

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Graduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	18 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14524-B9G2J0

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 major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (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:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04177

Programme name	Graduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04178

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 has informed us that they have increased the learner numbers for this programme from 25 to 50 and added an additional cohort.

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.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: As part of the submission the visitors were provided with Curriculum Vitae's (CV's) of the two new staff members appointed to support these programmes. From

reading the CV's the visitors noted that other responsibilities have been allocated to these staff, and so it is not clear how much of their time is dedicated to these programmes. One of the staff members had stated their involvement in the programmes were "minor". The information states that the two new members of staff appointed are equivalent to 1.0 FTE. However, the visitors were not clear what the FTE of each individual member was, so they could not determine how much time each member of staff would contribute to this programme. Additionally, there were no details provided about the existing staff members involved in the teaching of the programmes, and how much of their time is contributed to these programmes. Without this information, the visitors were unable to make a judgement about the overall staffing provision and whether this was adequate for the proposed increase in learner numbers. As all these details were not provided, the visitors were unable to establish whether there was an adequate number of staff who were appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the overall staffing resources for the programmes, and how much staff members contribute to these programmes, in order to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: As part of the submission the visitors were provided with Curriculum Vitae's (CV's) of the two new staff members appointed to support both programmes. From reading the CV's the visitors noted that the two new staff members had omitted previous employment details from the CV. As this information was not provided, the visitors were not able to establish whether the new staff members had the necessary knowledge and expertise required to deliver their parts of the programmes effectively.

Suggested evidence: Information about the qualifications and experience of the new staff members involved in these programmes which demonstrates relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	City, University of London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time MSc Speech and Language Therapy, Full time Master in Speech and Language Therapy (with Hons), Full time Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	01 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14591-Y0R8Y1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	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 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:

Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50 shared across the MSc Speech and Language Therapy programme.
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04233

Programme name	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 100
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04234

Programme name	Master in Speech and Language Therapy (with Hons)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50 shared across the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy programme.
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04264

Programme name	Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 100
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04265

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 has informed us that they have redistributed the number of learners across their speech and language therapy programmes. This change now means that there will be 100 learners on the MSc / PG Dip programmes and 50 learners shared across the BSc and the Master in Speech and Language Therapy 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: 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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Derby
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Date submission received	14 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14559-P0Z5T4

Contents

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

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:

Gail Fairey	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04194

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 informed us that they have developed an Assistant Practitioner Bridging programme, which is an entry route for applicants who have completed a foundation degree programme offered by the education provider. The entry route bridges the gaps in knowledge between the education provider’s foundation degree programme and years one and two of the currently approved programme. Applicants who successfully complete the bridging programme can enter onto year three of the approved BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography.

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: 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 23 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	22 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14592-N4C8Y6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation	3

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:

Natalie Matchett	Occupational therapist
Rebecca Khanna	Occupational therapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04228

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 August 2004

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04235

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 originally intended to increase learner numbers for one cohort of their MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) programme, but following this cohort running successfully, have decided to increase these numbers on a more permanent basis. In order to manage this increase, they intend to keep the same total number of learners across their whole provision, by reducing numbers for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme.

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: 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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Glyndwr University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	27 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14569-N3D3V7

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation	3

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:

Natalie Matchett	Occupational therapist
Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 January 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04207

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist

First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 29
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04249

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 informed the HCPC that they intend to offer a part time route for the programme, in addition to the current full time route. The education provider has not made changes to the existing full time route, however the additional learners on the part time route will likely have an impact for this programme.

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: 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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	24 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13299-G4P5Q9

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	5

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:

Lucy Myers	Speech and language therapist
Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03750

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2019

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04292

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 has made changes to the curriculum and assessment of the programme. They also reported their intention to add a part time route through the existing programme. The current programme will be reviewed due to the revised standards of educations and training (SETs) and updated professional body curriculum guidelines.

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.

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.

Reason: For the proposed BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Part time) programme the education provider has provided a web link to evidence this standard. The visitors noted that the website gives two options of a full time and a part time route together with the anticipated length of studies for each route. However the visitors were

unable to get further information on the new part time route around administration matters, timetabling or practice-based learning across the six year study. The visitors were not able to determine whether the applicants will have the information they require to make an informed choice about the proposed part time programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information which demonstrates relevant information shared with applicants relating to the proposed BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Part time) programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates how the applicant will have the required information to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the proposed BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Part time) programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The education provider showed the strategic plan which includes learner numbers across speech and language therapy programmes and totals 132 learners for all programmes delivered within the speech and language sciences school. With regards to the proposed BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Part time) programme the visitors were unclear on the proposed learner numbers. In particular, the visitors are aware of a maximum learner cohort of 50 learners on the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Full time) programme. However, the visitors were not clear what the transition arrangements for current learners on the full time route or to any additional learner numbers on the part time route would be. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine whether the programmes will be effectively managed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the proposed learner numbers for both programmes and any other arrangements which will ensure effective management for both programmes.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which clarifies the learner numbers on both programmes. Further evidence which demonstrates how the programmes are effectively managed.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider has provided a programme management chart relating to the current BSc (Hons) Speech & Language Therapy (Full time) programme. The visitors understood that the structure on the chart refers to the existing full time route. However, they were unclear whether the same structure applied on the part time route. Therefore, the visitors were unable to make a judgement as to whether the proposed BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Part time) programme will be effectively managed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the programme management structure for the proposed BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Part time).

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Part time) programme is effectively managed.

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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning
Date submission received	11 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13259-V9T4X4

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 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:

Anne Mackay	Social worker
Patricia Cartney	Social worker
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 90
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03721

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2019

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04191

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 has highlighted that they want to introduce an integrated degree apprenticeship social work programme which is based on their currently approved BA (Hons) Social Work programme. We will also need to consider how the delivery of an apprenticeship programme will impact on the currently approved programme.

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

Reason: For this standard the visitors considered the diagram of the programme structure which outlines the modules on the programme. From the information provided, the visitors were unclear how practice-based learning will be structured on the proposed new programme. However, the visitors were unclear what the range of practice-based learning will be for apprentices who have working commitments in parallel with their

practice-based learning The visitors were unable to determine what the structure, the duration and the range of practice-based learning will be and how this supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which clearly outlines how practice-based learning is structured on the proposed programme, and how this will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the structure of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

5.8 Learners and practice educators must have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning.

Reason: For this standard the visitors noted the education provider has different roles and ways of support in place for practice-based learning for the proposed programme. The visitors understood that learners will be working with their independent practice educator and their line manager. However the visitors were unclear what the lines of communication and responsibility are between apprentices, their line managers and their independent practice educators. The visitors were unable to determine how learners and practice educators have the information they need from the education provider in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which clarifies the lines of communication and responsibility in practice-based learning, which ensures learners and practice educators have the information they need to be prepared for practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which clarifies the information to prepare learners and practice educator for 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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Medical Imaging, Full time
Date submission received	13 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14419-W8L3D8

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	5
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	5

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.

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 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:

Mark Widdowfield	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Medical Imaging
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04117

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 has informed us of a review of the curriculum for this programme to align it to the requirements of their new Curriculum Framework across health care professions that they deliver. The education provider is moving towards an inter-disciplinary model for health and social care education.

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.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider provided a standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document which intended to show in which modules SOPs are addressed. The education provider also provided the revised module descriptors. However, the visitors were unable to cross reference all learning outcomes the education provider had mapped in the SOPs mapping. In particular, the module U30153 references three learning outcomes, but there are six learning outcomes mapped for the respective module in the SOPs mapping. The visitors were unable to determine whether the learning outcomes ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the learning outcomes which are addressed in each of the revised modules link to the SOPs to make a judgement on whether the standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence on the revised modules which shows how the learning outcomes ensure that learners meet the standards of diagnostic radiographers.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider showed the revised module descriptors and the SOPs mapping form. In a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the learning outcomes are mapped across SOPs. However, the visitors considered the content of the modules not being clearly linked with the learning outcomes across modules. For example, in module U30125 the visitors noted the learning outcomes covered discussion around the strengths and weaknesses of published evidence and around the context and barriers of evidence based decision-making. However, they could not see how the content of the module U30125 linked to this learning outcome. This is because learning outcomes have generally a cognitive approach rather than an action-focused approach. The visitors were unable to determine how the modules fit with the learning outcomes and ultimately how they fit together. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the learning outcomes are indicative of the modules' content.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence on the revised modules which indicates how the content of each module and the learning outcomes ensure relevance with the standards of proficiency.

4.5 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the programme.

Reason: The education provider did not provide this evidence in support of this standard. However, the visitors noted that there were core elements of academic and practice-based learning in the revised module descriptors. Therefore, without information in this area, the visitors were unable to understand how the academic and practice-based learning modules integrate together. In particular, the visitors were unable to identify how elements of academic learning will ensure appropriateness for delivery of practice-based learning. Thus the visitors were unclear how the academic and practice-based learning modules are appropriate to integrate with the curriculum. Therefore the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures integration of theory and practice will remain central to the programme following the curriculum review the education provided introduced. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensure practice-based learning continues to integrate theory on an ongoing basis to make a judgement on whether the standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates how integration of theory and practice remains central to the programme.

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.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider has shown an assessment map across their revised modules. The education provider has stated the assessment for the practice-based learning modules is a "portfolio" with a 4000 word limit. The visitors were unable to locate information relevant to the assessment, in terms of when

it takes place, what is being assessed via the portfolio, and what the assessment criteria are. The visitors could not determine whether the assessment strategy and design will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which shows how the assessment in practice-based learning fits within the broader assessment strategy and design to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for diagnostic radiographers.

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 22 May 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 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 are satisfied that SET 6.1 is met at threshold as the education provider has explained they are currently developing the Practice Assessment Document (PAD) for year three of the programme. The visitors were unable to review relevant evidence around this PAD, but they noted that the PAD for years one and two is satisfactory and recommended the ongoing approval of the programme. They suggest in future monitoring processes that the education provider should ensure that they can present the evidence for this standard as the programme will reach year three.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	13 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14416-R5W5Q1

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	5

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:

David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 August 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04121

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 has informed us of a review of the curriculum for this programme to align it to the requirements of their new Curriculum Framework. The education provider is moving towards an inter-disciplinary model for health and social care education.

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.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The education provider has not submitted evidence in support of this standard. However the visitors noted changes in the management of certain elements on the programme. The visitors understood that a group of staff members will be managing the delivery of the revised modules for interprofessional learning (IPL). The visitors considered that this management model of IPL modules goes in line with the revised interdisciplinary model which the education provider is introducing for their health and social care education programmes. However, the visitors were unclear what the lines of responsibility and the workload will be for each individual within the group management team for the delivery of the IPL. Thus the visitors were unable to determine how the IPL elements on the programme will be managed. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the lines of responsibility and the workload of staff relating to IPL elements of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further information which clearly outlines management responsibilities and workload of staff for the IPL modules on the programme to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

4.3 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Reason: The education provider has not submitted evidence in support of this standard. However the visitors noted changes in this area relating to the content of the shared IPL modules. The visitors understood that academic staff relevant to a specific programme will be responsible for teaching IPL elements for all the professions. However, the visitors were unclear how the teaching staff on these modules will be able to consider the learning needs of each professional group involved. The visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure that the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of each profession are reflected and taken into consideration from academic staff on a different profession. Therefore the visitors require further information on the academic staff teaching IPL elements sufficiently considering the learning needs specific to the operating department practitioners' profession.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates that the programme reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the College of operating department practitioners' scope of practice.

4.6 The learning and teaching methods used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

Reason: The education provider has not submitted evidence in support of this standard. However the visitors noted changes in the teaching methods for the revised modules where the delivery of IPL occurs. In a review of the documentation the visitors noted that among the professions involved in the shared modules there are some groups of professionals who are relatively smaller than others. The visitors considered how all groups of professionals will be appropriately represented to contextualise IPL for their respective profession, although they noted that operating department practitioners may not be represented proportionately. For example, in module U30125 the visitors noted the learning outcomes covered discussion around the context, barriers and enablers for evidence informed decision-making. However they could not see how learners on the module U30125 will be able to discuss with learners from all other relevant professions involved in IPL if their group is not represented proportionately. This is because operating department practitioners would be a less represented profession in relation to the other nursing and allied health professions involved in IPL. The visitors were unable to determine how the teaching and learning methods used are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates how the learning and teaching methods used are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Swansea University
Name of programme(s)	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for Emergency Medical Technicians, Part time
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14544-R0D0M8

Contents

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

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:

Paul Bates	Paramedic
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for Emergency Medical Technicians
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04189

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 has proposed changes to the entry criteria for the programme by expanding the range of qualifications accepted for entry on to this programme. The education provider has noted that all other entry requirements will remain the same for this programme.

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: 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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14562-X1D1H2

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 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:

Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 July 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04196

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 has informed the HCPC they intend to increase learner numbers from 40 to 50 per cohort.

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.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider said they currently have seven members of staff teaching on the programme, and provided the staff curricula vitae. The education provider also said that teaching is supported by input from other academic staff, as well as external specialist lecturers and hours from a visiting lecturer.

It was not clear from the information provided whether all current staff are full time, or how much the other staff and visiting lecturers contribute to teaching on the programme. The education provider is increasing the learner numbers from 40 to 50 on the programme. The visitors have not seen information about how the education provider plans to manage this increase in terms of staffing, in particular over the next two academic years when the maximum number of learners across all three years of the programme will have increased. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Information which demonstrates that with the increase of learner numbers, there will continue to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. For example, information about how much time staff are inputting to the programmes (such as the FTE), including other academic staff and visiting lecturers.

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 22 May 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](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Nordoff Robbins
Validating body	Goldsmiths, University of London
Name of programme(s)	Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society, Full time
Date submission received	01 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14483-L7J3C1

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 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:

Phoene Cave	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Music therapist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04158

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 intending to introduce a third teaching base for the programme, in Newcastle. Currently, the programme is approved to be delivered simultaneously in Manchester and London, with the management of the programme based in London. The education provider will not make changes to the delivery of the curriculum or assessment of the programme. They intend to deliver the programme in Newcastle, in the same way it is currently delivered in Manchester and London.

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.

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.

Reason: The education provider is intending to deliver the programme at a new site in Newcastle, in addition to the current provision in London and Manchester. The education provider did not submit evidence for this standard as they said they have not made changes to how the programme meets this standard. The visitors have not seen what information will be given to applicants about the delivery of the programme in Newcastle that would give them the information they need to make an informed

decision about whether to take up a place on the programme delivered at this site. This includes information that is specific to programme delivery in Newcastle, and information about practice-based learning for this area. For example, the visitors could not see how applicants would be made aware of any relevant information about associated costs of travel and or accommodation, which may be required if there are distant sites for practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the information that will be provided to applicants about the delivery of the programme in Newcastle that will give them the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: On the SETs mapping document for this standard, the education provider stated “The existing management structure will continue to operate. To enable us to ensure that the programme operates effectively as a national programme, each teaching base has a Base Coordinator (effectively a lead tutor) and we will”. The visitors note the sentence is incomplete, and therefore could not make a judgement on how this standard continues to be met. The visitors require further information about what the education provider intends to have in place, which ensures the programme is effectively managed.

Suggested evidence: Complete information to demonstrate what the education provider intends to have in place, which ensures the programme is effectively managed.

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 has said that the arrangements relating to placement identification, support and monitoring will be the same for the Newcastle site as they are currently for London and Manchester. The education provider has said that there will be appropriate and sufficient practice-based learning for the new site in Newcastle. This is a new standard, and so we have not previously seen evidence of what process the education provider uses to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors have not seen evidence of how the education provider ensures this, for example, how they record and monitor availability of practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Further information to demonstrate there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

Reason: For the standard, the education provider explained that over that last few years they have grown and developed the workforce in Yorkshire and the North East so they have a number of staff who are already experienced in providing input on the

programme that is delivered in London or Manchester, or in both. The education provider indicated there will be a new tutor for the Newcastle site, who will be from the Yorkshire / North East region. The education provider highlighted that this person will already have had experience guest teaching on the programme delivered in London or Manchester, as well as hosting learners on practice-based learning. On review of the documentation, the visitors understood the programme will be delivered at the Newcastle site by the same staff as in London and Manchester, and there will be some new staff from the region who have had experience inputting into the programme in London and Manchester.

From the information provided, the visitors were not clear exactly what the staffing provision for the Newcastle site would be, including detailed information about who the staff are or how many staff will input to the delivery in Newcastle. In addition, the visitors note the base co-ordinator / lead therapist will move from London to Newcastle. It was not clear to the visitors how many hours this person will be doing as part of the split role between education (training) and music services (delivery). It was also not clear to the visitors whether other staff within the education team would have increased hours, to reflect the increase of workload for the additional site and learners on the programme. For this standard, we require the education provider to demonstrate there is an adequate number of staff, including educators as well as those involved in other areas such as managing or administering the programme. The visitors require further information about the staffing provision, including the structure of staffing, for the Newcastle site to determine whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested evidence: Further information about the staffing provision and its structure for the Newcastle site, in particular, detailed information about who the staff are, including how many, who will be involved in the delivery of the programme.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: On the SETs mapping document, the education provider stated there are no changes to how the programme meets this standard. In the documentation provided, the education provider explained that in the local region for the Newcastle site, the education provider currently employs music therapists to work in 31 partner organisations. The education provider said they therefore have access to a wide range of potential placement settings with suitable levels of support. From the information provided, the visitors understand the education provider intends to take a cohort of ten learners at the Newcastle site. From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not clear how the education provider will ensure there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for the Newcastle site. As such, the visitors require further information to determine how the education provider will ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for the Newcastle site.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the education provider will ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for the Newcastle site.

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.

Reason: On the SETs mapping document, the education provider stated there are no changes to how the programme meets this standard. In the documentation provided, the education provider explained that in the local region for the Newcastle site, the education provider currently employs music therapists to work in 31 partner organisations. The education provider said they therefore have access to a wide range of potential placement settings with suitable levels of support. The visitors understand the education provider currently have a process to ensure that practice educators for this programme will undertake regular training appropriate to their role. However, the visitors were not clear whether any new practice educators for the Newcastle site would be required to undertake the same training as practice educators for the Manchester or London sites. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether practice educators in the region for Newcastle delivery will undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the education provider will ensure that practice educators involved with the Newcastle site will undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of 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 22 May 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](#).