

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	09 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14851-H1C8M9

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 Ariu	Occupational therapist
Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 August 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04322

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1996

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04325

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 highlighted changes on their programme as part of the periodic curriculum review. This process involves a review of the curricula and learning and teaching approaches across several programmes delivered by Glasgow Caledonian University.

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 26 September 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	Academy for Healthcare Science
Name of programme(s)	Certificate of Attainment, Full time Certificate of Equivalence, Full time
Date submission received	13 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13674-C8G8F2

Contents	
Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Gillian Mcgaffin	Clinical scientist – Genomic Sciences
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

We regulate clinical scientists as a single profession. However, there are a number of different disciplines with the profession. To the HCPC these are known as modalities. When we register a clinical scientists they tell us of their modality. AHCS operates two route to clinical scientist registration, a Certificate of Attainment and a Certificate of Equivalence. The curriculum changes that we reviewed through this process were relevant to one or both of the pathways.

HCPC-registered clinical science programmes are expected to define which modalities they offer. This is because some of the SOPs refer to modalities, and since the HCPC’s regulatory framework requires that visitors make a judgment about whether a programme will deliver learners who can meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs), visitors considered individual modalities.

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate of Attainment
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 260
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04030

Programme name	Certificate of Equivalence
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 500
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04031

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes reported to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider informed us that they intended to introduce a new specialism, Cancer Genomics, which sits under the modality of Genomic Sciences.

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 26 September 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	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7), Part time Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) (SP only), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) (SP only), Part time
Date submission received	23 August 2019
Case reference	CAS-15042-P7M0G2

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 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:

Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	MC04431

Programme name	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) (SP only)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	MC04432

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	MC04433

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) (SP only)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	MC04434

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes notified to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider informed us of a number of changes across the programme, including programme delivery, assessment and practice-based learning.

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 24 September 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 Birmingham
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work with Year Abroad, Full time
Date submission received	05 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14889-F0Z7B7

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:

Lynda Kelly	Social worker
Anne Gribbens	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 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04345

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work with Year Abroad
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2019

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04379

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 intends to introduce an option for learners on the programme to undertake a year abroad, studying at an international partner institution. The programme would be the same as the current programme offered, with a period of 12 months at an international partner institution between years two and three 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: 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 26 September 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 Central Lancashire
Name of programmes	BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice, Work based learning
Date submission received	26 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14871-G8W7S8

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
Nick Clark	Operating department practitioner
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04335

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

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04358

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes reported to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider has informed us that they have increased the learner numbers for this programme. Learner numbers are increasing from a total of 30 spread across both the full time and work based learning programmes, to 30 learners on each of the full time and work based learning programmes. This change should be read in conjunction with the major change notification form received on 23 November 2018. That major change notification form let us know of changes to the full time programme to approve a work based learning programme. Due to the impact of the increase in learner numbers across our standards, and as this previous major change has not been fully assessed, we will ask the provider to submit evidence relating to all of their changes again.

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 26 September 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	De Montfort University
Name of programme(s)	BSc Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Graduate Certificate in Non Medical Prescribing, Part time Post Graduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	01 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-14771-B4X4Q2

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.....	4
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Nicola Carey	Independent prescriber
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	Part time
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45 across all programmes
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04261

Programme name	Graduate Certificate in Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	Part time
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45 across all programmes
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04262

Programme name	Post Graduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	Part time
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45 across all programmes
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04263

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 intends to make changes to their programme in the following main areas:

- reducing the number of credits to bring the programme more in line with similar programmes locally, and to better integrate it with a post registration advance practice nursing programme at the education provider;
- as a result of the change noted above, how the programme delivers and assesses the HCPC standards for prescribers;
- making practice-based learning credit bearing; and
- the requirements for practice supervisors.

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.

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and 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 intends to reduce the number of credits and make changes to the type of supervision across their three prescribing programmes. The education provider has not provided any evidence for this standard, but the visitors considered that applicants will need to be aware how the programme is intended to run (specifically, its length and the supervision required). This standard is about how applicants are provided with information to make an informed choice about whether to take up the offer of a place on the programmes. As no information has been provided, the visitors are unclear how applicants will be made aware of how the programme will run. Therefore, the visitors require further information on how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Documentation or links containing information reflecting the changes to the reduction in credits that will be made available to applicants.

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 24 September 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Full time BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time
Date submission received	28 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14852-N6X8M9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	6

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Paul Blakeman	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Carly Elliott	Radiographer Therapeutic radiographer
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer Diagnostic radiographer
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 68
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04324

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	POM – Administration, POM - Sale / Supply (CH)
First intake	01 January 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04326

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04327

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 proposed to make changes to the curriculum, learning and teaching approaches across these three programmes. The changes revolved around programme admission, programme design and delivery and assessment.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

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

Reason: The education provider submitted curriculum vitae (CVs) for the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging programmes, as evidence for standard 3.9. The education provider stated in the respective mapping documents that the two programmes have shared modules which will be taught across both programmes by the staff, whose CVs have been provided. With the current upper maximum limit of upto 50 learners (BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology) and 20 learners (BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging) per cohort, the visitors could not determine how this will be managed as the information provided gives the impression of a high student:staff ratio. With just having the CVs as evidence, it was not clear how will the shared modules be managed and by which staff. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if the programme will be effectively managed. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate if there are adequate number of staff to deliver both the programmes including the shared modules, to ensure the programmes will be managed effectively.

Suggested evidence: The education provider should provide further evidence about how the shared modules will be managed and by which staff, including information on the work allocation model and student staff ratio. Additionally, the education provider must give clarity if there have been or will be changes in the learner numbers for these two programmes. Evidence should also demonstrate how will the education provider manage both these programmes with the current staff in place.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: The education provider referenced new modules descriptors as evidence for this standard and there was mention of mapping of curriculum to SOPs. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted there was SOPs (standards of proficiency) mapping document provided for BSc (Hons) Podiatry and and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging programmes only, and not for BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programme. From reviewing the SOPs mapping document for the podiatry programme, the visitors noted nothing was mapped to SOP 15.8 “immunisation requirements and role of occupational health.”

Additionally, the visitors noted the module descriptors are not clear in how the assessments deliver the learning outcomes, for BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging programmes. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum will remain relevant to current practice to ensure the SOPs will continue to be met, for the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging programmes.

Suggested evidence: SOPs mapping document for BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programme, including information demonstrating how the SOPs will continue to be met, ensuring that curriculum remains relevant to current practice. Information regarding the content for SOPs mapping 15.8, for the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard and were able to view the information clearly demonstrating how interprofessional education (IPE) will take place for all the three programmes. However, the visitors noted it included shared modules, which will also include other existing HCPC approved programmes such as Physiotherapy, Occupational therapy, and Dietetics programmes. The visitors noted these other programmes are not being looked at as part of this major change process, but there was no clarity how much involvement these professions have had for this new IPE provision and whether there have been any changes in those programmes. Additionally, it was also not clear if any changes in those programmes have been looked at via major change or any other process. Therefore, the education provider should confirm how other profession programmes have been helpful in setting up the new IPE strategy, and demonstrate if any modules for those programmes were changed.

Suggested evidence: Confirmation if other professions programmes have been part of setting up the IPE strategy, were any modules changed and how where the changes analysed.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programme, the visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard. The visitors noted the assessment strategy was not defined clearly nor did each assessment support the learning outcomes listed in the module descriptors. For example, most assessments did not include a pass mark and did not clarify how will the assessment strategy ensure SOPs are met by learners who successfully complete the programme. There is also mention of the programme specification and module descriptors being mapping to the SOPs for Radiographers, but there was no SOPs mapping document provided. For the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging programme, the visitors noted the module descriptor assessments do not link the learning outcomes to the assessments. Additionally, Document 6 Programme Pro-forma 'Assessment Regulations' document includes a statement regarding learners who fail to meet the standards is called 'misconduct', but there was no further detail or information as to what a learner has to do to avoid failing and be able to meet the standard. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate the assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the register.

Suggested evidence: A mapping of assessments to learning outcomes with an assessment schedule. A clearly defined assessment strategy including how it will link to help learners achieve the learning outcomes and SOPs; for the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programmes.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From reviewing the modules descriptors provided as evidence for this standard, the visitors noted there is lack of information to demonstrate how learners will meet the expectation of professional behaviour. As noted above for standard 6.1, the visitors noted there was not clear information regarding the assessment strategy for BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programmes. For most of the modules, the visitors could not see what the mark threshold and exam duration is. Due to this, the visitors were not clear how learners would be able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate and provide more details on the assessment strategy.

Suggested evidence: Mark threshold for all modules and duration of exam/how will it be assessed. Details on what clinical portfolio entails and how will it be assessed. The education provider must clarify which assessments link to which learning objective, and how this will ensure that learners meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs

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 26 September 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	Liverpool John Moores University
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Full time Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Part time Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, Full time Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	14 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14596-B8N4J9

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	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	6

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Stephen Smith	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
Gareth Roderique-Davies	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 April 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04240

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
----------------	---

Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 April 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04241

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 April 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04242

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 April 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04243

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.

For the currently approved Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology and Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology programmes, the education provider will be providing two new full time (3 years) and part time (6 years) pathways, for each programme. There will be no increase in the learner numbers, however the new pathways will give learners access to new funding arrangements.

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: As per the standards mapping document, it was mentioned that the suggested text for new pathways is available and will be added to the programme documentation and website once this major change is approved. The evidence provided for this standard did not contain any information regarding what information will be provided to learners regarding the new pathways for both the programmes, nor was there any information on the education provider's website. Due to this, the visitors were unable to determine what information will be provided to potential applicants and how this will differ from the existing approved programme pathways. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what information regarding the new programme pathways will be available for both programmes, to enable applicants to be able to make an informed choice during the admission process.

Suggested evidence: Information regarding the admissions process for the proposed full time and part time pathways for Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology and Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology programmes. This includes clarifying what information will be provided to applicants regarding all aspects of the programme for the proposed pathways.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider stated there will be no changes to this standard, for introducing the new pathway routes for both the programmes. However, from reviewing other sources of documents for this major change, the visitors could not see any information regarding how will the education provider monitor and evaluate the programme's quality and effectiveness, for the new pathways. It is expected there will be monitoring and evaluation systems in place for the existing approved pathways, but the visitors were not clear how and what system will be used for the proposed pathways. As per the requirement for this standard, it is expected that education providers will have processes to critically review current arrangements and respond to any identified risks, challenges and changes. Therefore, the education

provider must demonstrate how they will ensure there are processes in place to review and monitor the new pathway arrangements.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating what processes are in place to regularly evaluate and monitor effective monitoring of both the programmes and their respective pathways.

3.16 There must be thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

Reason: The visitors were not clear what current or existing systems or processes in place are going to be used to assess learners' ongoing suitability, for the new proposed programme pathways. It is expected that there will be processes for the current ongoing programmes in place to determine the learners' suitability via assessing their conduct, character or health. As the proposed programmes pathways vary in durations, the visitors could not determine what system will be used to check to carry out criminal record checks on learners during the start and if needed every year or at regular intervals. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what processes are in place to ensure the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating the system or processes in place to ensure learners' fitness for the new proposed pathways. If there is an existing process in place, will it be any different or a varied application to the new proposed programme pathways. Suitable processes could include those used to carry out criminal records checks, or those used to raise concerns about a learner by practice educators or service users and carers.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Reason: The education provider stated in the standards mapping document, there will be no changes to this standard, for the newly proposed 3 year full time and 6 years part time pathway. The visitors were not clear if there will be any points during the programme, where attendance will be mandatory. As each semester for the newly proposed pathway will be structured differently, the visitors could not determine how learners will be made aware of which specific days, modules or placements are mandatory to attend, and whether there will be a minimum attendance requirement. Additionally, the visitors were not sure how this key information will be communicated to learners and what attendance monitoring systems will be in place. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what key parts of the new proposed pathways for both the programmes will be necessary, and how will they monitor this in addition to communicating to learners.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating what will be the minimum attendance requirements for each pathway, for both the programmes and what aspects of the programme will be mandatory to attend. This includes how this information will be communicated to learners and what attendance monitoring system will be used.

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: The education provider stated there would be no changes to this standard, as per the standards mapping document. The visitors could not see any information amongst any other documentation to indicate what will be the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning for the new proposed pathways, for both the programmes. Due to this, the visitors were unable to determine how the relevant learning outcomes and standards of proficiency (SOPs) will be achieved. Therefore, the visitors must provide information regarding what will be the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning for the new proposed pathways.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning for the proposed pathways of both the programmes will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

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

Reason: There was no evidence provided for this standard, as per the standards mapping document, because the education provider states there will be no changes to this standard. However, the visitors were not clear as to how will learners progress on the new proposed pathways for both the programmes. As noted above in standard 2.1, the visitors did not have sufficient information regarding the new proposed pathways; therefore, they could not determine how progression will take place and whether it will be any different from the current existing approved pathway in place. Additionally, as per the requirement for this standard, the learners must be made aware of what can prevent them from progressing and all such policies must be made clear to them. There is mention of new funding arrangements for this programme. The education provider must provide information if this will in any way affect the way learners can progress from one year to another. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate the progression and achievement requirements for the new proposed pathways, for both the programmes.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating how will progression and achievement take place on this programme, for the new proposed pathways. Additionally, evidence showing whether new funding arrangements will have any impact on how progression takes place within the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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	Liverpool John Moores University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Part time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science Practitioner (Biomedical Science) Degree Apprenticeship, Work based learning BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	29 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-14844-K8G0X8

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	4
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:

Kathleen Simon	Biomedical scientist
Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	Part time
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04319

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science Practitioner (Biomedical Science) Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04349

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04447

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the existing 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 developed a new degree apprenticeship route. The degree apprenticeship programme is being introduced to replace the part time programme currently being offered. The education provider confirmed via email that these changes were implemented from September 2017. The new programme will contain the same curriculum as the part time and full time programmes. The education provider has added an end point assessment to the programme to meet the requirements of a degree apprenticeship.

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 procedures 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: In the standards mapping document, the education provider references the process by which they manage employer engagement with potential applicants. The visitors noted that within this process, there is no evidence of what information potential applicants are provided with from their employer. In their evidence, the education provider has also referred to the degree apprenticeship section of their website. The website provides generic information and a link to current apprenticeship vacancies, and has a link to an application form for potential applicants to complete. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation states that applicants must make a declaration of disclosure of any criminal convictions including those outstanding. The document does not state if there are any costs for these checks and if so who is responsible for them.

As the visitors were unable to find evidence of the information provided to applicants for the degree apprenticeship route, they were unable to determine whether the information to be provided to applicants regarding the admissions process will be sufficient for them to make an informed decision about the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information that demonstrates how applicants will be informed of the admission requirements, including costs, for the degree apprenticeship programme.

2.5 The admissions process must ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.

Reason: The education provider has stated there is no change to this standard. However, the visitors noted that there is a statement in the programme documentation that applicants must undertake an Occupational Health screening and vaccinations are necessary. The visitors found that the statement was not clear, as they were unsure if the requirements discussed are for the degree apprenticeship route only, and if all applicants have to engage in the occupational health screening and vaccinations. Furthermore, it is unclear how applicants are provided with this information prior and during the admissions process. As the application process will differ from the previous route, the visitors are unclear on the application process for the degree apprenticeship route and how applicants are made aware of what the process entails.

Suggested evidence: Information that demonstrates how the admissions process works in relation to health screenings and vaccinations, and how applicants are made aware of and comply with any health requirements.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The mapping document discusses how the degree apprenticeship and applied biomedical science part time programmes will have a separate programme lead from the full time programme. However, this standard is not just about who leads the programme, but is about ensuring there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme. To evidence this, the education provider also refers to the apprenticeship programme guide. The guide contains contact details of the management team and their roles. However, the guide does not provide details about the management structure or lines of responsibility. As the employer partners are a key stakeholder for the degree apprenticeship programme, the visitors would expect to see how they are involved within the programme management. From the evidence provided, the visitors are unable to make a judgement on how the programme is effectively managed and are therefore unclear on how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence on the management structure and responsibilities of programme staff, to ensure that the programme is managed effectively.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The education provider has stated that this standard was met through their 2017-18 annual monitoring audit. However, this standard was revised in September 2017, and we did not assess how programmes met this standard via annual monitoring audits until the 2018-19 academic year. Therefore, the visitors noted that this standard could not have been met during their last annual monitoring as it was not in effect at this point. This standard is about how the education provider ensure the appointment of an appropriately qualified and experienced programme lead, and the process to find a suitable replacement. Therefore, from the information provided, the visitors are unclear on the process taken to appoint an individual to this role and require further information on how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the process followed to appoint the person holding overall professional responsibility and how they would appoint a suitable successor.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has been running the degree apprenticeship programme since September 2017. In the evidence provided, the education provider has noted that there is no change in this area, and so has not specifically provided supporting information to show how this standard is met. However, the visitors considered that they need to see further evidence in this area in order to see that the programme has been effectively monitored since it commenced. This will allow

the visitors to take assurances that the education provider has effectively managed the learning for the learners undertaking this programme from September 2017.

Suggested documentation: Information that shows that the Degree Apprenticeship programme has been effectively monitored, including how feedback is received and acted upon, since it commenced.

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

Reason: The education provider has stated that all academic staff undertake training as necessary, and that the train the trainer days will include information about End Point Assessments (EPA) for the programme. They also reference the Leadership and Development Policy document which discusses the education provider's policies on how staff are given time to complete their continuous professional development. The visitors can see there is a policy for ensuring continual professional development for staff. However, the visitors noted that the policy does not include information on how staff are trained specific to their involvement with this programme. The visitors noted that there are differences with how this programme runs compared to the full time and part time programmes, and are unclear how programme staff will undertake professional and academic development specific to their role with this programme. The visitors noted that, although staff will need to undertake training about the EPA, they were not clear what this training involves. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider sets out the training that staff will receive, and demonstrate how this training is appropriate to their role in the programme, to consider whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence of what the specific training involves to prepare staff for the degree apprenticeship programme.

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

Reason: The education provider has stated there is no change to how this standard is met for the new programme, and explained that practice educators (PE) will attend training as appropriate with their own employers. They continued by saying PEs will also attend training the trainer days at the education providers site. As evidence, they refer to the employer's handbook. The handbook discusses the purpose of the PE role, its main responsibilities, and discusses types of training they have held in recent years. As this new route will be for degree apprenticeship learners, there will be different learning needs and assessments for fulltime students. From the information provided, the visitors are unable determine what trainer days involve and how staff are given the information they need in order to supervise learners. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider provides further evidence to demonstrate how training provided for practice educators is appropriate for their role, learners' needs, and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the training practice educators undertake to deliver the learning outcomes of the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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	London South Bank University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time MA Social Work, Full time MA Social Work, Work based learning PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Work based learning PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time
Date submission received	12 August 2019
Case reference	CAS-14996-B6K3V1

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

David Childs	Social worker
Patricia Higham	Social worker
Niall Gooch	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 May 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04402

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04403

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04420

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04429

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04430

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 notified us that they intend to make changes to the modules on the social work programmes, and also that they have changed the exit route arrangements for their MA programmes such that learners may no longer choose to “step off” with a PgDip, but will be awarded a PgDip if they fail to complete the dissertation on 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: 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 26 September 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	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Music Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	05 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14877-R0H5S4

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

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:

Donald Wetherick	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Music Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Music therapist
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04337

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 on the programme from 15 to 25 from September 2019. The education provider highlights that the increase is required as the programme has attracted more than 75 applicants each year since revalidation in 2015 and this has resulted in continuously running a waiting list.

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not see what strategies the education provider is putting in place to ensure collaboration between the education provider and practice education provider remains unaffected as a result of the increase in learner numbers. The visitors considered that if one member of staff has oversight / responsibility for all placements (as it seems from the information provided), then taking on additional 10 learners would cause a substantial increase in their workload. This could impact on the regularity and the effectiveness of the collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers. Therefore, the visitors need to be sure that communication with placements is going to remain regular and effective (for instance, communication regarding student progress or concerns) with a larger cohort.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that the collaboration between the education provider and the practice education providers continues to be regular and effective.

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

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors could not see any evidence that demonstrates how the education provider intends to find additional placements to accommodate for the increased cohort size or how the additional placements would be effectively managed. The visitors noted that there is no information about the strategic processes that will be utilised to increase from provision of placements for 15 learners to 25 learners. As such, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure sufficient practice placement for all learners on the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information that shows how the education provider will find all of the additional placements required for the additional 10 learners joining the programme and their strategy for ensuring that there continues to be sufficient practice placements for all learners 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 evidence submitted, the visitors noted that the education provider plans to appoint one additional member of staff on a 0.4FTE contract. The visitors are aware that current staffing is 1.8 FTE for 15 learners and an additional 0.4 FTE would total 2.2FTE for 25 learners. The visitors also noted that the education provider intends to recruit an additional staff member of 0.2 FTE from 2020 to support the second year of the programme, as the new larger cohort moves through to Year 2, making the total staff resources 2.4 FTE by 2020-21. The visitors considered that a number of the key administrative roles such as programme lead or placement manager would take a similar amount of time for 25 learners as for 15. However as the education provider intends to double up on some seminar groups, this would also double teaching time. Other activities such as supervision of dissertations, marking and placement allocation for additional learners are all activities which are directly proportionate to learner numbers. Hence the visitors considered that the 66% raise from 15 to 25 learners does not seem to be adequately reflected in the staffing increase from 1.8 to 2.2FTE. The visitors considered that the additional 0.2FTE from 2020 will improve the staff situation, but would need to know how these roles will be utilised.

Suggested evidence: Further information on how the 0.4FTE increase will be utilised within the current course management and teaching structure as well as the plan for utilising the additional 0.2FTE from 2020. The education provider should also provide Job Description/Person Specification for the post advertised.

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 did not submit evidence in relation to this standard. From the documentation review, the visitors could not find any information that shows that the education provider has considered the additional demands that the increase in learner numbers would place on resources available to support learning. These resources could include library resources, and crucially for music therapy – instrument resources (especially keyboards/guitars) and practice spaces (including dedicated practical rooms) for learners. As this standard has not been addressed by the education provider, the visitors require information on the resources that will be provided to support the additional 10 learners. These should include access to dedicated teaching rooms, equipment (musical instruments), library resources, and any other resources that would be needed to ensure the setting is effective and appropriate for the delivery of the programme to all 25 learners.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which details how the increase is to be supported in terms of associated resources as highlighted above.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider stated in the SETs mapping that “Clinical supervision of practice placement takes place at University each week with experienced staff in small groups –these will remain at max 5 in a group despite the increase in overall cohort size.” They also referred the visitors to the Practice-Based Learning section of their website. From reviewing the submission and from checking the website, the visitors could not find any information that articulates how the education provider intends to ensure there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in practice-based learning. The visitors considered there is no evidence given to support the education provider’s claim that the number of practice educators would increase each year. The visitors also considered that the information given about supervision groups refers to staff delivering the programme (SET 3.9). As such, the visitors could not see any evidence that clearly demonstrates how the education provider intends to meet this SET.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence that outlines how the education provider will ensure that there continues to be adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors considered, from their review of the additional evidence submitted that sufficient teaching materials such as books/ebooks, musical instruments will be made available to accommodate the additional learners on the programme. However, availability of music practice rooms for individual music development/maintenance of skills (outside of class time) and reliance on a specific member of staff remain areas to consider in future assessments. These issues may impact on the programme's ability to meet the standards relating to programme resources in the future.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	St George's, University of London St George's University of London and Kingston University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	22 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-14806-F1J1Y1

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).....	5

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Natalie Matchett	Occupational therapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	1/9/2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04285

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	1/9/1999

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 73
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04286

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	1/9/2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04331

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 undergoing a review of their physiotherapy programmes in St George's University of London, which has led to a redesign of shared modules with the occupational therapy programme in St George's University of London and Kingston University. These cover changes to the programme governance, management and leadership, curriculum, practice-based learning and the assessments.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: Regarding the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes, the education provider has provided the curricula vitae for 18 staff on these programmes. In their submission, the education provider stated that they expect the academic team to work flexibly across both programmes and support in the delivery of those focusing on their area of expertise. The visitors noted that staffing resources will be shared across physiotherapy programmes. The visitors also considered current learner cohorts being 25 learners on the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) programme and 73 learners on the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures staff share their responsibilities and working time to contribute to each programme. The visitors were unable to determine whether there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how staff share their responsibilities and working time across the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes to deliver them effectively.

Suggested evidence: Information around appropriate numbers of staff to deliver the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes effectively.

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

Reason: Concerning the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes, the education provider provided module descriptors and noted the learning outcomes in each module. In their submission, the education provider mapped the standards of proficiency (SOPs) across physiotherapy programmes in one document. However, the visitors noted there is limited evidence around the delivery of the SOPs and the learning outcomes which address them. The visitors were unable to identify the specific learning outcomes which are related to the SOPs to ensure learners meet the SOPs for physiotherapists. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider must outline the learning outcomes, which address the SOPs across the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which outlines the learning outcomes in relation to the SOPs across the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes.

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 26 September 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.

With regards to the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes the visitors considered the clarification provided. The visitors are satisfied that the standards are met at a threshold level. The visitors note that the education provider at St George's, University of London are committed to provide the level of detail in the areas of concern when engaging with our monitoring processes in the future ensuring the response addresses the highlighted areas. In future assessments, the education provider at St George's, University of London will need to provide certain information in the areas indicated to be able to meet our requirements and satisfy the standards.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	Master of Social Work, Full time MSc Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	17 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14875-J7N6B7

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:

Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Anne Mackay	Social worker in England
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04317

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 2019

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04318

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 wants to increase interprofessional learning and shared learning across these programmes by making changes to the curriculum via amending the learning outcomes, teaching and assessment methods.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: As per the mapping document provided, the education provider stated there will be no changes to how the programmes meet this standard. However, the visitors could not see any information amongst other documentations regarding the level of profession-specific lecturers involved in the programmes. There are some joint and shared learning aspects between both these programmes, but it was unclear as to the relevancy of the correctly qualified person teaching the respective modules. Therefore,

the visitors could not determine if there will be adequate appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the IPL aspects of the programmes.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must articulate or provide information regarding the profession specific staff who will be involved in the programme, particularly for the IPL aspects of the different modules.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referenced the assessment course structure timetable, module descriptors and standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted some modules are assessed by a 2000 word assignment, whilst others are assessed by a 2500 word assignment for the same credit value. Additionally, they noticed some modules had examinations while some had presentations as the assessment method. The visitors could not determine the rationale for having different assessment methods for different modules. They could also not see any assessment strategy that clearly links the method of assessment to the relevant SOPs. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met. The education provider must provide a clear assessment strategy that ensures those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating the rationale for why some modules have different assessment methods and how will this ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs. Additionally, the education provider must provide an assessment strategy that clearly links the method of assessment to the SOPs.

6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Reason: From reviewing the evidence submitted for the Master of Social Work programme, the visitors noted that the 'child and families' modules only have a 25 minute individual presentation and a viva, as opposed to its counterpart with the 'adults' module having a three hour exam. The visitors could not see any information to determine how the chosen assessment methods are in line with the learning outcomes of each respective module or part of the programme. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how will this be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating how the chosen assessment methods for both the mentioned modules will be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: It was noted in the major change form that the education provider is considering the external examiner appointment, who will be responsible for the inter-

professional and shared learning aspects of the programmes. From reviewing the mapping document submitted, there was no evidence submitted for this standard and the education provider stated there will be no changes to this standard. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether or not there will be any changes to the current arrangements for external examiners for these programmes, and if so what will be the changes. Therefore, the education provider must provide clarity if there will be any changes to the current arrangements/appointment of external examiner for these two programmes

Suggested evidence: The education provider must clarify if they will be appointing an additional external examiner for the IPL aspects of the programme. If they will be appointing one, then they should demonstrate the professional experience and qualifications that will be considered, and whether the external examiner should be on the relevant part of the Register.

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 24 September 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Date submission received	15 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14950-V8Z2J5

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:

Rachel Picton	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04378

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 notified us that they are moving to a new structure for their academic year. Instead of a term-based model, they are introducing a semester-based model. This will require changes to the structure and delivery of the programme. The education provider has said that the learning outcomes will remain unchanged, and has indicated in correspondence that no changes to the structure or position of practice-based learning are planned.

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 26 September 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)

The visitors considered the programme resources are effective to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. However, the visitors were made aware a number of modules do not have reading lists / resources available or attached. The visitors considered learners will need to know what resources they need to support their learning and achieve the learning outcomes.

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.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Suffolk
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	23 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14560-M5J1F2

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:

Andrew Jones	Paramedic
Susan Boardman	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 April 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04195

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 intends to make changes to the curriculum and timetabling structure; by embedding inter professional learning modules, increasing theory sessions from 10 to 15 weeks, reducing practice house from 750 to 600 per year and reducing 'specialist placement hours' by 150 hours 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.

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

Reason: The education provider referenced the course handbook and interprofessional learning (IPL) strategy documents, as evidence for this standard. From reviewing the relevant page numbers suggested in the mapping document, the visitors noted there were module specifications which contained information about the module such as credits and study hours. However, the visitors were unable to see clearly any information with regards to how the learning outcomes at each level relates to the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document, particularly with regard to IPL activities.

As per the major change form, there are proposals to change the modules and introduce some new modules to integrate IPL learning. From just reviewing the SOPs mapping and having no module content to view, the visitors could not see what the changes will be and what learning outcomes the SOPs mapping refers to.

Additionally, the education provider stated a student conference held in year two contributing towards IPL teaching. But the visitors could not determine if this conference is mandatory and if there are specific learning outcomes linking this conference to the relevant module in the curriculum.

Due the above mentioned reasons, the visitors were unable to determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, the education provider must provide more information demonstrating how learners will be able to learn with, and from professionals and learners, in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating how the learning outcomes at each level relate to the SOPs mapping document, particularly in relation to IPL. Additionally, the education provider must confirm whether the student conference in year two is mandatory and if there are specific learning outcomes linking this activity to a module in the curriculum.

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 24 September 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](#)