

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Derby
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics, Full time BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics Degree Apprenticeship, Work based learning
Approval visit date	15 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-16941-X4D8M9

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details .....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment .....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review .....	4
Section 5: Outcome from second review .....	6
Section 6: Visitors’ recommendation .....	8

### 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:

Hazel Anderson	Prosthetist / orthotist
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
John Archibald	HCPC executive

### Other groups involved in the virtual approval visit

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

Sarah Digby	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Derby
Clare Webb	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Derby
Patrick Barber	Internal Panel Member	University of Derby
Sharon Bell	Internal Panel Member	University of Derby

Stacey Care	External Panel Member	Kent and Medway NHS and Social Care Partnership Trust
Simon Dickinson	External Panel Member	Talarmade Ltd
Christian Gerstner	Centre for Quality Assurance Representative	University of Derby
Ann Minton	Cross Bench (Apprenticeships)	University of Derby

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Prosthetist / orthotist
Proposed first intake	01 January 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 across both programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02333

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

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Prosthetist / orthotist
Proposed first intake	01 January 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 across both programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02334

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involved consideration of documentary evidence and a virtual approval visit, to consider whether the programme 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	Comments
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements	Yes	
Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning	Yes	
Proficiency standards mapping	Yes	
Information provided to applicants and learners	Yes	
Information for those involved with practice-based learning	Yes	
Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme	Yes	
Internal quality monitoring documentation	No	Only requested if the programme (or a previous version) is currently running

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

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	No	The education provider was unable to source learners to meet with us at the visit. The visitors explored areas relating to learners at other, appropriate meetings.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	No	Since the move to virtual visits, we do not ask to meet with service users and carers. The visitors explored areas relating to service users and carers at other, appropriate meetings.
Facilities and resources	No	Since the move to virtual visits, we do not ask to have a meeting related specifically to facilities and resources. The visitors explored areas relating to facilities and resources at other, appropriate meetings.
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 virtual 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 August 2021.

### **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 further evidence to demonstrate that information provided throughout the admissions process is clear and thorough, and allows informed decision-making.

**Reason:** To meet this standard, the education provider provided a draft of the information to be available for applicants on the website about these programmes. The education provider also gave details of the contents page for the apprenticeship handbook.

The visitors noted that information on the draft webpage did not accurately reflect the role of a prosthetist or orthotist. For instance, it said prosthetists and orthotists 'take a lead role in ensuring a patient is safe during their journey through the operating theatre'. The visitors considered this did not accurately represent the role of a prosthetist or orthotist, and the programme team confirmed this was a draft version of the webpage which required updating.

The visitors were also informed the degree apprenticeship programme was in the process of developing a handbook for apprentices. The education provider informed the visitors the apprenticeship handbook is currently in draft status, and provided the visitors with an outline of the contents. Although the visitors were able to see from this outline every aspect that will be covered, they did not have an understanding that the information was clear and thorough.

Therefore, the visitors were not able to see that information provided throughout the admissions process is clear and thorough, and allows informed decision-making. The visitors need to make sure that the education provider provides applicants with all the information on the programme that they need to make a fully informed decision about taking up a place on a programme.

#### **4.5 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to ensure that theory and practice are linked and support each other.

**Reason:** To meet this standard, the education provider said both programmes are predominately work-based learning programmes and the integration of theory and practice is integral to successful completion of both. This will be assessed by the supervisors throughout the learner's time on the programmes. At the visit the programme team informed the visitors that the programmes offered flexibility available to practice educators and employers in regards to the timing of assessments. The visitors considered this had the potential to mean that theory and practice would not complement each other. The visitors were therefore unsure how learners are able to apply knowledge to practice as a basic part of being prepared and competent to practise their profession. The visitors need more information to make sure that theory and practice are combined within both the theory and practical parts of the programmes so they link and support each other.

#### **6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate that learners understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme and educators can apply assessment criteria consistently.

**Reason:** To meet this standard, the education provider informed the visitors that the assessments for the programmes will be in line with the education provider's assessment regulations to ensure that all learners are fairly and objectively assessed, and that they meet the progression and achievement required within the programmes. At the visit the programme team informed the visitors that the programmes offered flexibility available to practice educators and employers in regards to the timing of assessments. However, the visitors considered this could mean learners would be assessed on the same learning outcomes at different times. This would also mean learners may not fully understand what it is they need to achieve and by when. The visitors therefore require more information to demonstrate that learners understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme and educators can apply assessment criteria consistently. The visitors also require evidence of how this is clearly communicated to both learners and educators.

### Section 5: Outcome from second review

#### **Second response to conditions required**

The education provider responded to the conditions set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that the following conditions were met, for the reasons detailed below. Therefore, in order for the visitors to be satisfied that the following conditions are met, they require further evidence.

#### **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 further evidence to demonstrate that information provided throughout the admissions process is clear and thorough, and allows informed decision-making.

**Reason condition not met at this time:** To meet this condition, the education provider informed the visitors that they had updated the draft website to reflect the roles of the prosthetist and orthotist more accurately. The education provider also submitted a full draft copy of the proposed college apprenticeship handbook.

However, the visitors noted that on the draft website the programmes are referred to as the 'level 6' programme. The visitors considered this information did not reflect that entry onto the programme takes place at level 4, which could cause confusion for applicants who might be expecting level 6 in year one of the programme. The visitors therefore could not be sure that the information provided throughout the admissions process is clear and through and allows for informed decision-making.

**Suggested documentation:** The education provider must provide information available through the admissions process which reflects that entry onto the programme takes place at level 4.

#### **6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate that learners understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme and educators can apply assessment criteria consistently.

**Reason condition not met at this time:** To meet this condition, the education provider informed the visitors that the college apprentice handbook outlines what type of assessments would be required of any apprentice / learner. Assessments of a module are outlined at the beginning of each module and will be discussed with the apprentice / learner at tripartite reviews. Also apprentices / learners will have a personal academic tutor to go to for support if they are unsure of any assessment processes. Personal progress and review of assessment targets will be discussed in tripartite reviews every 8-12 weeks and documented in the Practice Assessment Document.

The visitors considered that learners can be assessed on the same learning outcomes at different times, and were unsure of how this is communicated to learners. The visitors saw that communication to both learners and employers / practice educators explained the gateway and End Point Assessment. They were unsure how any limits related to timelines of assessments to allow progression were clearly communicated to both learners and employers / practice educators. The visitors considered that as assessments of a module are outlined at the beginning of each module and are discussed with the apprentice / learner at tripartite reviews, this partially addressed their concerns. However, the visitors remained unclear how assessment criteria will be applied consistently across the number of educators assessing on the programmes. This is so that educators can apply assessment criteria consistently and learners know what they need to achieve and by when.

**Suggested documentation:** The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how assessment criteria will be applied consistently across the number of educators assessing on the programmes. This is so that educators can apply

assessment criteria consistently and learners know when they are required to complete all module assessments and can then progress onto the next academic level. The education provider must also provide further information on how this is communicated to both learners and employers / practice educators.

## Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, and the request for further evidence set out in section 5, 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 07 December 2021 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)