

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences), Work based learning
Date submission received	13 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13562-W7S7Y1

### 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.....	4
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 major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes 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 report. 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:

Stephen McDonald	Biomedical scientist
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences)
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6 (Up to 24, across the work based learning programmes noted on this form)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC4037

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences)
----------------	--

Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6 (Up to 24, across the work based learning programmes noted on this form)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04038

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences)
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6 (Up to 24, across the work based learning programmes noted on this form)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04039

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences)
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6 (Up to 24, across the work based learning programmes noted on this form)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04040

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes reported to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider intends to introduce a Degree Apprenticeship route to their already existing BSc (Hons) Health Sciences programmes. Particularly, the education provider will introduce degree apprenticeship routes, which will be based on their currently approved full time programmes. The introduction of the degree apprenticeship routes will present some differences to the currently approved programmes, and are noted through this process as new work based learning programmes.

### 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
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were not satisfied that there was 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.

### 5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that the practice educators are appropriately trained at the practice setting, considering the different requirements of the Degree Apprenticeship route. In particular, the visitors noted in the SETs mapping document (SET 5.8), that the evidence mapped provides information about what learners will undertake, and how practice educators will assess learners, rather than how practice educators will be trained to support learners. Given the change in the Degree Apprenticeship route of the programme, the visitors require further evidence of how the practice educators are undertaking appropriate training to deliver effective learning for Degree Apprenticeship learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence to demonstrate that there will be practice placement educator training available for the practice placement educators, which is appropriate to the Degree Apprenticeship programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).