HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Leeds
Name of programme(s)	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Part time
Approval visit date	24 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15925-B7W6W7

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 for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

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

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

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
David Rovardi	Independent prescriber
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
Proposed first intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP02219

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
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

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	Not Required	We did not meet with these groups as we did not have any issues to explore with them following the visitors' assessment of the education provider's documentary submission.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Not Required	
Facilities and resources	Not Required	
Senior staff	Not Required	
Practice educators	Not Required	
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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 is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met, and that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 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	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	Master of Occupational Therapy (MOccTher), Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (BSc(Hons)OT), Full time Master of Science in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) (MScOT pre-reg), Full time PGDip Occupational Therapy (PGDipOT), Full time
Approval visit date	10 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15922-J2N1J3

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.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section five of this report.

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:

Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
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.

Jacklyn Jones	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Queen Margaret University
Alison Basford-Thomson	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Queen Margaret University
Clair Parkin	Panel member	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Anna Pratt	Panel member	Royal College of Occupational Therapists

Sally Feaver	Panel member	Royal College of Occupational Therapists
Chris McKenna	Panel member	Royal College of Occupational Therapists

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Occupational Therapy (MOccTher)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed first intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35 across both this programme and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (BSc(Hons)OT)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02218

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (BSc(Hons)OT)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed first intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35 across both this programme and Master of Occupational Therapy (MOccTher)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02251

Programme name	Master of Science in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) (MScOT pre-reg)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed first intake	01 September 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40 across both this programme and PGDip Occupational Therapy (PGDipOT)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02252

Programme name	PGDip Occupational Therapy (PGDipOT)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
Proposed first intake	01 September 2022
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40 across both this programme and Master of Science in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) (MScOT pre-reg)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02253

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
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	Yes

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	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	No	Questions related to service users and carers were explored in other meetings and by correspondence.
Facilities and resources	No	Questions related to facilities and resources were explored in other meetings.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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 is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met, and that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future.

The visitors were satisfied that learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions. However, the visitors were informed by the learners that there are different levels of engagement with interprofessional education (IPE), and that IPE activities are not well attended. The visitors would like to highlight this for future assessment of the programmes to ensure IPE remains of the most possible benefit for learners' future practice and for service users and carers.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University Centre South Devon
Validating body	South Devon College
Name of programme(s)	Hearing Aid Aptitude Test, Flexible
Approval visit date	30 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16081-D9V4T0

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:

Elizabeth Ross	Hearing aid dispenser
Stephen Orchard	Hearing aid dispenser
Temilolu Odunaike	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.

Carrie Piper	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	South Devon College
Frederique Moussaoui	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	South Devon College

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Hearing Aid Aptitude Test
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
Proposed First intake	01 January 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP02256

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.

There are important differences in this approval process that distinguish it from the normal HCPC approval process, and these should be noted.

The Hearing Aid Aptitude Test is a single module programme designed to meet the needs of suitably qualified audiology practitioners wishing to apply for registration with the HCPC as a Hearing Aid Dispenser. The programme will utilise the Specialist Practice and Professional Issues module (UCSD2047) from the Foundation Degree Hearing Aid Audiology which is an existing HCPC approved programme. The Hearing Aid Aptitude Test is being treated as a new programme for HCPC regulatory purposes.

Learners on the Hearing Aid Aptitude Test will all be practitioners who are working in the sector and are either, registered by another body (ie. The Registration Council for Clinical Physiologists (RCCP)) or have undertaken an alternative qualification.

The Hearing Aid Aptitude Test does not contain practice-based learning as applicants will have already completed the practice-based learning element before applying onto this programme. Therefore, the visitors did not assess SET 5: Practice-based learning as part of this approval process.

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	Not Required	Programme does not have practice-based learning element.
Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme	Yes	
Internal quality monitoring documentation	Yes	Programme is new and has not run yet.

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	Not Required	As this was a virtual visit and, because the visitors did not have areas to address with this group, we decided that it was unnecessary to meet with them.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Not Required	As above
Facilities and resources	Not Required	As above
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Not Required	The HCPC did not meet with the practice educators as the nature of the programme means that applicants will have already completed their practice-based learning.
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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 is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met, and that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.

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.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme handbook to ensure all the information required for applicants to make an informed decision about the programme is available.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met at threshold as they saw all the information needed by applicants to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme, in the different documents submitted. Some of this included information about entry criteria, percentage of online and face-to-face delivery, and assessment. Upon request and prior to the visit, the visitors were presented with various documents containing this information. However, they noted the programme handbook, which will be available to applicants, did not in itself contain all of this

information. At the visit, the education provider mentioned that they will be redesigning the programme handbook to ensure that all the information required is contained there. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider updates the programme handbook so applicants can have all the information they need to decide about taking up a place on the programme.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of West London
Name of programme(s)	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, Part time PG Cert Clinical Practice (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing), Part time
Approval visit date	14 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-14994-V0G1D4

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 for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

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

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

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

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

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

Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
Wendy Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist POM – Administration
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.

| Lucy Hemming | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of West London |
| Joy James | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of West London |

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
Proposed first intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	6
Assessment reference	APP02155

Programme name	PG Cert Clinical Practice (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
Proposed first intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	6
Assessment reference	APP02186

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
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	Yes

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	Not Required	We did not meet with these groups as we did not have any issues to explore with them following the visitors' assessment of the education provider's documentary submission.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Not Required	
Facilities and resources	Not Required	
Senior staff	Not Required	
Practice educators	Not Required	
Programme team	Yes	

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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 is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met, and that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.