

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Hidden Hearing Limited
Name of programme(s)	Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence, Work based learning
Date submission received	30 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15616-V9J2Q0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	4
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)	4

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 annual monitoring 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 6 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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
Lindsay Moore	Hearing aid dispenser
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
First intake	01 October 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09186

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the Steering Committee/Exam Board Minutes and the Trainee Rep Reports as evidence for this standard. The visitors noted that the reports showed that learners are able to provide feedback on the programme, to the teaching team through their representatives. However, the visitors noted that the student representatives were not present at either of the Steering Committee/Exam Board meetings. As such, they could not determine the learners' involvement with any changes made or discussed as a result of the feedback they have given or any discussions going forward. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to

provide further evidence demonstrating how learners are involved in discussions or changes being made as a result of their feedback. This way, the visitors will be able to determine how learners' involvement contribute to the development and improvement of the programme and that learners are aware of the actions the education provider has taken as a result of their involvement.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating learners' involvement with the changes being made or discussed as a result of their feedback.

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

Reason: From their review of the documentation for this standard, the visitors were made aware that the education provider intends to deliver interprofessional education by exposing learners to staff from Nursing and Care Homes through a training session. The visitors also noted that the education provider had not been able to take this plan further due to the current Covid-19 situation and restrictions. The visitors noted that the document submitted appears to be at a preliminary stage and no information had been given on responses from the Nursing and Care Homes. As this audit relates to how the education provider meets this standard in the 2017/18 and 2018/19 academic years, the visitors could not determine how the programme has delivered this standard over the last two academic years as no information was provided about this. As such, the visitors could not determine that this standard was met and request that the education provider submit evidence to demonstrate how the programme has delivered interprofessional education over the last two academic years.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of how learners have been able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions, in the 2017/18 and 2018/19 academic years.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 6: 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 these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors considered that the standards continue to be met. They also noted that the education provider is continuing to develop the interprofessional learning opportunities to ensure learners are prepared to work with other professionals, and across professions, for the benefit of service users and carers. These developments will include “in-house” and a range of external healthcare settings such as Health centres and care homes. The education provider should consider whether these changes will impact on the way the programme continues to meet the SETs, and if appropriate submit a major change notification form. The visitors wished to highlight this area for those visitors reviewing future assessments.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	04 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15619-Y8L3B5

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09200

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the education provider's whistle blowing policy and module specifications that were referenced, as evidence for this standard. Through their review, the visitors noted that there was no explicit evidence demonstrating that learners are enabled to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors noted the module descriptors highlighted which include:

- Personal Development and Communication Skills for Dietitians – Level 4;
- Professional Development for Dietitians – Level 5; and

- Competent Practitioner – Level 6;

The visitors noted that none of the above modules provide explicit information on how learners are taught to raise concerns or how the education provider will ensure learners understand their responsibilities regarding raising concerns. Although there are communication skills taught, the visitors considered that enabling learners to raise concerns is a specific requirement of this standard and this is not explicitly addressed through the evidence provided. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating their process for enabling learners to raise concerns when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that shows how learners are explicitly taught or informed about how to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This could be evidence of taught sessions that covers this area or an extract from the practice handbook that clearly instructs learners in the protocol used to raise concerns.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	04 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15646-F5L5C2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 4: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09209

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including the education provider's whistle blowing policy and the 'Professional Development for Practice – Level 7 module descriptor'. Through their review, the visitors noted that the evidence did not demonstrate how learners are enabled to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors noted that the module descriptor did not provide explicit information on how learners are enabled to raise concerns, or how the education provider will ensure learners understand their responsibilities regarding

raising concerns. Although it was noted there are communication skills taught, the visitors considered that enabling learners to raise concerns is a specific requirement of this standard and this is not explicitly addressed through the evidence provided. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating their process for enabling learners to raise concerns when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk.

Suggested evidence: Evidence or information demonstrating how learners are explicitly taught or informed about how to raise concerns regarding the safety and wellbeing of service users. This could be evidence of taught sessions that covers this area or an extract from the practice handbook that clearly instructs learners regarding the protocols used to raise concerns.

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust
Validating body	University of Essex
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Child, Community and Educational Psychology (D.Ch.Ed.Psych.), Full time
Date submission received	06 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-15201-C2W3K5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Sarah Hulme	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Child, Community and Educational Psychology (D.Ch.Ed.Psych.)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09339

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider stated in the audit submission document, it was not possible to evidence this as one submission, as service users and carers were involved in various capacities.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document that evidence for the suitability of the current 'Director' for this programme was submitted as part of a previous major change process, however there was no evidence provided for this annual monitoring submission. From reviewing our records, the last major change submission received from this programme was received in 2014.

The narrative in the mapping document, suggested to the visitors that the education provider was stating that they had met the standard rather than showing how they meet it. This is a new standard (introduced in September 2017) that they must evidence as part of this annual monitoring audit. This standard is intended to ensure that the education provider ensures that the individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified and experienced. As such, the visitors were unclear about the effective process in place to identify a suitable programme lead and if necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider determines the person holding professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: As noted above under Section 3 of this report, the education provider did not provide evidence demonstrating service user and carer monitoring for last two years. The visitors learnt from the mapping document how service users and carers were involved in the programme and noted that there had been no change to this. The visitors also noted that there had been no changes made to the monitoring and evaluation systems in place. However, as per the annual monitoring expanded evidence requirements this year, education providers are required to submit evidence of how they have monitored service user and carer involvement for the last two years. Without receiving this evidence, the visitors could not confirm how the education provider makes sure the programme delivers overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. Therefore the education provider must show how they are monitoring and evaluating the programme's quality and effectiveness in relation to service user and carer involvement.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide information or documentation demonstrating effective and regular monitoring of service user and carer involvement in the programme for the last two years.

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

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document that it provides year one practice-based learning placements for all learners on this programme. It was also mentioned that the availability of year two and three practice-based learning placements is planned jointly, by education providers who are part of a South East, East and London (SEEL) consortium. This consortium is a group of education providers that meet regularly as part of a committee to determine capacity and availability of practice-based learning. To demonstrate this formal process, the education provider evidenced the terms of reference of the consortium executive group.

From reviewing the 'Placement handbook' and mapping document, the visitors noted that the education provider is solely responsible for providing placements to learners who are on year one of the programme. However, no information was provided suggesting the formal process in place about how the capacity and availability of practice-based learning is determined for this group. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if the standard has been met.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners on year one of the programme.

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.

Reason: The education provider mentioned in the mapping document that learners are made aware during their practice-based learning about policies such as whistleblowing, safeguarding and information governance. From reviewing the 'Placement handbook', the visitors noted there is a checklist of areas that practice-based learning supervisors must ensure are discussed with learners. The checklist included areas such as first aid, whistle blowing arrangements and fire safety. However, the visitors noted no information was provided regarding the whistleblowing and safeguarding policies themselves. The visitors considered that the whistleblowing and safeguarding policies may possibly differ at each practice-based learning site, however they did not receive evidence demonstrating how the education provider ensured these policies reflected an effective process to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

In addition, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider enabled learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users within other aspects of the programme. Therefore the visitors were unclear about the process in place to ensure learners are able to recognise situations throughout all parts of the programme where service users may be at risk. This includes, how learners are encouraged to raise any concerns and what support is available to them. Based on this, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met, because they could not determine whether there was an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate the effective process in place throughout the programme (years 1, 2 and 3) to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

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

Reason: The education provider referred to relevant pages of the 'Placement handbook' as evidence for this standard. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted that learning outcomes for the programme were revised in 2015 and that the competencies have been mapped with the HCPC proficiencies. The visitors could not see any further information regarding how assessments and learning outcomes mentioned in the evidence were linked with the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). For example, the visitors could not see information demonstrating how the mentioned assessment techniques will ensure learners will meet the SCPEs. Based on this, the visitors were unable to determine how assessment throughout the programme ensures that learners demonstrate that they understand the expectations of professional behaviour including the nature of professional regulation, and the responsibilities involved in being a regulated professional. Therefore, the visitors require further information, which demonstrates how assessment throughout the programme ensures and allows learners to demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs. In this way, the visitors will be able to make a judgement about whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating how assessment throughout the programme ensures learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy), Full time
Date submission received	02 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15204-X3W8L3

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Sarah Hulme	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09342

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: The education provider mentioned in the mapping document that inter-professional learning (IPL) teaching takes place on campus and off campus, via timetabled sessions with learners from other disciplines. Additionally, it was also mentioned that learners are placed within multi-disciplinary teams, at their practice-based learning setting. The education provider evidenced the teaching timetables for learners on this programme and relevant pages of the ‘Clinical Practice Handbook’.

From reviewing the timetables provided the visitors noted that learners will learn with learners from other professions such as Speech and Language Therapists, Neurologists and Psychiatrists. However, the visitors could not find any information regarding what teaching takes place in the joint IPL timetabled lectures and who conducts the teaching. Additionally, the 'Clinical Practice Handbook' mentioned about some of the competencies to be met, but there was no mention of what IPL learning takes place during practice-based learning. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if the standard has been met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate what IPL takes place on this programme to demonstrate how learners are able to learn with, and from other learners and professionals on this programme.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document that an electronic portfolio system 'Mea Vita' was previously used to record learners' progress and achievement during practice-based learning. This has been replaced by a new system called 'Mahara', to record details of practice-based learning. From reviewing the relevant pages of the 'Clinical Practice Handbook' document evidenced for this standard, the visitors noted there is information regarding the guidelines for supervision for practice and how assessment gets recorded during practice-based learning.

From reviewing the evidence, the visitors could not find any information regarding how 'Mahara' is used to regularly monitor practice-based learning. This standard is regarding how the programme delivers continued quality of practice-based learning. The visitors could not see any information regarding the effective processes or mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of practice-based learning. The visitors were therefore unclear whether the system for approving and monitoring practice-based learning had changed with the introduction of Mahara. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if the standard has been met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate the effective system in place to ensure the quality of practice-based learning.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Ulster
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	03 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15217-K8M2W0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Helen Catherine White	Dietitian
Susan Lennie	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 19
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09359

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider submitted documentation that highlighted the duties of a course director, the terms of reference for course committees and a flowchart for appointing a course director within the school of biomedical sciences. The visitors were able to see what the course director role entailed, but this information did not describe the qualifications or experience that would be required or deemed necessary to be a course director. The flowchart indicated that appropriate applicants would be shortlisted and it is preferable they be a registered dietitian or biomedical scientist. The information did not state this would be essential or what arrangements would be made if the course director was not registered with the HCPC. As such the visitors could not determine that this standard was met. The education provider should highlight how they deem potential applicants' qualifications and experience to be appropriate for the role of course director. They must also clarify

that the course director must be a HCPC registered dietitian or demonstrate that there are appropriate alternative arrangements.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures the course director is appropriately qualified and experienced to be professionally responsible for the programme, and, unless other arrangements are in place, on the relevant part of the register.

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

Reason: In review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality documents section 17.24 – Course directors reports, that workloads are increasing and if further increases occur it will not be sustainable. This is further supported in the external examiner report that staff are working above and beyond their normal hours to support learners. In response to the external examiner the education provider shared the concerns raised around the staffing levels. The external examiner commented (Joan Gandy, 2018) that the education provider should look carefully at the number and level of staff needed to maintain such high programme standards. As such the visitors require further information to understand that this issue has now been addressed and that this standard is met. The education provider must show how they have met the demands of learners and how they have ensured staffing resources are adequate. The visitors would expect to see specific reference to how the education provider has addressed the concerns raised in the external examiner report and the internal quality document.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider submitted three pieces of evidence; a module descriptor for NUT522 Professional Practice module (the visitors were unclear whether this should be NUT414 as NUT522 was not within the evidence); a service user document (outlining service user and carer involvement within the programme as lecturers/guest speakers) and a revalidation document (page 55). The latter outlined the support for service users and carers who work with the programme team within the university.

From their review, the visitors noted there did not appear to be evidence that addressed how learners might escalate service user concerns in the context of patients and clients in practice-based learning. As such they were unable to determine how learners would be able to support service users in situations where they may be at risk. Therefore, the education provider should provide evidence to show that a process is in place to enable learners to escalate concerns within practice-based learning setting.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that there is an effective system in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

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

Reason: In the course revalidation document the education provider has indicated that content within modules has been reviewed and updated. They have also removed some optional modules from the programme. The visitors were able to see that the content was changed but not how this was reflected in the learning outcomes or how the changes ensured the programme still allowed for learners to meet the standards of proficiency. The education provider must provide further detail around the changes to the modular content and learning outcomes to show that learners meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for dietitians.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the learning outcomes of the programme ensure learners meet the SOPs for dietitians.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

4.8 The delivery of the programme must support and develop evidence-based practice.

Reason: In the course revalidation document the education provider has indicated that content within modules has been reviewed and updated. They have also removed some optional modules from the programme. The visitors were able to see that the content had been changed but the education provider did not detail how it had changed or what the new modules contained. As such the visitors could not determine these changes ensured the curriculum was relevant to current practice and was supportive of evidence-based practice. The education provider must provide further detail of the changes to modules and show how the curriculum has retained its relevance to current practice and support of evidence-based practice.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice and supportive of evidence-based practice.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: In the standards mapping document the education provider suggests they have made changes to how the programme meets this standard. They listed the names of various meetings that take place in relation to practice-based learning. However, they did not disclose the nature of these meetings and so the visitors could not determine they would ensure the quality of practice-based learning. The education provide must confirm if they have made changes to how they approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning. If changes have been made they must demonstrate that these changes ensure the process continues to be thorough and effective.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that there is a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

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

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

Reason: The education provider has indicated changes to the content and assessment in some of the teaching modules. They did not disclose the nature of these changes or how the new assessment methods related to the updated modular content. To evidence these standards in the documentary submission the education provider highlighted a timetable of the assessments within the programme. The visitors could see the type of assessment and the relative weighting. However, the education provider has not detailed the changes to the learning outcomes. As such, the visitors could not judge that the assessment methods are appropriate and effective at measuring the learning outcomes. Therefore, the education provider must provide further details about the changes to the content and potential learning outcomes within the modules. They should also show how the assessment methods are appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes, and learners meeting the SOPs for dietitians.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that changes to the assessment strategies and methods ensure that learners are able to meet the learning outcomes and the SOPs for dietitians.

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

Reason: The education provider has indicated in the mapping document that they have made changes to the way the programme meets this standard. They referred to the revalidation document as evidence. Upon review of this document it was not clear to the visitors what changes had been made. As such, they request that the education provider clarify if they have made changes to the way the programme meets this standard. If they have, they must show how the changes ensure that learners understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme and how educators apply assessment criteria consistently.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that any changes to the assessment policies clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Ulster
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics, Full time Pg Dip Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	03 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15225-W1J5T8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Susan Lennie	Dietitian
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 3
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09365

Programme name	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2003

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 3
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09366

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider submitted documentation that highlighted the duties of a course director, the terms of reference for course committees and a flowchart for appointing a course director within the school of

biomedical sciences. The visitors were able to see what the course director role entailed, but this information did not describe the qualifications or experience that would be required or deemed necessary to be a course director. The flowchart indicated that appropriate applicants would be shortlisted and it is preferable they be a registered dietitian or biomedical scientist. The information did not state this would be essential or what arrangements would be made if the course director was not registered with the HCPC. The education provider should highlight how they deem potential applicants' qualifications and experience to be appropriate for the role of course director. They must also clarify that the course director must be a HCPC registered dietitian.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures the course director is appropriately qualified and experienced to be professionally responsible for the programme, and, unless other arrangements are in place, on the relevant part of the register.

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

Reason: In review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality documents section 17.24 that workloads are increasing and if further increases occur it will not be sustainable. This is further supported in the external examiner report that staff are working above and beyond their normal hours to support students. In response to the external examiner the education provider shared the concerns raised around the staffing levels. As such the visitors require further information to understand that this standard is met. The education provider must show how they have met the demands of learners and how they have ensured staffing resources are adequate. They must also make specific reference to how they have addressed the concerns raised in the external examiner report and the internal quality document.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: In the course revalidation document the education provider has indicated that content within modules has been reviewed and updated. They have also removed some optional modules from the programme. The visitors were able to see that the content was changed but not how this was reflected in the learning outcomes or how the changes ensured the programme still allowed for learners to meet the standards of proficiency. The education provider must provide further detail around the changes to the modular content and learning outcomes to show that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant of the register.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the learning outcomes of the programme ensure learners meet the standards of proficiency for dietitians.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

4.8 The delivery of the programme must support and develop evidence-based practice.

Reason: In the course revalidation document the education provider has indicated that content within modules has been reviewed and updated. They have also removed some optional modules from the programme. The visitors were able to see that the content had been changed but the education provider did not detail how it had changed or what the new modules contained. As such the visitors could not determine these changes ensured the curriculum was relevant to current practice and was supportive of evidence-based practice. The education provider must provide further detail of the changes to modules and show how the curriculum has retained its relevance to current practice and support of evidence-based practice.

Suggested evidence: evidence to show that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice and supportive of evidence-based practice.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: In the standards mapping document the education provider suggests they have made changes to how they meet this standard. They listed the names of various meetings that take place in relation to practice-based learning. They did not disclose the nature of these meetings and so the visitors could not determine they would ensure the quality of practice-based learning. The education provider must confirm if they have made changes to how they approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning. If changes have been made they must demonstrate that these changes ensure the process is thorough and effective.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that there is a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

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

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

Reason: The education provider has indicated changes to the content and assessment in some of the teaching modules. They did not disclose the nature of these changes or how the new assessment methods related to the updated modular content. To evidence these standards in the documentary submission the education provider highlighted a timetable of the assessments within the programme. The visitors could see the type of assessment and the relative weighting. However, the education provider has not detailed the changes to the learning outcomes so the visitors could not judge that the assessment methods are appropriate and effective at measuring them. The education provider must provide further details about the changes to the content and potential learning outcomes within the modules. They should then show how the assessment methods are appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes, and learners meeting the standards of proficiency.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that changes to the assessment strategies and methods ensure that learners are able to meet the learning outcomes

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

Reason: The education provider has indicated they have made changes to the way they meet this standard in the mapping document. They referred to the revalidation document as evidence. Upon review of this document it was not clear what changes had been made. The education provider must clarify if they have made changes in the way the programme meets this standard. If they have they must show how the changes ensure that learners understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme and how educators apply assessment criteria consistently.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that any changes to the assessment policies clearly specify requirements for progressions and achievement within the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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](#).