In addition, the education provider referred to their Fitness to Practise Regulations, which outlined the universities general regulation policies and what is expected of learners. The visitors could not determine from this document, how learners would demonstrate how they meet the expectations of professional behaviour through the assessments on the programme.

From this information, the visitors were unclear about the detailed assessment criteria throughout the programme which ensured that learners would be able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate this standard is met.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how assessments provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider discussed the processes by which modules are assessed, both internally and externally. To evidence this, they referred to a Module Guidance 2018-2019 document. This document provides guidance about the requirements for developing and assessment of modules. In addition, it outlines the information which assessment briefs should include, such as, any specific constraints or requirements (e.g. word limits), submission procedures and deadlines. Upon a review of the module descriptors, the visitors noted assessment methods such as 'Practice learning 0% (pass/fail) LO1' (Professional Development Review One), 'Reflective analysis LO1 – LO4' (Using Knowledge in Practice) and 'Written Critical Case Study' (Being a Social Worker/End Point Assessment). The visitors noted that the module descriptors did not contain detailed information such as was outlined in the Module Guidance 2018-19. From the detail provided the visitors were unclear about how the assessments demonstrated an objective, fair and reliable measures of progression and achievement. The programme team explained their overall approach to assessment and acknowledged that detail within the module descriptors could be expanded upon to include further information.

In addition, the programme team confirmed they are currently working on the necessary detail surrounding the End Point Assessment (EPA) to ensure that it offers an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. They also confirmed there was sufficient time to develop this as the EPA was in year 3 of the programme. No further information was provided about the discussions to date or provisional plans which demonstrated how the education provider intended to structure the EPA, including who will be making the independent decisions and how this is managed to ensure the assessments are objective, fair and reliable.

The visitors noted that the standards of education and training (SETs) do not require an education provider to ensure independence through the EPA. Rather the SETs require all assessments within a programme to be an objective, fair and reliable measure of progression and achievement. They also noted the approval process requires programmes to be able to meet all the SETs before a programme can gain approval and there are many different ways in which to meet them.

During the programme team meeting, the visitor's learnt that the universities internal structure made it difficult for the modules and assessments to be amended once they were 'locked' into the system. The programme team confirmed the updated information will be in the student handbook which will be available after they receive internal validation. However, this information was not available at the visit. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures assessments, including the EPA, are an objective, fair and reliable measure of a learners' progression and achievement.

6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment methods are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider states that assessment events reflect a range of assessment methods and that learning outcomes from each module are made clear to learners. The education provider referred to the Assessment section of the programme handbook which, in turn, referred the visitors and learners to the module handbook. It also stated that a full assessment briefing will be provided in the module teaching.

The education provider also submitted a Module Guidance 2018-2019 document. This provided information about the requirements for developing the assessment of modules. This document outlines the information which assessment briefs should include, such as, any specific constraints or requirements (e.g. word limits) and submission procedures and deadlines. Upon a review of the module descriptors, the visitors noted assessment methods such as 'In class law test: multiple choice and scenarios (50%)' (Social Work with Children and Families), 'A group presentation examining a relevant social issue (30%)' (Knowledge, Theories and Skills for Social Work) and 'Written Critical Case Study' and 'An Executive Summary' (Being a Social Worker/End Point Assessment). Some of the module descriptors did not contain details about which learning outcomes the assessment method was measuring. The programme team explained their overall approach to assessment and acknowledged that detail within the module descriptors could be expanded upon to include further information.

During the programme team meeting, the visitor's learnt that the universities internal structure made it difficult for the modules and assessments to be amended once they were 'locked' into the system. The programme team confirmed the updated information will be in the student handbook which will be available after they receive internal validation. However, this information was not available at the visit

From this information, the visitors were unable to determine whether the assessment methods being used, are appropriate to and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes of the respective modules. Therefore, the visitors require further information on the assessment methods and how they effectively and appropriately measure the learning outcomes.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Approval visit date	13-14 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14438-Q8M3B2

Contents

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:

Angela Ariu	Occupational therapist
Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
Louise Towse	Lay
John Archibald	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.

Lorraine Agu	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Leeds Beckett University
Kay Hartley	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Leeds Beckett University
Sarah Bodell	External panel member	University of Salford
Liz Ward	External panel member	Leeds City Council

Matt Myers	Internal panel member	Leeds Beckett University
Helen White	Internal panel member	Leeds Beckett University
Clair Parkin	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Rebecca Khanna	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Karen Newberry	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed first intake	1 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02080

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	The programme is not approved and has not run, so we met with

		learners from the MSc Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes.
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 26 July 2019.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Condition: The education provider must show that they have an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: From the documents, the visitors were made aware that learners should raise issues within practice-based learning as soon as they arise. During the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed there was a process and within the practice-based learning environment learners had to refer to practice tutors. During meetings with the learners and the practice educators the visitors understood that these groups were not aware of a process to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors did not see and therefore could not be sure there is an effective process in place to help learners recognise situations throughout the entire programme where service users may be at risk, to support learners to raise concerns and to make sure action is taken in response to those concerns. The visitors require further evidence of a process to cover all parts of the programme to ensure learners are able to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and are supported in doing so.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must show that they have a clear and effective process in place for obtaining appropriate consent from learners.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation provided the education provider taught the issue of consent on the programme. In the meeting with service users and carers, the visitors were informed there was a clear process in place to obtain consent from them and the visitors were satisfied with this. In the meeting with learners, the visitors noted there was not a process in place for obtaining consent from learners, and that learners volunteered to undertake role play as service users. At the visit, the panel was supplied with a Memorandum of Understanding in relation to the MSc Occupational Therapy programme which set out various expectations of the programme, including consent, which the learner has to agree and to sign and date. The visitors were informed the same form would be used for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. The visitors were satisfied this form was fit for purpose. The visitors however had not seen a form for learners on the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. The visitors therefore need to see a clear and effective process for obtaining appropriate consent from learners on the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must show that they provide clear and consistent information about the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the learner handbook and all module specifications that 100 per cent attendance was mandatory. At the visit, the panel was supplied with a Memorandum of Understanding in relation to the MSc Occupational Therapy programme, which would be used for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. This document stipulated leaners 'are *expected* to attend 100% of the sessions' (emphasis added). In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were informed 100% attendance was required. The visitors could not be sure there was clear and consistent information about attendance requirements on the programme. The visitors were therefore unsure whether all learners would be fully involved in the parts of the programme essential to meeting the SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence which defines and communicates the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Sunderland
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work (Integrated Degree Apprenticeship), Full time
Approval visit date	18-19 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14410-Z5J0G9

Contents

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:

Ian Hughes	Lay
Anne Mackay	Social worker in England
Patricia Higham	Social worker in England
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

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

Sue Brent	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Sunderland
April Allan	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Sunderland
Susie Robertson	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Sunderland

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Integrated Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01/09/2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP02076

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

We also usually ask to meet the following groups at approval visits, although there may be some circumstances where meeting certain groups is not needed. In the table below, we have noted which groups we met, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	Met learners from existing BA (Hons) Social Work programme
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

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 02 August 2019.

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 whether the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme, should or should not be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The education provider had provided a job description and person specification for the role of a senior lecturer. The education provider explained that the senior lecturer within the programme team, who is familiar with the programme, is appointed to a programme leader role. The decision is usually made by the team leader and head of school, in consultation with the programme team. The visitors noted that the person specification cited essential criteria such as minimum qualifications, but did not specify if there is a requirement to be on the relevant part of the Register. The proposed programme leader for this programme is currently on the HCPC Register, but the visitors were not clear whether this is a requirement for the role and whether this will be a necessity for future replacements. Therefore, the education provider must clarify whether it is a requirement for the programme leader to be on the relevant part of the Register, and will this also apply in future for suitable replacements. The education provider should explain if non-registered senior lecturers will be allowed to take up the role of a programme leader in future, and if so, under what circumstances and how will they be supported.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the student complaint process document as evidence for this standard. Upon reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted there was a complaints process in place for learners on practice-based learning. However, the visitors noted this process applies to learners on non-apprenticeship programmes such as the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, and there was no clarity regarding what process should be followed by learners on the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship programme. As this programme is an employer-led programme involving learners currently employed by the local authority, the visitors were not clear from the documentation whether the learners should follow the education provider or their employer's complaints process. Therefore, the visitors could not determine whether this standard is met. As such, the visitors require further evidence that clearly defines which process the learners should use if they should need to raise a complaint, and how learners will be informed about this process. Additionally, the education provider must demonstrate how all parties involved are informed of this process so that it is clear to all involved.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the module descriptors and staff curriculum vitaes, as evidence for this standard. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors could not find any evidence regarding how interprofessional education will take place, for this programme. At the visit, the programme team mentioned about having joint seminars and organising events, which will involve learners learning and interacting with learners from other professions. However, as this was not evidenced in any of the documentation, the visitors were not clear how learners would be able to learn with and from learners in other relevant professions. Therefore the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how interprofessional education will take place, and how will learners learn with and from professionals and learners, in other relevant professions.

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 22 August 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of the West of Scotland
Name of programme(s)	DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time
Approval visit date	14-15 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-14372-D3H5K4

Contents

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

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

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

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

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Diane Whitlock	Lay
Paul Jeffrey	Operating department practitioner
Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive (observer)

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

Steven Leonard	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of the West of Scotland
Hazel Shepherd	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of the West of Scotland
Maggie Sweeney	Internal panel reviewer	University of the West of Scotland

| Nina Anderson-Knox | Internal panel reviewer | University of the West of Scotland |

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	Distance Learning (DL)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
Proposed First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 66
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02064

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	We met with learners on the nursing programmes run at the education provider.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	

Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	No	We did not meet with service users and carers. Instead, we were provided with written testimonials.
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 03 July 2019.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that appropriate information about the programme is provided to potential applicants, to ensure that they can make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that information regarding entry requirements, additional costs on the programme, requirements for criminal conviction checks and health requirements were available within the programme handbook. However, the visitors could not see how applicants would have access to this information prior to securing a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how applicants would have all the information they require to make an informed decision about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. The visitors require further evidence as to what information will be made available to potential applicants, and how this information will be provided. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine how the education provider ensures that applicants have all the information they require in order to make informed decisions about taking up a place on the programme.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice education providers at a programme level.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, the education provider noted that they had "contract/relationship between education provider and practice through regional leads". The education provider also provided contractual agreements which had been agreed with NHS Education for Scotland (NES).

In discussions with the programme team, the education provider explained that collaboration had taken place as follows:
- At a senior level between NES, health boards and ODP programme leads across Scotland.
- The senior team had engaged with practice educators through telephone conferences.
- Meetings had been held to discuss the development of the programme and the proposals in putting together the portfolio document.
- Meetings with practice educators within the region to discuss how the standards of proficiency would be integrated into the programme.

When the programme team were questioned about the engagement with practice educators on a programme level they provided verbal reassurances of how collaboration would take place. Considering the documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied with the collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers on a senior level, and in developing this programme. However, they were not able to determine the nature or the extent of the collaboration that would take place on an ongoing basis at a programme level. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate how they will continue to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers on a programme level.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved to contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme, and demonstrate how this involvement is monitored and evaluated.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider had referenced various documents as evidence for this standard. This included guidance from the School of Health, Nursing and Midwifery on how to engage with service users and carers, an action plan on engaging service users for 2017-2019 which appeared to be an example of a document used by the School. This document showed a range of goals, aims to be met and the measures which would be applied to meet these. Additionally, an example of a flyer used to engage service user and carers on the nursing programme was provided. From reviewing all the documentation provided, the visitors were aware of the education provider's intention to involve service users within the programme. As part of the visit process, the visitors did not have the opportunity to ask questions of service users and carers about their involvement in the programme. Instead, testimonials were provided prior to the visit

which were reviewed by the visitors. However these did not provide any details of the involvement of service users and carers in this programme specifically.

In discussions at the visit, the programme team explained that service users and carers are keen to be involved in the programme and explained ideas on how they might involve service users in this programme. One example provided by the programme team was to involve service users in the interviews at the admissions stage. From these discussions the visitors gained an insight of the education provider's intention to involve service users and carers within this programme. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider would translate their intention into tangible service user and carer involvement in the programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how they will involve service users in the programme, so they are able to contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the individuals recruited to the role of the regional lead will be appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that regional leads will be recruited to lead, develop and deliver the programme in conjunction with the education provider. The visitors understood that the role will include supporting the regional management of the programme by overseeing work-based learning and offering support to learners recruited to the programme. In discussions at the visit, the visitors learnt that the regional leads are yet to be recruited onto the programme. From the information provided in the documentation and through discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to ascertain what the education provider required in regards to the regional leads' qualifications and experience. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that the individuals recruited to this role would be appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology used is accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there were various instances of inaccurate and inconsistent information. For example, in the programme specification reference is made to "adult nursing" rather than "operating department practitioners". The visitors also noted that there were inconsistencies across the documentation where reference was made to "nurses and midwives" and ODPs were referred to as "OCP". The visitors considered that such references could be misleading and confusing to learners. Therefore, the education provider must ensure that that they revise the programme documentation to ensure that the information provided to learners is accurate and avoids any potential confusion for learners.

4.3 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme reflects the philosophy, core values and skills and knowledge in the curriculum guidance, related to the surgical and post-anaesthetic care phases of perioperative practice.

Reason: In their mapping, the education provider states "the curriculum is underpinned by the COPD (2018) curriculum document and is designed to ensure achievement of the HCPC (2014) Standards of proficiency, as evidenced in the SOP mapping document". From reviewing the documentation provided, the visitors noted that the curriculum guidance from the College of Operating Department Practitioners had been reflected in the anaesthesia component of the programme. However, they were unable to determine how the programme reflected the BSc (Hons) curriculum guidance related to the surgical and post-anaesthetic care phases of perioperative practice. The programme team acknowledged that this had not been completed and they would review this to incorporate the relevant curriculum guidance and would consider embedding it into Moodle. As this information was not currently available, the visitors were not able to determine how the programme reflects curriculum guidance. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that learners on the programme will be provided with opportunities to engage in online discussion forums and complete activities through various mediums such as VoiceThread, Webex and Skype. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were also informed of the education provider's plan to engage learners in interprofessional learning through activities within the practice-based learning environment and through CPD activities which they would complete twice a year. The visitors understood the education provider's intention of providing opportunities for interprofessional learning. However, from the information provided and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were not able to determine how these proposed ideas would be embedded through the programme to ensure learners are able to learn with and from professionals in other relevant professions. For example, it was not clear to the visitors if these ideas would be covered in specific modules on the programme or through other mediums. Therefore, the education provider is required to articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners on this programme will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will communicate the attendance requirements for practice-based learning to learners on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors understood that learners would complete two 30 credit modules and one 60 credit practice-based modules each year of the two year programme. They noted that learners would complete 2400 hours of practice-based learning in total across the two years. However, from this information it was not clear whether the 2400 hours were mandatory. In discussions at the visit, the programme team confirmed that it will be mandatory for all learners to complete 2400 hours practice-based learning as part of the programme. The visitors noted that details were provided of the engagement requirements for the programme in the programme handbook, but no details were included about the specific requirements of attendance for practice-based learning. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider would communicate to learners the mandatory attendance requirements for practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the practice proficiencies assessed through the clinical skills record provide a fair measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: From a review of the practice-based learning handbook the visitors noted that learners would complete a 'clinical skills record' whilst in the practice-based learning environment. The visitors noted that there were specific areas in the clinical skills record in C7, C8 and C9 relating to enhanced skills with no details of how these aspects would be taught on the programme. The visitors questioned the programme team about this and they confirmed that they did not intend to teach these areas on the programme and this was an error within the documentation which needs to be amended. Considering the documentation and the discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the clinical skills record would need to be updated to ensure it constitutes a fair measure of assessment for learners. Therefore, the education provider must provide further information in order to determine whether this standard is met.

Recommendations
We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider engaging with the professional body as an opportunity to ensure the curriculum remains relevant to current practice.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors were aware of how the programme takes account off and reflects current practice so that it remains relevant and effective in preparing learners for practice. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met, they noted that nobody from the programme sat on the Clinical University Educators (CUE) forum run by the College of Operating Department Practitioners where developments in the profession and discussed. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider considers

further and ongoing engagement they with the CODP to help ensure the curriculum remains relevant to current practice. The visitors considered this as important to ensure that the programme is able to reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of the programme on an ongoing basis.