

Approval process report

Cardiff University, Occupational therapy / Physiotherapy, 2020-21

Executive summary

This is a report covers our review of the occupational therapy and physiotherapy programmes at Cardiff University. Through our review, we did not set any conditions on approving the programmes, as the education provider demonstrated they met our standards through documentary evidence and further review. Our Education and Training Committee (Panel) made a final decision that all standards are met, and therefore the programmes should be approved.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment.....	3
About us	3
Our standards	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The approval process	3
How we make our decisions.....	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: Institution-level assessment.....	5
The education provider context.....	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider.....	5
Institution performance data	5
The route through stage 1	6
Admissions	7
Management and governance.....	7
Quality, monitoring, and evaluation	8
Learners	8
Outcomes from stage 1	9
Section 3: Programme-level assessment.....	10
Programmes considered through this assessment	10
Stage 2 assessment – provider submission	10
Quality themes identified for further exploration	11
Quality theme one – selection and entry criteria.....	11
Quality theme two – capacity of practice-based learning	11
Quality theme three – recruitment and deployment of programme staff.....	12
Quality theme four – resources.....	13
Quality theme five – learning and teaching methods.....	14
Quality theme six – assessment methods.....	15
Section 4: Findings	16
Conditions	16
Overall findings on how standards are met.....	16
Section 5: Referrals.....	18
Recommendations.....	18
Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes	18
Assessment panel recommendation	18

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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.

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme(s) detailed in this report meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme(s) ongoing approval.

Our standards

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

Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

The approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:

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

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

This approval assessment was triggered from a strategic review of healthcare education in Wales undertaken by the body responsible for commissioning Allied Health Professional (AHP) training, Health Education Improvement Wales (HEIW).

In preparation for this approvals work, we worked with HEIW to understand their approach within the commissioning exercise, and how we could support each other to achieve proportionate approval assessments for newly commissioned and re-commissioned education providers.

From information provided by HEIW, areas of assessment from the tender process had considerable overlap with our standards of education and training (SETs). We decided to use this information to apply a 'right touch' approach to assessment, gaining assurance that education providers and programmes have already been assessed (or at least demonstrated some progress) in certain areas of our SETs.

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 design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

Julie-Anne Lowe	Lead visitor, occupational therapy
Kathryn Campbell	Lead visitor, physiotherapy
John Archibald	Education Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers ten HCPC-approved programmes across six professions. It is a higher education institute and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1993.

The education provider was asked to deliver pre-registration post graduate programmes for Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy by their commissioners, Health Education and Improvement Wales (HEIW), as part of a strategic review of healthcare education in Wales.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Occupational therapy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2007
	Operating Department Practitioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2014
	Physiotherapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2007
	Practitioner psychologist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1993
	Radiographer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2007
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing		2009	

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	539	459	2021	The enrolled numbers of learners across all HCPC approved provision is a little lower than the approved intended numbers we have on our records. Through future assessments, we will continue to monitor this data point for us to determine sustainability of the programme at the education provider.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	2%	2021	The percentage of learners not continuing is less than the benchmark at Cardiff University which implies learners are well supported for the demands of their programme.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	93%	97%	2021	The percentage in employment or further study is more than the benchmark. This shows that learners who successfully complete their learning at this institution find employment / undertake further study, which links to the institution delivering programmes which are fit for purpose.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	n/a	Silver	2021	A silver award would indicate that the institution is doing well but there is room for improvement.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	76%	94%	2021	This score indicates that the percentage of learners who are satisfied with their learning at this institution is relatively higher than average. This implies that the institution is performing well.
HCPC performance review cycle length	n/a	n/a	n/a	We have not yet reviewed this institution through our performance review process. The cycle length will be decided through the institution's first review in either the 2022-23 or 2023-24 academic year.

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full

partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Information for applicants –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering information for applicants, which applied to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the school team who scrutinise any information distributed to learners, a Terms and Conditions of Offer process, and Post Graduate Programme of Mailings.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health –**
 - There is a university-wide policy for determining applicants' suitability for pursuing programmes including satisfactory occupational health checks and satisfactory Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) enhanced disclosure. This covers the proposed provision. This is supported by English language requirements and the admissions webpage.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L) –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering prior learning and experience, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by Recognition of Prior Learning and Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning Policy for Taught programme processes.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering equality, diversity and inclusion, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the Welsh Language Compliance Framework (2018), the remit of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Committee, and the Cardiff University Equality and Diversity Policy.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Effective programme delivery –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering programme delivery, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the remit of the Programme Management Group, Board of Studies, Strategic Education Committee, and School Board.
- **Effective staff management and development –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering staff management and development, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the probation process, the role of line management for all staff, the personal development process, and the Staff Mental Health policy.

- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering partnerships, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the work of the Management Board.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering academic quality, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the Programme Development policy, Digital Learning Framework, Annual Review and Enhancement process, and the Our Strategy, The Way Forward: Recast Covid-19 Education and Students strategy.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering practice quality, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the Programme Development policy, the Our Strategy, The Way Forward: Recast Covid-19 Education and Students strategy, Placement Learning policy, service level agreements and a biennial audit of placement settings.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering learner involvement, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by learner representation in the education provider, internal learner evaluations, and participation in the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering service user and carer involvement, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by representation on school committees, and the role of the Patient and Public Involvement lead.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering support for learners, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by Cardiff University Code of Practice for Personal Tutors (2019), and Assessment and Feedback Strategy 20/21.

- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering ongoing suitability, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by Cardiff University Senate Regulations (2020/21), and Cardiff University Code of Practice for Personal Tutors (2019), and Assessment and Feedback Strategy 20/21.
- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering learning with and from other learners and professionals, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the Healthcare Interprofessional Education Strategy.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering equality, diversity and inclusion, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the Reasonable Adjustment Policy and Procedure, which provides support of individuals with specific learning support needs.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering objectivity, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the HCARE Assessment and Feedback Strategy 2021 / 22, Cardiff University Senate Regulations, and the External Examiner Policy (Taught Programmes).
- **Progression and achievement –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering progression and achievement, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the HCARE Assessment and Feedback Strategy 2021 / 22, and the Cardiff University Senate Regulations.
- **Appeals –**
 - There is a university-wide policy covering appeals, which applies to the proposed programmes. This is supported by the HCARE Assessment and Feedback Strategy 2021 / 22, Cardiff University Senate Regulations, and the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section.

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
MSc pre-registration Occupational Therapy	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Occupational therapist	25 per cohort, one cohort per year	19/09/2022
MSc pre-registration Physiotherapy	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Physiotherapist	50 per cohort, one cohort per year	19/09/2022
Postgraduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Occupational therapist	25 per cohort, one cohort per year	19/09/2022
Postgraduate Diploma Physiotherapy (pre-registration)	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Physiotherapist	50 per cohort, one cohort per year	19/09/2022

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme.

Linked to the approach to assessment of Health Education Improvement Wales (HEIW)-commissioned programmes discussed earlier in this report, we took assurance from the commissioning exercise that some areas from the standard are met. For each standard we made one of the following judgements which impacted on the information and evidence the education provider needed to provide through the process:

- all areas of the standard have been met and do not need to be further evidenced;
- no areas of the standard have been met and the whole standard needs to be directly evidenced; or
- there were areas of the standard covered by the commissioning exercise but others were not.

In line with the above, the education provider supplied information about how each relevant standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information through a mapping document.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider met our standards.

Quality theme one – selection and entry criteria

Area for further exploration: This area was related to the physiotherapy programme only. The entry criteria was for any degree and that there was no requirement for a science qualification. They were concerned that the academic level, especially during the first year, would be difficult to achieve without any A-level in a science subject. The visitors explored the rationale for not requiring a science background in terms of qualifications.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this area by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained that the entry criteria have been deliberately left quite open to try and address the Widening Participation strategies of both the institution and the commissioning body. The visitors considered the education provider had provided a well-reasoned explanation for their entry criteria, so it is appropriate and inclusive for a variety of learners.

Quality theme two – capacity of practice-based learning

Area for further exploration: For the occupational therapy programme, the process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners is referred to in the tender document and is referred to throughout the documentation mapped to the appropriate SET. However, the visitors were not clear about the process and plan for developing placement capacity as learner numbers increase, with 25 this year, and an additional 25 next year. The visitors saw that four trusts were mentioned, but were not able to see any information about the numbers they will take.

For the physiotherapy programme, an extensive list of clinical placement providers has been submitted. They saw that clinical placements for the programme will run in conjunction with the established undergraduate physiotherapy programme. However, they were unclear when the Masters programme's clinical placements will occur. The visitors explored whether the clinical placement providers have the availability and capacity to provide placements for the new cohort of Masters learners alongside current undergraduate learners.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this area by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was

the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: For the occupational therapy programme, Health Education and Improvement Wales (HEIW) have confirmed the numbers for 2022 / 23 will be 22. No additional placements will be required. This new MSc pre-registration programme will also adopt a placement model which will reduce the number of placements required overall by one per learner over the two years of the programme. Placement capacity will also be increased through placements provided in social care, the independent and charity sector as well as innovative alternative settings. Development of new placement provision is ongoing in alternative placement settings.

The visitors considered that additional learner numbers are accounted for and that placement capacity is maintained.

For the physiotherapy programme, placements have been planned to coincide in the main with the same time points that undergraduate learners are also out. The education provider received confirmation from their commissioning body regarding expected learner numbers for 2022 entry, which came to a lower amount than in recent years, and was a maximum of 140. Approval has been sought for a maximum of 50 learners on this new programme to account for any growth in learner numbers over the subsequent years post-roll out.

In collaboration with their clinical educators, the education provider explored options for additional placement capacity during this time for both programmes. This included opportunities to review models of clinical education, with perhaps two or more learners per team. In addition, the education provider had established links to private placement providers and independent clinics to supplement placement capacity.

The visitors considered that the education provider showed how they are securing placements and working collaboratively to ensure that there is ongoing availability and capacity to accommodate the learners throughout the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the provider's response through the quality activity, and that no outstanding issues remained.

Quality theme three – recruitment and deployment of programme staff

Area for further exploration: For the occupational therapy programme, there was an appropriate staff number. However, the visitors wanted more information on what plans there are to increase staffing next year when there will be two cohorts on the programme.

For the physiotherapy programme, the visitors wanted more information of which current staff will provide time to the postgraduate programme, and their time commitment and roles. They also wanted information about any new staff who will be providing time to the proposed programme in terms of time and roles, and if there had been any recruitment in place for the new staff.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this area by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: For the occupational therapy programme, the education provider informed the visitors that the additional numbers in the second year of the programme will be offset by the discontinuation of the Postgraduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) programme, whose final cohort completes in August 2023. Therefore, an increase in staffing is not needed to maintain the current staff: learner ratio.

The visitors noted that staff levels are being maintained while the Postgraduate Diploma and the undergraduate learner numbers are reducing. This maintains a suitable number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. The visitors were therefore satisfied this area was being met.

For the physiotherapy programme, since the submission of programme documents to the HCPC the education provider confirmed that additional staff have been appointed, and that a business case for two additional full time equivalent posts on top of these appointments was awaiting university approval.

The school has a workload model in place to ensure work is spread evenly and appropriately amongst the team. Each role has an allocated tariff. The visitors considered the education provider has documented the new staff who have been recruited and how the workload is distributed to ensure an effective programme is provided. The visitors were satisfied with the provider's response through the quality activity, and that no outstanding issues remained.

Quality theme four – resources

Area for further exploration: For the occupational therapy programme, the visitors wanted more information about how resources are allocated to shared clinical spaces, which they considered will be in high demand across the range of health programmes.

For the physiotherapy programme, the visitors thought the proposed programme will now increase total physiotherapy provision at the education provider by 50 learners. The visitors wanted more information that whether the learners on the proposed programme are to share all current facilities with the currently approved programmes, and whether there is a funding provision or additional space for resources if required.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this area by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: For the occupational therapy programme, the allocation of shared clinical space across and between programmes will be managed through

the scheduling process and module / programme planning for specific simulation teaching and learning activities.

The visitors considered the education provider had provided a clear rationale for the process, and a sound explanation of how resources are allocated. The visitors were therefore satisfied this area was being met.

For the physiotherapy programme, HEIW have indicated that the number of undergraduate learners will reduce and that the total number of pre-registration learners will be in the region of 120 - 130. The commissioned numbers for 2022 entry onto the proposed programme are 29 learners, and 94 learners for the undergraduate programme. The education provider noted that this provides sufficient scope to deliver both programmes within the facilities currently available. The education provider informed the visitors that engagement with programme materials, attendance to sessions, and contribution to group work can be monitored using the tools available in the virtual learning environment. The visitors were informed the programme development team will work with the current undergraduate programme leadership team to explore opportunities for shared resources and teaching opportunities.

The visitors considered the education provider has evidenced how current resources will be efficient to deliver the proposed programme. They also saw that the education provider has also provided information on the business proposal in place for further development of the programme resources. The visitors were satisfied with the provider's response through the quality activity, and that no outstanding issues remained.

Quality theme five – learning and teaching methods

Area for further exploration: For the occupational therapy programme, the visitors were unsure about the delivery methods in terms of the amount of the programme which is delivered online. They considered the blended learning approach to be appropriate and allows for flexibility and adaptability. However, they were not clear how the blended learning approach will be able to measure learners' engagement with online learning, and how attendance is monitored for online learning. For the physiotherapy programme, the visitors wanted to explore how the learning outcomes can be met through the blended learning approach.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this area by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: For the occupational therapy programme, there is no set formula for allocation of delivery methods. This will be indicated by the learning outcomes and educational needs of individual modules. The visitors were told the education provider envisaged that there would be a maximum of 30% - 50% online learning per module. Where learners are required to attend on-line sessions, attendance is monitored and absences are reported. Regular absences are followed up by a member of staff. The education provider does not monitor engagement in

asynchronous activity, but face-to-face feedback and seminar sessions are often held as follow-ups and evidence of engagement can be monitored within these sessions.

The visitors considered the education provider offered a logical and rational response that continues to allow for adaptable and flexible delivery. The visitors therefore considered that this area continues to be met.

For the physiotherapy programme, Covid-19 has seen programme delivery switch to a blended approach, and this had been “very successful” in terms of flexibility for learners. The proposed programme has been designed to continue with this blended approach, with learners experiencing one or two dedicated full days each week in a face-to-face environment. The education provider informed the visitors that engagement with programme materials, attendance to sessions, and contribution to group work can be monitored using the tools available in the virtual learning environment. The education provider’s experience of Covid-19 has equipped staff and learners on the undergraduate programme to continue to meet the learning outcomes on that programme and the proposed programme offers a more consistent structure and uses the lessons learned from teaching during Covid-19. The education provider said modules and clinical practice will dovetail together to ensure that learners will appreciate connections between their knowledge and skills through the spiral curriculum.

The visitors considered that the education provider has evidenced how it successfully delivers blended learning, and how it will continue to deliver through this model on the new programme. The visitors were satisfied with the provider’s response through the quality activity, and that no outstanding issues remained.

Quality theme six – assessment methods

Area for further exploration: For the physiotherapy programme, module HCT360 is delivered over two semesters and is assessed at week 13. The visitors noted that week 13 is after the first semester and mid-module. The visitors were unsure what learning will be taking place in the second half of the module, and wanted more information as to the reasoning to have the assessment and the learners achieving all the learning outcomes at this point.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this area by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The module explores research in practice. It is expected that learners who meet the entry criteria of having achieved a previous degree will likely have been introduced to research methods previously. The taught theory components will conclude prior to the summative assessment of the module. Learning outcomes four and five will be assessed formatively via the submission of a research proposal for ethical review. It is this research proposal which will form the

basis of the learners' dissertation project. Learners will need to have gained ethical approval before commencing this project and by doing so will evidence of meeting Learning outcomes four and five for module HCT360.

The education provider has clearly described how the assessment methods for module HCT360 ensure that all learning outcomes are met. The visitors were satisfied with the provider's response through the quality activity, and that no outstanding issues remained.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

The visitors were satisfied that no conditions were required to satisfy them that all standards are met. The visitors' findings, including why no conditions were required, are presented below.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** – this standard is covered through institution-level assessment

- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
 - The entry requirements provided are suitable for entry to the programme and clearly evidenced in all relevant handbooks, and programme specification
 - The education provider addressed visitors' concerns about the entry criteria for the physiotherapy programme through the quality activity.
 - The visitors are satisfied this means the standards in SET 2 are met.

- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
 - Those teaching on the programme are appropriate for programme content

- For the occupational therapy programme, face-to-face delivery through problem-based learning is the primary teaching and learning method on the programme.
 - For the physiotherapy programme, the current resources are efficient to deliver the proposed programme.
 - The education provider addressed visitors concerns about capacity of practice-based learning, recruitment and deployment of programme staff, and resources through the quality activity.
 - The visitors are satisfied this means the standards in SET 3 are met
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - The programme ensures that graduates can meet our standards of proficiency and understands the expectations and responsibilities associated with being a regulated professional
 - The standards of proficiency are met by the learning outcomes in the course modules. The standards of conduct, performance and ethics are defined within module learning outcomes
 - The programme content matches the expected profession knowledge base as defined by the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational Therapists.
 - There is internal monitoring of module content
 - There is integration of theory and practice
 - There are an appropriate variety of different teaching and learning styles
 - There is effective monitoring of learner attendance on the programmes
 - The education provider addressed visitors concerns about learning and teaching methods through the quality activity.
 - The visitors are satisfied this means the standards in SET 4 are met
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**
 - There are clear processes that demonstrate practice-based learning is a central part of the programme. The programme embeds practice modules and placements into the curriculum
 - Practice educators received both initial and refresher training provided throughout the academic year
 - The visitors are satisfied this means the standards in SET 5 are met
- **SET 6: Assessment –**
 - There was clear evidence assessments meet the requirements of the programme.
 - Programme contains module assessments which are suitable for the learning outcomes.
 - The standards of conduct, performance and ethics are defined within module learning outcomes.
 - There are university-wide policies in place to monitor assessment standards.
 - Learners who meet the entry criteria of having achieved a previous degree will likely have been introduced to research methods previously. This means that visitors' concerns linked to assessments for one module are now addressed

- The visitors are satisfied this means the standards in SET 6 are met

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Section 5: Referrals

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval, focused review, or performance review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

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. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

- The visitors did not set any recommendations.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

- Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that all standards are met, and therefore the programmes should be approved.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The programmes are approved

Reason for this decision: The Panel accepted the visitor's recommendation that the provider and its programmes should receive continued approval.