

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Bournemouth University
Name of programme(s)	PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families), Full time MA Social Work (Children and Families), Full time
Approval visit date	4 – 6 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13069-C3N6G8

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	4
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	5
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	6
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation .....	13
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	13

### 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 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). 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:

Robert Goemans	Social worker
David Childs	Social worker
Diane Whitlock	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

### Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 - Diploma of Higher Education and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice; BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioners
- Panel 2 - PG Dip Social Work, MA Social Work and BA (Hons) Social Work
- Panel 3 - PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families) and MA Social Work (Children and Families)
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy

For the paramedic programme there were representatives from the professional body, College of Paramedics. For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational Therapists. For each profession

assessed at this multi-professional event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at the approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

<b>Internal panel members</b>		
Angelos Stefanidis	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (paramedic and operating department practice panel)
Julia Evans	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Maxine Frampton	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University
Fiona Cownie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work panel)
Jack Guymer	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (social work children and families panel)
Andy Guttridge	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Bournemouth University (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy)
<b>External panel members</b>		
Roger King	External panel member	University of West London—operating department practice
Lee Price	External panel member	University of Brighton – occupational therapy
Karin Crawford	External panel member	University of Lincoln – social work
Helen Frank	External panel member	University of Worcester – physiotherapy
<b>Professional body panel members</b>		
Vince Clarke	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Chris Moat	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics – Representative
Helen Frank	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Representative
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education advisor
Shan Aguilar-Stone	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Professional advisor
Vanessa Parmenter	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative

Patricia McClure	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative
Maureen Sheila	Professional body representative	Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education officer
<b>HCPC MA and BA Social work panel members</b>		
Dorothy Smith	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC – Social work panel lead
<b>HCPC MA / PG Dip Social work (Children and Families)</b>		
Diane Whitlock	Lay	HCPC visitor
Robert Goeman	Social worker	HCPC visitor
David Childs	Social worker	HCPC visitor
<b>HCPC occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel members</b>		
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist	HCPC visitor
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist	HCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HCPC visitor
John Archibald	HCPC executive	HCPC –occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive	Observer

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01874

Programme name	MA Social Work (Children and Families)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01875

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programmes continue to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programmes via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment.

The education provider submitted a major change notification flagging changes to curriculum and assessment, and updates to the inter-professional learning for the programmes, as part of a review of all the programmes within the Faculty. From the major change, we decided to assess the programmes via the approval process against all of the standards of education and training.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

### **Recommendation of the visitors**

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

### **Conditions**

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 07 December 2018.

#### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will make it clear to applicants that these programmes offer a generic social work qualification rather than a specialist Children and Families qualification.

**Reason:** The visitors were aware that the programmes' titles included the subtitle "Children and Families", even though the HCPC approves social work programmes as generic qualifications that need to equip social workers in England for all areas of practice. From discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that the content of the programme was appropriately generic. However, the visitors considered that the generic nature of the programme was not made clear on the programme website. In discussions at the visit, some of the learners and practice educators appeared to be under the impression that the programmes were specialist Children and Families programmes. The visitors considered that this title, and other information about the programme, created a risk that applicants or potential applicants would misunderstand the nature of the programme, and so would not be able to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place. As a result they could not determine whether applicants would have all the information which they might need. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure that all applicants understand that they are applying to a generic social work programme, not a specialist children & families one; and

#### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that they communicate to applicants whether recognition of prior learning is available on the programmes.

**Reason:** From their review of documentation and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors understood that the Step Up programmes did not offer recognition of prior learning (RPL). The HCPC does not require education providers to offer RPL so this is not an issue in itself. However, the visitors were not able to see where applicants would be informed of the RPL policy in the information available to them, and so it was not clear to them that the education provider had appropriately explained their processes in this area to applicants. As a result they could not determine whether the education provider gave applicants the information they required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they inform applicants of their policy regarding RPL.

## **2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants are monitored.

**Reason:** From review of programme documentation and from discussions with the senior team and programme team, the visitors were aware that there were equality and diversity policies relating to admissions in place. They considered that these policies were appropriate. However, they could not see from the evidence provided, or from discussions with the programme team and senior team, how data generated from equality and diversity monitoring was used to ensure that there was no unfair discrimination in admissions. Similarly, members of the senior team were involved in working groups that focused on equality and diversity but the visitors could not see how this work fed into the completion of feedback loops regarding equality and diversity in admissions. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how the data gathered from equality and diversity monitoring is used to implement changes in admissions procedures where appropriate.

## **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify the roles and responsibilities in the working relationship between the education provider, the local authority and the Step Up organisation.

**Reason:** The visitors were aware from programme documentation that Step Up programmes are a partnership between the education provider, their local authority partners and the central Step Up organisation. They considered that this is an appropriate means of programme management, but they were not able to see evidence clarifying the various roles and responsibilities of the different organisations. In particular it was not clear who would bear the responsibility for addressing issues arising in practice-based learning. The programme team and the practice educators did give verbal assurances to the visitors that there were mechanisms in place, but the visitors did not see evidence of a clear written process. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence showing that there is a process to deal with any issues or problems that arise in practice-based learning.

**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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes is appropriate

**Reason:** For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leader. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes 'mentoring system', sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

**3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence showing regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the stakeholders in the Step Up partnership.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including the programme handbook. This contained a description for learners of the practice placement cycle and the placement preparation process. However, the visitors were not able to see specific evidence relating to the collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers. The senior team, programme team and practice educators gave the visitors verbal assurances that there was ongoing collaboration between the stakeholders in the Step Up partnership. However, the visitors were not able to make a judgment about whether this collaboration was regular and effective. In particular, they were not able to determine whether the programme team had an ongoing relationship with the local authority's adult social care services, through which the education provider could ensure that learners would have access to appropriate practice-based learning opportunities in adult social work settings. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating regular and effective collaboration with all stakeholders.



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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including staff profiles. From this documentation and from discussion with the programme team and senior team about the number of learners, it was not clear to the visitors that the existing staff team would be able to deliver the programme effectively. They were not able to see a breakdown of the staff's full time equivalent (FTE) commitments to the different programmes across the social work provision. When the visitors asked about staffing, the programme team were not able to give assurances that they could deliver an effective programme with current staffing levels. The visitors also noted from discussions at the visit that a staff member who had previously been working one day a week on the social work programmes was now on secondment and could no longer commit any time to the programmes. The senior team suggested to the visitors that more recruitment was possible but the visitors were not able to see plans for this recruitment. They were therefore unable to be satisfied that there were an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure an appropriate level of staffing for the programmes.

### **3.13 There must be effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in all settings.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners in practice-based learning have access to appropriate wellbeing and learning support.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including university-level policies on academic support and an additional learning needs policy. From this evidence, and from discussions with the programme team and with learners, they were satisfied that the arrangements for supporting learners in the academic setting were appropriate. However, it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that learners would have access to such support while in practice-based learning. The visitors were aware from discussions with the programme team and practice educators that staff from the education provider did not visit learners while they were in practice-based learning. The HCPC does not require that education providers send staff to visit learners in practice-based learning, but the visitors could not see that any other appropriate arrangements were in place to provide wellbeing and learning support to learners in practice-based learning. The programme team informed visitors that they were planning to start visiting learners in practice-based learning, but the visitors did not see evidence relating to the planning for this. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that learners have access to appropriate support while in practice-based learning.

### **3.14 The programme must implement and monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to learners.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to learners are monitored.

**Reason:** From review of programme documentation and from discussions with the senior team and programme team, the visitors were aware that there were equality and diversity policies in place in relation to learners. They considered that these policies were appropriate. However, they could not see from the evidence provided, or from discussions with the programme team and senior team, how data generated from equality and diversity monitoring was used to ensure that the programme provided an impartial, fair and supportive environment. Similarly, members of the senior team were involved in working groups that focused on equality and diversity but the visitors could not see how this work fed into the completion of feedback loops regarding equality and diversity for learners on the programme. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how the data gathered from equality and diversity monitoring is used to implement changes on the programme where appropriate.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the university's "Fusion" plan for promoting research, teaching and practice. In the documentation the visitors could not see how the education provider intended to ensure that learners on social work programmes would be enabled to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. The programme team and senior team informed the visitors that they hoped learners would have opportunities for inter-professional education (IPE) in practice-based learning. They also stated that they hoped to develop IPE in the academic setting, but the visitors were not able to see evidence relating to how this would be developed and how the education provider would ensure that all learners would have access to appropriate IPE. They were also not clear how the education provider would ensure that the IPE would be designed and delivered in such a way as to ensure that it was as relevant and useful as possible. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that learners will be enabled to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

#### **5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that there is appropriate availability of practice-based learning in adult social care settings.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed documentation relating to this standard, including the description of practice-based learning in the programme specification and guidance for learners in the practice-based learning handbook. They were aware from the documentation that, even though the programme was subtitled "Children & Families", the curriculum content was appropriately generic. However, from the evidence provided, they were not able to determine whether the programme was able to ensure that learners had access to sufficient adult social care placements. At the practice education provider meeting the majority of attendees were from children and families settings, and they were not able to assure the visitors that there would be appropriate adult

placements available as required. Some practice educators appeared to be under the impression that the programme was a specific children and families programme, even though the HCPC approves social work programmes as generic qualifications that need to equip social workers in England for all areas of practice. The learners to whom the visitors spoke about this issue stated that their own practice-based learning had been heavily focused on children and families work. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were given assurances that all learners would have access to appropriate adult social care experience in practice-based learning. However, they were not able to see evidence relating to how the education provider would ensure an appropriate level of genericism in practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners have appropriate experience of adult social care settings in their practice-based learning, such that learners are able to meet the relevant learning outcomes and standards of proficiency.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators complete practice-based learning audit forms as required.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the audit process for practice-based learning. The education provider used a form known as QAPL, or quality assurance of practice learning. They considered that the audit system itself was appropriate for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. However, the programme team informed the visitors that they sometimes found it difficult to ensure that local authority practice educators completed their QAPL forms at the appropriate time. The visitors were therefore not clear how the education provider ensured that their system for quality-assuring practice-based learning was thorough and effective. They require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that their system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning is effective.

### **5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators receive regular training appropriate to their role.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed evidence submitted for this standard, including a description of the expected qualifications for practice educators. They also discussed training for practice educators with the programme team and practice educators. From their review and from discussions it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that all practice educators had received appropriate training. The programme team told visitors that they had confidence in their partners to train their staff appropriately, and the practice educators informed the visitors that they had access to training as required. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence of a process by which the education provider could consistently monitor the training status of practice educators, and could ensure that practice educators undertook new training where appropriate. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence of how they will ensure that practice educators undertake regular training.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify for learners whether, and under what circumstances, resits of modules are permitted.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed evidence relating to this standard, including a section in the programme handbook laying out for learners the detail of learning hours and assessment. For the PGDip programme, it was not clear to the visitors from this evidence whether learners would be allowed to resit modules. The programme team were able to answer the visitors' questions about resit procedures, and the visitors were satisfied that there were appropriate policies in place, but the learners did not appear to be familiar with the policies. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure that learners understand the circumstances, if any, under which resits of modules might be permitted.

#### **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 how they communicate to applicants and staff the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) and occupational health check procedures, and the principles of the decision-making process.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as all the appropriate information about the Step Up applications process was available for applicants on the relevant websites. However, they considered that it was not easy for applicants to discover the principles that would underlie the education provider's decision-making process if either occupational health or DBS checks highlighted a potential issue. For example, it was difficult for applicants to find out what kind of health condition or what kind of past convictions might be disqualifying. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were told that such cases were considered on an individual basis according to a set of guidelines, and that applicants who inquired could have this explained to them. The HCPC does not have specific requirements around the level of detail about checks that must be communicated to applicants. However, the visitors considered that there was a risk that if the principles underlying the case-by-case decision-making were not easily accessible, it might mean that in future an applicant might be prevented from making an informed choice about whether to take up a place.

### **3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider how best to encourage staff to continue their professional and academic development in line with the programmes in place.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met at threshold, as there was a programme in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, both in the academic setting and in practice-based learning. The education provider had a strong university-wide focus on staff development, and provided professional and academic development opportunities for practice educators. However, from discussion with the programme team the visitors were aware that some staff members' opportunities to take part were limited by time or other factors. The visitors considered that this may create a risk that in future the development programme would no longer be effective, because staff were not taking part. They therefore suggest that the education provider keep under review how they enable staff to participate in professional and academic development.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 30 January 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## 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 this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future.

From a review of the documentation and the tour of the facilities, the visitors were satisfied the current resources available to learners and educators are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programmes. However, the education provider informed us at the visit that the programmes will be moving to a new building in 2020. This may affect the programme's ability to meet the standards relating to programme resources. Therefore the education provider should notify us of this change through the annual monitoring audit process after they have moved.