

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

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: Visitors' recommendation.....	6

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

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 learners '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.

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 26 September 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](#).