

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	14 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14575-Q9C9H8

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:

David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
Lawrence Martin	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 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04220

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.

In September 2018, the education provider reduced the total practice based learning hours for the programme from 900 to 750 hours, by revising how practice based learning would be delivered in years 1 and 2. The education provider has informed the HCPC that they will continue to deliver 750 hours of practice based learning but will be making a change to how this is delivered across the whole programme, now including year 3. Additionally, they are making changes to the range of practice based learning experiences available in the third year of the 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.

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

Reason: The education provider previously notified us in June 2018 about their intention to reduce their practice based learning hours on the programme from 900 to 750 hours. From a review of the documentation provided at the time, the reduction only applied to years 1 and 2 and there was no evidence relating to year 3. Upon submission of additional documents by the education provider for that review, and a further review by our visitors, the visitors were satisfied that the evidence provided for years 1 and 2 was sufficient and recommended that the programme remains approved.

The education provider has now informed us that these changes will now also apply to learners in year 3. They explained that this will be the first time that they will have a year

3 cohort following implementation of the programme in 2017/18, hence the need to review the change for year 3. Within the standards of education and training mapping document, the visitors were informed that regular meetings are held with practice educators and mentors for information sharing and updates about course developments. Upon reviewing the evidence submitted, the visitors understood the rationale for making the changes to year 3. However, they were unable to identify any discussions held with practice educators or mentors to inform them about the change to the hours, nor how learners were made aware of the changes to ensure they understand what is expected of them. As such the visitors require the education provider evidences how they have disseminated the changes with practice educators and learners and how this will be managed.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of how the education provider has informed both the learners and the practice educators of the changes made to year 3.

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 04 July 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	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship, Work based Learning
Date submission received	11 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14558-G2N5B7

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
Joanne Thomas	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 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04192

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Operating department practitioner

First intake	01 August 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04193

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 new degree apprenticeship route through the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme currently approved full time programme. The introduction of the degree apprenticeship routes will present some differences to 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.

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 has mentioned that the applicant will apply with the employer to show interest on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship programme. The visitors noted the detailed process which the education

provider will undertake for each candidate following reference from the employer. However, the visitors were unclear how the process is initiated with the employer in the first place. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how the admission process will give 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 the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship programme. The visitors require further evidence, which demonstrates how the application process is initiated with the employer.

Suggested evidence: Information on the admissions process and how the education provider ensures 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 BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship programme. Additionally, the education provider must demonstrate what process the employers have in place for referring their employees for this programme.

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

Reason: The education provider has mentioned that the arrangements to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners will remain unchanged. The visitors noted that there will be further support provided by the employer within the practice-based learning setting for learners on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship programme. However, the visitors were unclear whether the existing arrangements for learners on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme will apply for learners on the proposed BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship programme. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether there are arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship programme in all settings. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how learners on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship programme will be supported in the academic setting.

Suggested evidence: Information on the arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of apprentices in the academic setting on the proposed programme.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: The education provider has stated in the programme handbook that “apprentices who step off the programme... will not be eligible to register with the HCPC” (page 16). As per the wording of this standard, learners who successfully graduate from the programme will be eligible to apply for admission to the Register. The visitors were unclear whether the above statement is reflective of the standard. Additionally, on page four of the programme handbook the education provider stated “...in becoming a registered operating department practitioner”. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider will ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors require the

education providers to provide evidence which demonstrates language reflective of the standard.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence clarifying that learners, educators and other are aware that only successful completion of the proposed programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

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 apprentices on the proposed programme will be committed with working hours and academic learning hours in parallel. The visitors understood that learners will be working with practice educators and their line managers in the working environment. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider will manage lines of communication and responsibility for practice educators on the proposed programme, which will allow apprentices to engage with practice-based learning and academic learning. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure whether learners and practice educators will have the information they need in a timely manner to be prepared for the practice-based learning. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will manage lines of communication and responsibility for practice educators on the proposed programme, which will ensure learners and practice educators have the information they need to be prepared for practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which clarifies the mode of study and how the amount of practice-based learning hours is managed alongside the working hours to prepare apprentices and practice educators for practice-based learning on the proposed 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 04 July 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	Bradford College
Validating body	The University of Bolton
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, The University of Bolton, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, The University of Bolton, Part time
Date submission received	25 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14814-R1P6Y4

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:

Michael Branicki	Social worker
Gary Dicken	Social worker
Patrick Armsby	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 October 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04290

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 October 2017

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04291

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 indicated changes to the structure and delivery of the programme that will also change the assessments carried out on the programme. They have combined two modules titled “Personal, Professional Development and Readiness for Direct Practice 2” (currently at Level 5) and “Personal, Professional Development and Readiness for Direct Practice 3” (currently at Level 6) - to form a new 20 credit module, “Inclusive Assessment and Decision Making” to be delivered during Semester 1 of Level 6. They have also moved some modules from running across two semesters to running in just a single semester, as well as moving modules to better support the end point assessment for learners.

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 04 July 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	Edge Hill University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	20 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14493-Y2G7L4

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:

David Whitmore	Paramedic
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04166

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.

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.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted showing that the North West Ambulance Service, who provide ambulance-based practice-based learning for the programme, had given reassurances that they would be able to find extra capacity for the proposed additional learners. They were satisfied that the standard was met as regards to ambulance-based practice-based learning. However, they could not see from the evidence submitted how the education provider had ensured sufficient extra capacity for their non-ambulance practice-based learning settings. They were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has secured sufficient capacity in non-ambulance practice-based learning settings for the proposed additional learners.

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 04 July 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)	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology, Full time D.Psych in Counselling Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	28 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13555-Q5K9B0

Contents

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 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:

David Packwood	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
John Donaghy	Paramedic
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03961

Programme name	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist

Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03962

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 are making changes to the curriculum to create shared competencies, and shared learning with other approved practitioner psychologist programmes at the education provider.

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 04 July 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 5: 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 education provider has created shared learning with other approved practitioner psychologist programmes they offer. The education provider submitted some information about how they intend to meet our standard in relation to interprofessional learning. This is a revised standard, and we will not consider this now. However, we will assess the changes via the annual monitoring process in the 2019 - 2020 academic year to ensure the programme continues to meet the standards. The education provider should consider how they ensure interprofessional learning is demonstrated on their programme, which ensures that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. Evidence for inter professional learning should include information about learning with, and from, rather than only shared learning, or learning alongside which takes place. The education provider should consider how they meet this standard, and include evidence about this in their next annual monitoring audit submission.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time Doctorate in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	14 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14552-Q4K7H3

Contents

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 44
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04188

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 1997

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 78
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04222

Programme name	Doctorate in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04223

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 changes to the intake for the Masters programme as they increase the intake from 44 to 66 learners per year. The education provider has indicated that despite the increase in MSc learners, it would not exceed its overall existing learner allocation for all pre-registration Physiotherapy programmes (MSc, BSc & Doctorate in Physiotherapy).

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 04 July 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 5: 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 were satisfied that the education provider has highlighted how they will meet the standards with an increased MSc cohort due to the undersubscribed BSc and DPT programme. While the visitors were satisfied with the current resourcing in place to meet the standards, they wish to make the education provider aware of the potential to not meet the standards in the future. They recommend that the education provider has a contingency plan for the allocation of resources, staffing and practice-based learning should the number of learners for each programme be at their maximum intake. The visitors suggest that these areas are monitored in future to ensure the standards are being met.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Health Psychology, Full time Doctorate in Health Psychology, Part time Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Full time Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	13 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14567-R4M2P4

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

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:

Lynn Dunwoody	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Sandra Wolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04203

Programme name	Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist

Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 2
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04204

Programme name	Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04205

Programme name	Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 2
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04206

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 programmes modules, including changes to module content and credits. They have also revised assessment and delivery of the shared elements over multiple programmes.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: On page 8 of the Learning Outcomes by Module New Layout document, the visitors read that the education provider has made a change to the systematic review requirement for the Advanced Research in Applied Psychology 1. Learners will now conduct a mini systematic review as opposed to a full systematic review. The visitors understand that it is a British Psychological Society (BPS) requirement of the Research Competence that trainees must complete a full systematic review. The visitors were not clear how the change to a mini systematic review would reflect the skills and knowledge base as articulated in relevant curriculum guidance. The visitors require further information about this change to determine whether the standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further information about the change to a mini systematic review, and how this change will continue to meet the standard.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programmes remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 04 July 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 education provider has created shared learning with other approved practitioner psychologist programmes they offer. This is a revised standard, and we will not consider this now. However, we will assess the changes via the annual monitoring process in the 2019 - 2020 academic year to ensure the programme continues to meet the standards. The education provider should consider how they ensure interprofessional learning is demonstrated on their programme, which ensures that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. Evidence for inter professional learning should include information about learning with, and from, rather than only shared learning, or learning alongside which takes place. The education provider should consider how they meet this standard, and include evidence about this in their next annual monitoring audit submission.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Part time Podiatry (Degree) Apprenticeship, Work based learning
Date submission received	29 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14794-P7N0N8

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:

Emma Supple	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
Paul Blakeman	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04279

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04280

Programme name	Podiatry (Degree) Apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 52 across both full time and part time programmes
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04350

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 propose to deliver an integrated Degree Apprenticeship route through the currently approved BSc (Hons) Podiatry programmes using the same programme design as these 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 04 July 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 Hull
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Work based learning
Date submission received	23 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14782-S2P6B7

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:

David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	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 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04277

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2019

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04306

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 planning to introduce a degree apprenticeship route through their existing programme. Learners on the degree apprenticeship route will have the same award on completion of the programme. There will be some changes to admissions, curriculum, practice- based learning and assessments to integrate the new route.

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.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Reason: The education provider provided the revised programme specification and the programme practice work book in support of this standard. From their review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to identify total learner numbers for both

programmes. The visitors were unclear on the education provider's plans to manage the resources should the maximum cohort size on the current programme increase. The visitors could not determine whether there would be sufficient resources to support additional learners on the degree apprenticeship route. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the resources to support learning in all settings are effective and appropriate to the delivery of both programmes. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the education provider's plans on total learner numbers for the proposed apprenticeship route and the BSc (Hons) operating department practice programme, and how they plan to manage the resources to support all learners.

Suggested evidence: Information on total learner numbers for both programmes, and the plan to manage resources should the maximum cohort size increase.

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 education provider has provided evidence including the revised programme specification and the apprenticeship tripartite agreement. The visitors understood that the revised documentation will become available to learners and practice educators to support them and provide clarity on their roles and responsibilities. However the visitors were unclear how the education provider will inform practice educators and those involved in practice-based learning on the changes made to ensure they are prepared to support practice-based learning on the proposed apprenticeship route. The visitors were unable to determine whether practice educators and those involved in practice-based learning have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice educators are prepared for practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence on the information being delivered to practice educators in a timely manner for them to be prepared for practice-based learning for the proposed degree apprenticeship.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 04 July 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 Liverpool
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	15 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14271-C5M2T5

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:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Rachel Picton	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	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	9 January 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04087

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 indicated there have been changes to the curriculum with new programme learning outcomes, the modules (name and form), the assessment strategy and the content has been updated. The number of practice placements has been expanded from 10 to 12. There is also a new continuous clinical assessment scheme proposed (and piloted) to replace the current 'spot' test clinical assessment scheme.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	9 January 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04122

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 indicated there have been changes to the curriculum with new programme learning outcomes, the modules (name and credit value), the assessment strategy and the content has been updated. The number of practice placements weeks in total has been reduced to 40 weeks (current programme totals 46) and all placement is within University term dates. There is also a new continuous clinical assessment scheme proposed (and piloted) to replace the current 'spot' test clinical assessment scheme.

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 04 July 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	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	PG Dip Social Work (Employment based), Work based learning
Date submission received	08 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-14828-F2S6K0

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:

David Childs	Social worker
Michael Branicki	Social worker
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Employment based)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 42
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04305

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 reported:

- 1. Minor revisions of the wording of some learning outcomes.
- 2. Revisions of some assessment methods to offer a more varied assessment experience for learners.

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 04 July 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	The University of Northampton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Apprenticeship Route, Full time
Date submission received	16 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14522-Y4J5X6

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:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04186

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Apprenticeship Route
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04287

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 propose to deliver an integrated Degree Apprenticeship route through the currently approved 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: 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: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors understood that the Degree Apprenticeship route will be delivered over a period of three years which would equate to approximately 45 weeks per academic year with teaching continued across the summer. The visitors noted the End Point Assessment (EPA) summary timetable explained that the apprenticeship route will last approximately 48 months. Due to the disparity in the information it was not clear whether the Degree Apprenticeship route would be completed over a three year or a four year period. Additionally, the visitors were not able to establish whether the 45 weeks stated included the time spent in the practice-based learning environment. As such, the visitors were not able to determine the length of the Degree Apprenticeship and how the EPA would align into the programme. The visitors were not able to establish how applicants would be made aware of the requirements of practice-based learning. The visitors considered that if this information was not available to potential applicants it would be difficult for them to make a fully informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide clarity on the length of the Degree Apprenticeship programme and where the EPA fits into the programme and the length of time apprentices will be expected to spend in the practice-based learning environment. The education provider will also need to explain how this information is made clear to applicants so they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information detailing the length of the Degree Apprenticeship programme and the amount of time apprentices will be expected to spend in the practice-based learning environment and how this information is made clear to potential applicants so they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

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

Reason: From reviewing the information, the visitors understood that the introduction of the Degree Apprenticeship programme will include an additional ten learners on the new programme while the cohort on the existing programme will remain the same. However, from this information the visitors were unclear if any additional staffing resources will be required to accommodate the increase in learner numbers across the programmes. In addition the visitors were unclear about the requirements of the new role of training and supporting work based mentor. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what staffing arrangements will be in place to support the learners on both occupational therapy programmes.

Additional evidence: Information outlining how the education provider will ensure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff will continue to be in place to deliver these programmes effectively.

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: As part of the submission, the education provider outlined that the Degree Apprenticeship route will incorporate 4 days in practice through an active blended learning (ABL) approach. This will be used to support learners in practice-based learning to meet the standards of proficiency for the programme. This approach will be used to ensure that learning is monitored, guided and structured to sign off skills based

modules in practice. However, from this information the visitors were not able to establish how the education provider would ensure that an adequate number and range of practice-based learning opportunities will be made available to the ten learners on the Degree Apprenticeship programme in order to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of learning outcomes. Therefore, the education provider must outline how the education provider will ensure that there are a suitable number and range of practice-based learning available for the Degree Apprenticeship programme. This is so learners have the opportunity to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and meet the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists.

Additional evidence: Information outlining how the education provider will ensure that there will be an adequate number and range of practice-based learning opportunities available to the learners.

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 04 July 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)	Non-Medical Prescribing IP and SP for Designated AHPs (PHs and CHs) level 6, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing IP and SP for Designated AHPs (PHs and CHs) level 7, Part time
Date submission received	29 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14572-H1D2B0

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 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:

James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber)
Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist (Independent prescriber) Physiotherapist (Supplementary prescriber)
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing IP and SP for Designated AHPs (PHs and CHs) level 6
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing, Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04216

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing IP and SP for Designated AHPs (PHs and CHs) level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing, Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04217

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continue 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 changes in the professions which are admitted to their non-medical prescribing programmes. The new professions to be admitted are paramedics, therapeutic radiographers and pharmacists.

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.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors were made aware the programmes will start admitting learners from the three new eligible professions which are paramedics, therapeutic

radiographers and pharmacists. With regards to all five programmes under assessment which are Supplementary Prescribing, Non-Medical Prescribing IP and SP for Designated AHPs (PHs and CHs) level 6 and Non-Medical Prescribing IP and SP for Designated AHPs (PHs and CHs) level 7, Supplementary Prescribing to Independent Prescribing Level 6 and Supplementary Prescribing to Independent Prescribing Level 7 the visitors were unclear on the plans the education provider has around maximum learner numbers. However, the visitors were unclear whether the total maximum learner numbers will remain the same. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine whether the programmes will be effectively managed. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the total learner numbers for all programmes and any other arrangements which will ensure effective management for both programmes.

Suggested evidence: Information on total learner numbers and available resources to ensure the programmes are effectively managed.

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and/or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics on their prescribing practice.

Reason: The education provider provided information about the assessed learning outcomes throughout the modules. The visitors noted that education providers will need to facilitate learners from various professions to become familiar with HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However, the visitors were unable to identify how this is addressed through the curriculum. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how the curriculum ensures that learners understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors require further evidence on how the learners will understand the standards of conduct, performance and ethics for HCPC and/or NMC.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates how the curriculum ensures that learners understand the implication of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider provided evidence including programme specification for the interprofessional learning (IPL) module of the programmes. The visitors noted that different staff members are mentioned to support the planning of the revised IPL modules. However, the visitors were unclear what the level of involvement for AHP staff members is in the delivery of the programme. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group will be adequately identified and addressed. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will provide profession-specific support in IPL for AHPs and outlines which staff members are responsible for the delivery of the lectures.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will ensure the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group will be adequately identified and addressed.

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 04 July 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	Scottish Ambulance Academy and Glasgow Caledonian University
Validating body	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	DipHE Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	09 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14557-S7W6R7

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.....	7

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:

Andrew Jones	Paramedic
Susan Boardman	Paramedic
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	DipHE Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 June 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	MC04190

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 that they intend to increase learner numbers from 200 to 250 on the programme per year from August 2019, until the programme closes in August 2021. The education provider plans to spread the increase across the current four intakes, rather than having an additional intake per year.

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: From review of the documentation, the visitors understood that additional sites in Grangemouth and Hamilton may be used for the programme to accommodate the additional learners. The visitors understand that these sites are located much further from the current sites, which may require learners to arrange travel and accommodation if they are required to attend these new sites. The visitors were not clear what the financial implications might be for learners if this is required, or what support would be provided to enable them to attend these sites. As the visitors have not seen this information, they could not determine whether applicants would have this information before deciding whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors require further information to determine whether applicants will have the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information about how learners will be supported to attend the additional sites if required, and how this information is communicated to applicants to ensure applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: The education provider did not submit evidence in relation to this standard. From their review of the submission, the visitors noted that the increase to learner numbers may impact on how this standard continues to be met. The visitors noted that the overall programme costs would likely increase with the addition of 50 learners per year. For example, if there is a need to for recruitment / rotation of additional staff to support the delivery of the programme, and the need for increased support for learners in practice-based learning. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear how these possible financial implications would be supported.

In addition, the visitors read that there may be a need to use alternative sites to assist with delivery of the programme for the increased learners. The visitors were not clear if there would be an additional cost for this, or if learners would incur any additional costs required for travel and or accommodation for the alternative sites. The visitors also note changes to the staff student ratio. The visitors understand that with the increased ratio, the programme will use Clinical Training Officers (CTOs) working within the Education and Professional Development Department (EPDD) when necessary. The visitors were not clear whether there would be a cost implication for this, and whether this is reflected in the programme budget. From the information provided, the visitors have not seen how the education provider has considered the financial implications of the increase in learner numbers, and therefore how they have ensured that the programme continues to be sustainable.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of how the education provider has considered the financial implications of the increase in learner numbers to ensure that the programme continues to be sustainable.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: For the non-ambulance practice-based learning settings, the education provider submitted information about the approval process, and said that this process involved the identification of how many learners on the programme can be accommodated. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine how the non-ambulance practice-based learning settings are planned or organised to demonstrate how they ensure the availability and capacity for all learners. The visitors were unable to determine a link between the organisation and management of learners in non-ambulance settings, which would ensure availability and capacity for all learners.

For the ambulance settings, the education provider said that the availability of ambulance service practice-based learning is determined by how many staff are being supported within that service / station. The visitors were unable to see how ambulance practice-based learning settings are planned or organised. The visitors were not clear what the practice-based learning capacity is, or how the education provider has ensured that there is sufficient capacity for the additional learners on the programme. The education provider also provided a Mentor / Practice Placement Educator (PPEd)

spreadsheet. From their review of this, the visitors were not clear how learners are allocated to mentors / PPEDs.

From the information provided, the visitors could not see a clear process for ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme, for both ambulance and non-ambulance settings. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether there is an effective process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the practice-based learning capacity planning across the region that includes the current learners and the proposed increase in learners, for the ambulance and non-ambulance settings. Evidence of how the education provider has engaged with the practice education providers of non-ambulance settings 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 this standard, the education provider has said that the number of Scottish Ambulance Academy (SAA) staff remains unchanged. The education provider highlighted that Clinical Training Officers (CTOs) working within the Education and Professional Development Department (EPDD) are all experienced paramedics and experienced in educating / training Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) staff at all levels, and that a number of these staff have recognised teaching qualifications. The education provider provided curricula vitae (CVs) for both SAA staff and the EPDD educators that would support the increase as required. The visitors noted that some of the CTOs do not have qualifications in teaching and learning in higher education. The visitors could not see how these staff would be supported by the education provider to deliver an effective programme.

Additionally, the visitors were not clear how the use of the CTOs will work on a day to day basis. For example it was not clear if the additional staff would be used on an ad hoc basis, or if they would have responsibility for leading a module. It was not clear to the visitors how this would be organised to ensure quality provision and continuity across the programme. In the mapping document, the education provider stated “additional support will be available to the SAA staff for education of students through facilitation of teaching sessions that will be delivered by other EPDD staff”. The visitors were not clear what was meant by this and require further explanation. From the information provided, the visitors did not have sufficient information about the staffing arrangements to determine whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, with the additional number of learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the planning process to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The education provider should also provide evidence of how they will ensure that existing staff and any additional staff are supported to maintain the quality of academic teaching across both levels.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider included floor plans and equipment lists as evidence. From the information provided, the visitors could not find detail of programme planning or delivery to support the additional learners. The visitors note that two additional training centres may be used, however there was no detail on the capacity to host the additional learners. For example, the visitors could not see when the rooms will be required and whether the facilities are available. The visitors noted that the room capacity at the Grangemouth and Hamilton sites does not appear to be able to accommodate class sizes of greater than 60 individuals. The proposed increase of 50 across four cohorts would mean each cohort would have 62 – 64 learners per cohort. From the information provided, it was not clear to the visitors whether there has been a corresponding increase in equipment and other teaching materials due to the increase in learner numbers. The visitors could not see how the education provider plans to manage these resources for the additional learners to support learning in all settings. The visitors also note that the Grangemouth and Hamilton sites are outside of the city. It was not clear to visitors what arrangements are for travel, support, or accommodation if required for learners having to attend these sites. The visitors require further information to determine whether there continues to be adequate resources to support learning in all settings, with the increased number of learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of capacity to deliver teaching at Hamilton and Grangemouth centres, such as a training plan to evidence capacity and availability of the necessary resources. Evidence that all sites that learners are placed in during the programme delivery are able to accommodate the increased number of learners. Further information about plans for equipment resources and how these will be sufficient and accessible for the increase in learners.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider provided a SAS mentor list. The education provider said that the number of practice educators has increased to 730 live practice educators on the service database. The visitors noted that although there is evidence of the number and location of ambulance mentors and PPEs, the visitors were not clear how mentorship and allocation of those supporting learners work in practice. The visitors were also not clear whether the education provider has made an assessment of the impact an additional 50 learners would have on capacity of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. The visitors did not have sufficient information on the impact that the additional learners would have on staff involved in both ambulance and non-ambulance settings to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of practice-based learning capacity which demonstrates an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning with the proposed increase in learner numbers.

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 04 July 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	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	14 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-14534-X8N5Y1

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:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Niall Gooch	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 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04181

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.

From May 2019, the education provider is planning to amend its policy on recognition of prior learning (RPL) to allow some learners to enter the programme at the start of year two.

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.

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors 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 04 July 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](#).