HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Full time
Date submission received	09 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-13367-Z0Q2Z9

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the 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:

Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 58
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03822

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 is looking to send two learners to a practice placement in Norway as part of the ERASMUS project. The learners will undertake this hospital – based practice based learning element in place of a final year practice based learning element in the United Kingdom.

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.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors read the documentation for this change and noted that two final year learners will complete a 14 week placement in a Norwegian health or social care setting approved by the University in Tromso. The education provider has planned for the provision of one hospital based placement providing a range of radiology services. The specifics of this placement will be aligned with learners' preference and individual portfolio of required experience. However, it is unclear to the visitors what range of

radiology services are available at University Hospital Tromso, and if the learners will need to go to other hospitals in order to achieve the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the range of radiology services and placements available that will enable the learners to achieve the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency when based in Norway.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.
5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors noted that the submission states that two named staff at University Hospital Tromso will select experienced practice educators (PEs) and fully brief them in the education providers programme placement requirements, and that the PEs will attend a briefing of the placement regulations prior to the placement start. It is unclear to the visitors what preparation and training the Norwegian Clinical PEs will have / have had regarding the education provider's clinical practice 'scheme', assessment processes, and also the experience of those supervisors.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the processes to train and prepare the Norway based PEs for their role in the delivery of the learning outcomes of the education provider's radiography 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 23 August 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.