

Education and Training Committee – 16 September 2010

Items for consideration for the Education Department work plan 2011/2012

Executive summary and recommendations

#### Introduction

The Committee and the Education Department conduct a process of work planning that begins in September each year with initial considerations for work to be undertaken in the following financial year. At the strategy meeting in November 2010, the Committee will be asked to consider items for inclusion in the work plan. Following that meeting a work plan document will be drawn up and brought for approval to the March 2011 meeting of the Committee. The Education Department budget will be drawn up simultaneously and taken for approval to the Finance and Resources Committee in March 2011.

This paper is intended to enhance the debate for the November strategy meeting by highlighting areas for work that the Committee and Education Department have considered previously for inclusion in work plans. The Committee is asked to review the "long list" of items for inclusion in next year's work plan. The Committee may wish to ask questions about items or express views on:

- the appropriateness of individual items in the long list;
- relative priorities between items; or
- new items for inclusion.

This paper also contains a tabular summary of the key trends or indentified areas for further work from the four approval and monitoring annual reports that have so far been produced from 2006-2009. It is intended that this tabular summary will assist the Committee in determining if there is further work arising from the review of each year or potentially across years. The tabular summary will also be used to more effectively select areas for data analysis in future annual reports to make the information more accessible to readers.

#### Decision

This paper is for information only. No decision is required.

#### **Background information**

None

#### **Resource implications**

None currently

#### **Financial implications**

None currently

# **Appendices** None

Date of paper 1 September 2010

| Date       | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title                           | Status   | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| 2010-09-01 | а    | HRD       | PPR      | Items for consideration for the | Final    | Public    |
|            |      |           |          | Education Department work plan  | DD: None | RD: None  |
|            |      |           |          | 2011/12                         |          |           |

## Items for consideration for the Education Department work plan 2011/2012

#### Introduction

This paper outlines a "long list" of areas of work identified either by members of the Education and Training Committee at meetings or by members of the Education Department. This paper intends to promote early debate amongst the Committee members in the lead up to the strategy meeting in November 2010. No decision is required from the Committee, but comments or questions are welcome.

Items on the list are broadly prioritised in the following order under these headings:

operational work;

major projects;

supporting activities; and

departmental projects.

Highest priority

Lowest priority

Within these headings, the items have not been prioritised and the order of the list is not of significance. For the first three headings, the items of work have remained relatively fixed as they underpin the ability to meet legislative requirements. However, the items under the departmental projects heading are open to greater debate.

This list is intended only as an initial prompt to Committee members. No connotation should be read into either presence on or absence from the list. At the time of writing there is uncertainty in relation to the Government's intentions for work that commenced prior to the general election and any potential new priorities.

The final section of the paper is a tabular summary of key trends or recommendations for further work from the last four years of approval and monitoring annual reports (2006-2009). This section is again intended to promote debate amongst Committee members in assessing areas for future work.

#### **Operational work**

Each process undergoes an annual review to ensure it remains fit for purpose.

Approval process

It is anticipated that the approval process will continue to be the most resource intensive of the operational processes. The number of visits in the coming financial year is likely to outstrip the number of visits from the preceding three years as a result of the number of visits required for practitioner psychologist and hearing aid dispenser programmes alongside the routine number of visits arising from major changes, annual monitoring and new programme creation.

3

| Date       | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title                              | Status   | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| 2010-09-01 | а    | HRD       | PPR      | Items for Education Dept work plan | Final    | Public    |
|            |      |           |          | 2011-12                            | DD: None | RD: None  |

Annual monitoring process

The annual monitoring process workload increases incrementally each year as new programmes move into the annual monitoring cycle. This means the resource impact from annual monitoring is steadily increasing over time. However, in the coming year it is anticipated that the annual monitoring workload will be broadly comparable with the current year since there is no requirement to undertake specialised monitoring as there has been for ambulance trusts, hearing aid dispensers and practitioner psychologist programmes in this year.

Major change process

The major change process remains relatively unpredictable in terms of its resource impact as it is driven in the main by the cycle of change at an institutional level rather than professional level. However, it is anticipated that significant changes to operating department practitioner and supplementary prescribing programmes may come from profession / entitlement wide curriculum changes.

Complaints process

The complaints process has seen an increase in the number complaints made and it is likely that this results from the increased visibility of both the organisation and the complaints process to potential complainants. It is difficult to predict accurately if this rate of increase will continue in the coming year but it is anticipated that the number of complaints is unlikely to reduce in number next year.

#### **Major projects**

Education systems review

The education systems review project is a major project intended to review and revise the processes and systems of the Education Department in order to ensure they remain cost effective and fit for purpose in the face of continued growth in the number of approved programmes. This project falls into two components. This first stage, which would take the majority of the 2011/2012 financial year requires the Department to conduct a full scale review of operations and processes and produce recommendations for changes. In the second

stage, which would occur in the following financial year, the work recommended would be undertaken to enhance operations and systems.

Partners systems review

Similarly to the education systems review, the Partners Department will be engaging in a project to ensure continuing fitness for purpose of departmental processes and systems. The Education Department, as one of the key stakeholders in the services of the Partners Department, will play an active role in this work.

**Social Workers** 

Following the release of the Government's intention to consolidate regulation of social workers under the HPC, work may be required in the coming financial year to prepare for the opening of the Register and approval and monitoring arrangements for education programmes. At the current time it is difficult to predict the time scales for implementation of the Government's decision and therefore the impact on the coming year's work plan.

#### Supporting activities

Education update

The Education update newsletter is sent to relevant stakeholders in education three times a year. Work will take place to produce content and distribute issues at the relevant times.

**Publications** 

Publications due for production or potentially due for reprinting in this time period include the approval and monitoring annual report 2010, the standards of education and training and their guidance, the major change supplementary information for education providers and the approval process supplementary information for education providers.

Website

The website requires continuous content management, but there are no particular projects currently planned.

**Seminars** 

The annual education seminars take place from September to December each year. In previous years the seminars have been used to promote the approval and monitoring processes or focus on key areas for communication (such as major

5

| Date       | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title                              | Status   | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| 2010-09-01 | а    | HRD       | PPR      | Items for Education Dept work plan | Final    | Public    |
|            |      |           |          | 2011-12                            | DD: None | RD: None  |

change or student conduct). The Committee may wish to consider if there are further areas that may be appropriate themes for the seminars in the coming year.

Visitor recruitment / training

As a matter of routine, visitors are trained and refreshed in their training. Additionally, we also undertake recruitment activities in conjunction with the Partners Department to fill vacancies.

Committee work

As a matter of routine, work is undertaken to support the Education and Training Committee and the Education and Training Panels such as producing research and papers or offering training sessions. This work will continue in the coming year.

Liaison with stakeholders

In order to continue establishing strong working relationships with stakeholders in health, education and regulation we will continue to undertake activities that raise the profile of the Department and its work. The Committee may wish to make recommendations for groups which members of the Education Department may attend to achieve this goal.

#### **Departmental projects**

Feedback gathering

The Education Department gathers feedback from its stakeholders on a biennial basis. The next round of feedback gathering is due in the coming financial year. Committee members have indicated previously that there may be added value in adopting a different approach to feedback gathering. This round of feedback gathering would provide the opportunity to review the current processes and implement revised methods if necessary.

Commissioner events

Committee members previously indicated that the education seminars could be supplemented by events targeted at commissioners for education. It would be appropriate to consider the current effectiveness of any events given the significant change commissioning in England is likely to undergo over the next year.

Amended prescribing rights for paramedics, physiotherapists and chiropodist / podiatrists

The Department of Health are currently engaged in two projects to propose amendments to prescribing rights for certain professions regulated by the HPC. This work is still in its relatively early stages, but may require significant work in creation of new standards and in ensuring visitor resources are sufficient to cope with the new work in future academic years.

New professions yet to join the Register

As mentioned previously, there remains uncertainty around the prioritisation of professions proposed for regulation by HPC following the general election. However, liaison work for psychotherapists and counsellors, dance movement therapists and healthcare scientists is likely to be ongoing throughout the coming financial year.

Professions recently entered onto the Register

This year we plan to undertake a review of the practitioner psychologist arrangements for approval and monitoring. It is proposed that this is repeated for the second year of the three year programme of visits and also initiated for the hearing aid dispenser programme of visits.

Service user involvement

Following CHRE's recommendations, work has been proposed in papers to the Committee to: undertake a pilot for lay involvement on approval visit panels; conduct research into service user involvement; and commence work to revise standards of education and training to make service user involvement in programme design and delivery compulsory.

Review of role of HPC in quality assurance and enhancement (including review of commendations on approval) As a regulator applying threshold standards to approved programmes there is a tension between our role to quality assure education and training and a more widely adopted quality approach of quality enhancement. It is proposed that work be undertaken to review the legal responsibilities of the regulator alongside the practises of other educational quality assurance / enhancement organisations to ensure we follow good practice and the guiding legislation.

#### Education update review

Six issues of the Education update will have been circulated by the coming financial year. It is proposed that the Education update is reviewed with the intention to bring it more closely into line with organisational requirements for visual identity and house style by working collaboratively with the Communications Department on future issues.

#### Summary of key trends and recommendations for further work from approval and monitoring annual reports 2006-2009

#### 2006

Approval – 59 visits, 72 programmes Annual monitoring – 147 declarations, 179 audits

Major change - process not in operation

| Operational process | Description of trend or recommended work  | Action taken   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Approval            | The cancellation rate for approval visits was significant (20 visits). On some occasions the reason for cancellation was linked to a lack of available visitors without conflicts to undertake work.  | Work was undertaken to ensure that there were sufficient visitors in place to undertake all of the visits. Greater clarification of the requirements of the approval process was provided in standard documentation for education providers (including the approval process supplementary information document). |
| Approval            | Standard of education and training five (practice placement standards) received the most conditions in the majority of professions.   | The standards of education and training guidance document was produced to provide greater clarity on the requirements of the standards.  |
| Approval            | 87 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval or reconfirmed approval subject to conditions being met.  13 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval or reconfirmed approval without any conditions. | N/A  |
| Annual monitoring   | <ul><li>96 percent of programmes received a final decision that the standards of education and training continued to be met.</li><li>4 percent of programme required an approval visit following the outcome of annual monitoring.</li></ul>              | N/A  |

### 2007

Approval – 82 visits, 142 programmes Annual monitoring – 81 declarations, 113 audits Major change – 46 submissions, 80 programmes

| Operational process | Description of trend or recommended work   | Action taken   |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Approval            | The number of cancelled visits was slightly reduced in real terms but in percentage terms rate of cancellation was reduced from 25 percent to 11 percent. No visits were cancelled by HPC as a result of insufficient resources.   | Continued work was undertaken to make the requirements of the standards of education and training and the approval process clear in the education seminars.  |
| Approval            | Standard of education and training five (practice placements) continued to receive the most conditions on approval, though in percentage terms it was the same as standard three, programme management and resources (24 percent). | The education seminars focussed on the eight standards of education and training that received the most conditions to assist education providers in their understanding of the requirements of the standards of education and training. The standards of education and training guidance document was disseminated to education providers to provide greater clarity on the requirements of our standards. |
| Approval            | Standard 2.1 was the single standard that received the most conditions in this year. The standard relates to accurate advertising of the programme and its relationship to eligibility to apply to the Register.                   | The education seminars focussed on the eight standards of education and training that received the most conditions to assist education providers in their understanding of the requirements of the standards of education and training. The standards of   |

|          |   | education and training guidance document was disseminated to education providers to provide greater clarity on the requirements of our standards. An advertising protocol document was also produced to give clear guidance on advertising of programmes to education providers. |
|----------|---|--|
| Approval | 94 percent of visitors' reports were provided to education providers within 28 days of the approval visit.  23 percent of programmes visited provided observations on the visitors' reports for the Committee to consider.  6 percent of visitors' reports were subject to amendments from the Committee. Three out of the nine amendments were as a result of observations provided by the education | The visitors' report was subject to significant review following this year to ensure that it remained an accessible document for the general public and to ensure that reports were consistent in style and approach for each visit.   |
| Approval | provider.  95 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval or reconfirmed approval subject to conditions being met.  5 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval or reconfirmed approval without any conditions.   | N/A  |
| Approval | 40 percent of programmes visited received a final decision on approval within three months of the approval visit.  11 percent of programmes visited received a final decision on approval more than 6 months after the approval visit.  | It was noted in the report that many education providers chose earlier visit dates to allow more than three months to meet any conditions placed on approval.  |

|                   | No programmes had to delay a start date for a programme as a result of pending approval.   |  |
|-------------------|--|--|
| Annual monitoring | 100 percent of annual monitoring audits considered via correspondence required additional documentation before a recommendation could be given by the visitors.  20 percent of annual monitoring audits considered at an | N/A  |
|                   | assessment day required additional documentation before a recommendation could be given by the visitors.   |  |
| Annual monitoring | 99 percent of programmes received a final decision that the standards of education and training continued to be met.   | N/A  |
|                   | 1 percent of programmes required an approval visit following the outcome of annual monitoring.   |  |
| Major Change      | 42 percent of submissions were determined to be minor changes.   | Following this year, work was undertaken to revise the major change process to link the outcomes to the standards of education and |
|                   | 34 percent of submissions were determined to be major changes but no visit was required to gather further information about how the standards of education and training were met.  | training and to enhance the risk based approach in the process.  |
|                   | 6 percent of submissions were determined to be major changes requiring a visit.  |  |
|                   | 18 percent of submissions were pending a final decision at the point of review.  |  |
| Major Change      | 74 percent of submissions took less than three months to process.  | N/A  |

| 5 percent of submissions took more than six months to |  |
|---|--|
| process.  |  |

#### 2008

Approval – 38 visits, 84 programmes Annual monitoring – 139 declarations, 118 audits Major change – 77 submissions, 166 programmes

| Operational process | Description of trend or recommended work   | Action taken  |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Approval            | The rate of cancellation of visits remained relatively constant at 13 percent (previously it was 11 percent). Again, no visits were cancelled as a result of HPC not being able to allocate visitors.                        | No further action was taken, but the information to assist education providers understanding the requirements of the approval process and the standards of education and training was still being circulated in the early stages of the approval process. |
| Approval            | Standard of education and training five (practice placements) continued to receive the most conditions on approval. This time standard five accounted for 37 percent of all conditions placed on approval.                   | It was considered that time should be allowed for the standards of education and training guidance document to have its full effect before taking any further action.   |
| Approval            | Standard 2.1 continued to be the single standard that received the most conditions in this year. The standard relates to accurate advertising of the programme and its relationship to eligibility to apply to the Register. | It was considered that time should be allowed for the standards of education and training guidance document and the advertising protocol to have its full effect before taking any further action.  |
| Approval            | 49 percent of visitors' reports were provided to education providers within 28 days of the approval visit.   | The visitors' report was subject to significant review in this year and the nature of some  |

|                   | <ul> <li>22 percent of programmes visited provided observations on the visitors' reports for the Committee to consider.</li> <li>4 percent of visitors' reports were subject to amendments from the Committee. All cases were as a result of</li> </ul> | visits required lengthy periods of drafting reports. It was anticipated that further work spent on ensuring the new version of the visitors' report was utilised successfully by Education Department employees and that we would see an improvement in the time |
|-------------------|---|--|
|                   | observations provided by the education provider.  | taken to produce reports.  |
| Approval          | 91 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval or reconfirmed approval subject to conditions being met.  | N/A  |
|                   | 9 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval or reconfirmed approval without any conditions.  |  |
| Approval          | 37 percent of programmes visited received a final decision on approval within three months of the approval visit.   | It was noted in the annual report that changes to the approval process allowed education providers to seek extensions or   |
|                   | O percent of programmes visited received a final decision on approval more than 6 months after the approval visit.  | staged deadlines to meeting conditions from the Education and Training Committee if required.  |
|                   | No programmes had to delay a start date for a programme as a result of pending approval.  |  |
| Approval          | 46 commendations were given to programmes.  | Commendations were recorded in the annual report for the first time this year following an earlier decision by the Committee to change the way in which commendations were granted and recorded to enhance dissemination of good practice.                       |
| Annual monitoring | 53 percent of annual monitoring audits considered via correspondence required additional documentation before a   | N/A  |

|                   | recommendation could be given by the visitors.   |   |
|-------------------|--|---|
|                   | 38 percent of annual monitoring audits considered at an assessment day required additional documentation before a recommendation could be given by the visitors. |   |
| Annual monitoring | 96 percent of programmes received a final decision that the standards of education and training continued to be met.   | N/A   |
|                   | 3 percent of programmes required an approval visit following the outcome of annual monitoring.   |   |
|                   | 1 percent of programmes were pending a decision.   |   |
| Annual monitoring | 60 percent of declarations were processed within three months of receipt.  | The areas identified in this data where work took longer than our expected time scales were considered in the annual review of the  |
|                   | 0 percent of declarations took longer than four months to process.   | process. We also issued an updated version of the annual monitoring supplementary information for education providers               |
|                   | 44 percent of audits were processed within three months of receipt.  | document.   |
|                   | 3 percent of audits took longer than six months to process.  |   |
| Major change      | This data only summarises the outcomes from the revised major change process.  | The high percentage of pending notification decisions was noted and partially attributed to education providers giving insufficient |
|                   | 10 percent of notification forms led to a decision to undertake a visit to review changes to programmes.   | information about changes. Work was undertaken to enhance the major change supplementary information for education                  |

|              | 29 percent of notification forms led to a decision to review changes at the next annual monitoring audit.  31 percent of notification forms were reviewed by visitors.  12 percent of notification forms were withdrawn by the education provider. | providers document in the lead up the revision of the process. It was anticipated that more time to become familiar with the requirements would assist education providers in understanding our requirements. |
|--------------|--|---|
|              | 18 percent of notification forms were pending a decision.  |   |
| Major change | 33 percent of submissions reviewed by visitors led to a final decision that there was sufficient evidence to show how the standards of education and training are met and that no visit was required.  | The high percentage of pending submissions was noted and discussed in the later section of the report related to duration of the process.   |
|              | O percent of submissions reviewed by the visitors led to a final decision that there was insufficient evidence to show how the standards of education and training are met and a visit was required to gather more evidence.                       |   |
|              | 67 percent of submissions reviewed by visitors were still pending a decision.  |   |
| Major change | On average the major change notification forms took more than two but less than four weeks to process to a final decision.   | The times taken to reach final decisions were noted in the annual report. It was also noted that since the revised process had only been in operation for a few months that continued                         |
|              | On average the major change submissions took more than eight but less than twelve weeks to process to a final decision.  | training would assist with reducing the time taken to reach final decisions.  |

#### 2009

Approval – 37 visits, 91 programmes Annual monitoring – 177 declarations, 168 audits Major change – 106 submissions, 191 programmes

| Operational process | Description of trend or recommended work                        | Action taken   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Approval            | The rate of cancellation of visits remained relatively constant | No further action was taken, but the   |
|                     | at 14 percent (previously it was 13 percent). Again, no visits  | information to assist education providers  |
|                     | were cancelled as a result of HPC not being able to allocate    | understand the requirements of the approval  |
|                     | visitors.   | process and the standards of education and   |
|                     |   | training was still being circulated in the early                                       |
|                     |   | stages of the approval process.  |
| Approval            | Standard of education and training five (practice               | Whilst it was noted that the revised   |
|                     | placements) continued to receive the most conditions on         | standards of education and training guidance   |
|                     | approval. This time standard five accounted for 30 percent      | may assist in this area, it was considered   |
|                     | of all conditions placed on approval.                           | that further work to communicate the   |
|                     |   | requirements of standard five are required in future years to help education providers |
|                     |   | understand their responsibilities.   |
| Approval            | Standard 2.1 continued to be the single standard that           | It was considered that the revised standards   |
|                     | received the most conditions in this year. The standard         | of education and training, which now   |
|                     | relates to accurate advertising of the programme and its        | explicitly reference the advertising protocol,   |
|                     | relationship to eligibility to apply to the Register.           | will assist with education providers'  |
|                     |   | understanding of the requirements of this standard.                                    |
| Approval            | 69 percent of visitors' reports were provided to education      | The improvement in this area was noted from  |
| •                   | providers within 28 days of the approval visit.                 | last year. The continued work on particularly  |
|                     |   | challenging visits requiring detailed visitors'  |
|                     | 31 percent of programmes visited provided observations on       | reports was attributed as a continuing reason  |
|                     | the visitors' reports for the Committee to consider.            | for the unusually high percentage of reports   |

|                   |  | taking longer that 28 days to produce.  |
|-------------------|--|---|
|                   | 4 percent of visitors' reports were subject to amendments from the Committee. All cases were as a result of observations provided by the education provider. |   |
| Approval          | 71 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval or reconfirmed approval subject to conditions being met.                             | N/A   |
|                   | 9 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval or reconfirmed approval without any conditions.                                       |   |
|                   | 1 percent of programmes visited received a final decision for approval to be withdrawn.  |   |
|                   | 18 percent of programmes visited were still pending a final outcome.   |   |
| Approval          | 19 percent of programmes visited received a final decision on approval within three months of the approval visit.  | The particularly complicated nature of some of the approval visits was attributed as the reason for the significant reduction in the                          |
|                   | 17 percent of programmes visited received a final decision on approval more than 6 months after the approval visit.  | number of programmes not receiving final decisions within three months, and the increase in cases taking longer than six                                      |
|                   | No programmes had to delay a start date for a programme as a result of pending approval.   | months. This year also saw an increase in the number of education providers seeking extensions or staged deadlines for submission of responses to conditions. |
| Approval          | 43 commendations were given to programmes  | N/A   |
| Annual monitoring | 6 percent of annual monitoring audits considered via correspondence required additional documentation before a   | N/A   |

| recommendation could be given by the visitors.   |   |
|--|---|
| 25 percent of annual monitoring audits considered at an assessment day required additional documentation before a recommendation could be given by the visitors. |   |
| 91 percent of programmes received a final decision that the standards of education and training continued to be met.   | N/A   |
| 2 percent of programmes required an approval visit following the outcome of annual monitoring.   |   |
| 8 percent of programmes were pending a decision.   |   |
| 69 percent of declarations were processed within three months of receipt.  | Work was undertaken to review the deadlines for submission for education providers in the following year to determine if  |
| 2 percent of declarations took longer than four months to process.   | it would decrease the processing time for audit submissions. A series of batched deadlines closer to the periods of peak  |
| 44 percent of audits were processed within three months of receipt.  | activity in annual monitoring were implemented to reduce delays stemming from rolling submission dates occurring  |
| 1 percent of audits took longer than six months to process.  | several months before an annual monitoring assessment day.  |
| 24 percent of notification forms led to a decision to undertake a visit to review changes to programmes.   | The reduction in the percentage of pending notification forms was noted.  |
| 10 percent of notification forms led to a decision to review changes at the next annual monitoring audit.  |   |
|  | 25 percent of annual monitoring audits considered at an assessment day required additional documentation before a recommendation could be given by the visitors.  91 percent of programmes received a final decision that the standards of education and training continued to be met.  2 percent of programmes required an approval visit following the outcome of annual monitoring.  8 percent of programmes were pending a decision.  69 percent of declarations were processed within three months of receipt.  2 percent of declarations took longer than four months to process.  44 percent of audits were processed within three months of receipt.  1 percent of audits took longer than six months to process.  24 percent of notification forms led to a decision to undertake a visit to review changes to programmes.  10 percent of notification forms led to a decision to review |

|              | 56 percent of notification forms were reviewed by visitors.  |  |
|--------------|--|--|
|              | 8 percent of notification forms were withdrawn by the education provider.  |  |
|              | 2 percent of notification forms were pending a decision.   |  |
| Major change | 86 percent of submissions reviewed by visitors led to a final decision that there was sufficient evidence to show how the standards of education and training are met and that no visit was required.                        | The reduction in the percentage of pending submissions was noted.  |
|              | 4 percent of submissions reviewed by the visitors led to a final decision that there was insufficient evidence to show how the standards of education and training are met and a visit was required to gather more evidence. |  |
|              | 19 percent of submissions reviewed by visitors were still pending a decision.  |  |
| Major change | Again, on average the major change notification forms took more than two but less than four weeks to process to a final decision.  | The majority of delays were identified as being linked to education providers misunderstanding the requirements of the revised major change process. The |
|              | On average the major change submissions took more than twelve but less than sixteen weeks to process to a final decision.  | education seminars in 2009 were focussed particularly on helping education providers understand this process better.                                     |