

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	20 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-14899-R1G7J2

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:

Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Susan Lennie	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04303

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.

Following their 5-yearly periodic review, the education provider is making changes to their BSc (Hons) Dietetics programme. These include changes to the programme design and delivery as well as 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.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to the programme’s module descriptors and the External Subject Specialist Review and Feedback document. In their review of the module descriptors, the visitors noted that Placement D was awarded 20 credits (2 weeks placement and poster presentation) whilst Placements B and C were awarded 30 credits (both requiring 12 week placements and additional assessment). Similarly, they noted that the final year research project (6004 DT) was a 20 credit module requiring in depth exploration of the research subject area with significant work required to meet the learning outcomes for 20 credits.

Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate the number of hours required in practice-based learning or the number of credits per module, the visitors could not see how the different learning hours or the effort for the different placements required meet the learning outcomes stated and how this is communicated to learners. The visitors considered that

to determine whether this standard is met, the education provider would need to submit additional evidence that clearly maps out how the learning hours and the credits awarded in placements B,C and D would enable learners to meet the learning outcomes stated. Additionally, the education provider is requested to provide evidence on how learners will achieve the learning outcomes within the research module within the hours provided to ensure they meet the standards of proficiency for dietitians.

Suggested evidence: Further information regarding the different learning hours or effort for the different placements required to meet the learning outcomes stated and how this is communicated to learners. The education provider should also provide additional evidence that demonstrates how learners would achieve the learning outcomes within the research module within the hours provided.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to their Interprofessional education (IPE) strategy document, Practice Education Agreement and the programme's module descriptors. In their mapping document, the education provider stated that learners will have shared modules at levels 4 and 6, and partake in inter-professional simulated events throughout their programme of study. The education provider had also previously mentioned in their notification form that there will be some shared modules within the School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health to enable IPE.

In their review of the module descriptors, the visitors were unable to establish what the shared modules were other than module 6003 DT. The visitors noted that the IPE strategy document included dietetic learners as being part of the IPE activities but did not list the BSc (Hons) Dietetics programme in the list of subjects where the strategy is applied. The visitors also noted that the Appendix 1 document (Examples of IPE activities and module location) did not map any dietetic module to IPE learning as examples. In their Course Specification Part A document, the education provider said *"Inter-professional education (IPE) is threaded throughout the course and enables students from different health and social care professions to learn and work with each other. Students will experience authentic inter-professional learning experiences within their course as well as studying together in shared modules, and in doing so will develop a set of values and capabilities that are essential in becoming collaborative, practice ready health and social care professionals."* However, the visitors were unable to locate any evidence for this statement. The visitors therefore considered that they would require additional information on how the education provider intends to deliver IPE within the programme before they can consider this standard met.

Suggested evidence: Further information that clarifies which modules are shared with other programmes. Any further evidence that demonstrates how interprofessional education is threaded throughout the programme.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: The visitors reviewed several documents including the module descriptors, placement assessment folder and placement benchmark statements as part of the evidence for this standard. The visitors noted in their review that Placement D was awarded 20 credits (2 weeks placement and poster presentation) whilst Placements B

and C were awarded 30 credits (both requiring 12 week placements and additional assessment). Similarly, they identified that the final year research project (6004 DT) was a 20 credit module requiring in depth exploration of the research subject area with significant work required to meet the learning outcomes for 20 credits. From this evidence, it was not clear to the visitors how these assessments provide an objective measure of learners' progression and achievement, or how they are deemed to be consistent measure of learners' effort when assessing progression and achievement. The visitors therefore require further information which demonstrates that the assessments provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to show how the different learning hours for the different placements and research project ensure that the assessments provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

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 29 January 2020 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 Cumbria
Name of programme(s)	DipHE Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	06 January 2020
Case reference	CAS-15899-X7C6K0

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:

Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Anthony Hoswell	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	DipHE Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 March 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04559

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

The education provider has informed us of an increase in the learner numbers on the final intake of the programme, from 25 to 33. The education provider has told us additional practice-based learning has been confirmed with North West Ambulance Service (NWAS), and that NWAS have confirmed there are sufficient qualified practice educators. The education provider has also obtained additional equipment to meet the demands of the increased number of learners.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 29 January 2020 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)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	11 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15838-N6L2L9

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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 44
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04533

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 of an increase in the learner numbers on the programme, from 44 to 66. They informed us this academic session the course team has access to 239 practice-based learning sites and that they have invested in increased academic staffing resources to support the extra students. The programme plan to use teach the cohort as one group for some classes and then in three smaller separate groups if required.

This change was assessed alongside the parallel changes to other physiotherapy programmes in Scotland, as follows:

Prog ref.	Programme name	Education provider	Study mode
QMU01011	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	Queen Margaret University	FT (Full time)
QMU00995	Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	Queen Margaret University	FT (Full time)
RGU01025	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	The Robert Gordon University	FT (Full time)
RGU01029	Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	The Robert Gordon University	FT (Full time)

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 28 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors were satisfied the resources provided for the programme are appropriate and allow for an appropriate number of suitable and well-equipped educators able to deliver the programme effectively. As the additional learner numbers on the programme are accommodated year on year, and as finances within the higher education sector may be tighter than normal, the visitors wanted to highlight the SETs impacted by financial stringency are closely monitored.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	12 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15734-B7M1H1

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:

Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 80
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04492

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

The education provider informed the HCPC of their decision to increase learner numbers on the programme from 50 to 80 per year starting in September 2019.

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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors considered that currently there is adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. However, as the larger cohort runs in over the following two academic years, the current additional staff of a 0.6 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) post plus 350 external lecturer hours would seem to be insufficient to support this increase. This should be reviewed when the programme goes through its next annual monitoring audit.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	04 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15114-B0G2D5

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:

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Gemma Howlett	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 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04458

Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2009

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 41
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04489

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 BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme by redesigning the curriculum, shortening the programme delivery time period and adding an additional 50 learner cohort only for the academic year 2020-21. Additionally, the education provider also wants to increase learner numbers on this programme, by adding an additional cohort of 28 learners who will join in the final year on the Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: For standard of education and training (SET) 3.6, there were no changes noted by the education provider on the standards mapping document, so hence no

evidence was provided. From reviewing other documents provide for this major change such as practice overview document, the education provider stated that both programmes will have practice placement time in alternate environments, which will be the non-ambulance service practice-based learning placements. They are listed in the programme overview documents and cover areas such as maternity and mental health. However, the evidence provided only confirms capacity for additional learner numbers for the ambulance service placements, and not for the alternate practice-placement providers (non-ambulance practice-based learning placements), to accommodate the extra learner numbers for both programmes. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if there will be sufficient capacity for the non-ambulance service practice-based learning placements settings and how will this be determined to accommodate the additional learners on both the programmes. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence if there is a process in place demonstrating how capacity and availability is determined for the non-ambulance practice-based learning placements.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating the process to determine capacity and availability of the non-ambulance service practice-based learning placements, to accommodate the additional learners on both the programmes

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

Reason: The education provider had provided practice modules and an overview of practice-based learning documents, as evidence for this standard. From reviewing the practice overview document, the education provider stated that both programmes will have practice placement time in alternate environments, which will be the non-ambulance service practice-based learning placements. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors could not determine whether the education provider will be able to facilitate the provision of the non-ambulance service practice-based learning placements for both the programmes. This is because the visitors could not see anywhere in the evidence highlighting there is capacity or availability for this element, as noted under condition for SET 3.6. Due to this, the visitors were not clear how will this ensure that the practical aspects of the respective programmes are covered. Therefore, the education provider must provide information on what commitments are in place for the non-ambulance service practice-based learning placements to ensure that practical aspects of the programme are covered for the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information on what commitments are in place for the non-ambulance practice-based learning, ensuring that practical aspects are covered for both the programmes.

5.1 Practice-based learning must be integral to the programme.

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: From reviewing the evidence mapped for these standards, the visitors were clear about the structure, duration and learning hours related to practice-based learning for both the programmes. However, as noted above under standards 3.6 and 4.5, the visitors were not clear regarding the commitment towards non-ambulance service practice-based learning placements. Additionally, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine if and how the education provider will be able to deliver these alternative practice-based learning arrangements. Due to this, they could not

determine how this will ensure in helping learners achieve the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for both the programmes. Therefore, the education provider must provide information demonstrating what the arrangements and commitments are for the alternative practice-based learning and how will this ensure support in the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating what the arrangements and commitments are for the alternate practice-based learning and how will this ensure support in the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

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

Reason: To address the increment in the learner numbers, the education provider mentioned in the mapping document that training and education of practice educators takes place in the practice-based learning settings they work at. There is a system in place at each practice education provider which determines practice educators' training and mentorship updates. Additionally, there is a senior lecturer from the programme team who manages any issues around the respective practice education they have been assigned to. The mapping document also stated about the team structure and how it is managed is contained in the evidence, which contained some web-links. From reviewing the web-links, the visitors noted it was general information about the company that provides the software to practice education providers. From this, the visitors could not determine what arrangements are in place to ensure how many practice educators will be in place to accommodate the additional learners for both the programmes. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating the system or process in place to ensure there is adequate number of practice educators in place to accommodate the additional learners

Suggested evidence: How the education provider ensures there are enough practice educators in place to accommodate the additional learners for both the programmes. It will be useful if the evidence demonstrates how many practice-educators will be allocated to accommodate the additional learners for both the programmers.

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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	04 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15085-C9C5B2

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
Dawn Blenkin	Occupational therapist
John Archibald	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 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04450

Programme name	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 March 2011

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04451

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 a new course curriculum, including new modules and new learning outcomes, has been developed to address learning in relation to all standards of proficiency (SOPs). There will also be a greater use of interactive approaches to teaching and a new annual consent form has been developed to ensure learners provide ongoing consent.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

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: From a review of the documentation for these standards, the visitors were made aware there is a new course curriculum, including new modules, new learning outcomes and new assessments have been developed.

The visitors saw that SOP 13.11:

- understand the structure and function of the human body, together with knowledge of health, disease, disorder and dysfunction relevant to their profession

was taught and assessed by the learning outcomes in two modules:

- Occupations Across the Lifespan; and
- Occupational Therapy as a Complex Intervention.

The visitors read the module descriptor for Occupational Therapy as a Complex Intervention and considered the module does not cover nor assess an understanding of the structure and function of the human body. The visitors considered the understanding of the structure and function of the human body to be a crucial part of learning. The visitors considered that due to it being taught in one module only there is a risk learners are not able to understand and build up on their knowledge of anatomy and physiology in relation to occupational therapy, and that this SOP is not covered and assessed adequately in the programme. The visitors therefore require more information as to how SOP 13.11 is taught and assessed in the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence to show how SOP 13.11 is taught and assessed in the programme.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the education provider had said there had been no change to the way the programme meets this SET. However, the visitors were made aware all module descriptors state that the threshold pass for the modules is 40%. The visitors were not sure why the pass mark was not 50%, which is the usual minimum pass mark for an M level module. The visitors require more information about the rationale for the pass mark of 40% for Masters level modules to ensure the minimum standards are being met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further information as to the rationale for the threshold pass mark of 40%, such as marking criteria or descriptors for level 7, so the visitors can ascertain what a 40% at M level equates to in levels of knowledge.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 29 January 2020 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 were made aware the education provider plans to increase the threshold passmark for the modules from 40% to 50% from 2020/21. This change to the programmes should be reflected in the subsequent annual monitoring audit submission following the change.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	11 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15838-N6L2L9

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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 52
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04530

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2009

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 52
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04555

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 of an increase in the learner numbers across both programmes from 52 to 77. This change was assessed alongside the parallel changes to other physiotherapy programmes in Scotland, as follows:

Prog ref.	Programme name	Education provider	Study mode
GCU00454	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	Glasgow Caledonian University	FT (Full time)
RGU01025	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	The Robert Gordon University	FT (Full time)
RGU01029	Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	The Robert Gordon University	FT (Full time)

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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors were satisfied the resources provided for the programme are appropriate and allow for an appropriate number of suitable and well-equipped educators able to deliver the programme effectively. As the additional learner numbers on the programme are accommodated year on year, and as finances within the higher education sector may be tighter than normal, the visitors wanted to highlight the SETs impacted by financial stringency are closely monitored.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	11 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15838-N6L2L9

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04542

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2011

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04554

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 of an increase in the learner numbers across both programmes from 24 to 49. They informed us the course team has access to 430 practice-based learning sites and that they will recruit additional physiotherapy staff. The programme anticipate at times they will need to teach a third practical group to maintain an effective learning and teaching environment.

This change was assessed alongside the parallel changes to other physiotherapy programmes in Scotland, as follows:

Prog ref.	Programme name	Education provider	Study mode
GCU00454	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	Glasgow Caledonian University	FT (Full time)
QMU01011	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	Queen Margaret University	FT (Full time)
QMU00995	Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	Queen Margaret University	FT (Full time)

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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors were satisfied the resources provided for the programme are appropriate and allow for an appropriate number of suitable and well-equipped educators able to deliver the programme effectively. As the additional learner numbers on the programme are accommodated year on year, and as finances within the higher education sector may be tighter than normal, the visitors wanted to highlight the SETs impacted by financial stringency are closely monitored.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	St George's, University of London
Name of programme(s)	PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7, Part time Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6, Part time Prescribing: Independent and Supplementary, Part time Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Health and Care Professionals Council (HCPC) members), level 7, Part time
Date submission received	15 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15744-K9Y1Z1

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:

David Rovardi	Independent prescriber
James Pickard	Independent prescriber
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 April 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04495

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 April 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04520

Programme name	Prescribing: Independent and Supplementary
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 June 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04521

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Health and Care Professionals Council (HCPC) members), level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 March 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04543

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 they have:

- changed the credit value of the programme;
- changed learning outcomes of the programme; and
- made changes to the programme in line with our revised prescribing standards.

We adopted revised standards for prescribing from September 2019. We are satisfied programmes will continue to meet most of our standards based on the revisions we have made. We expect education providers to have made any changes needed to align their programmes to the HCPC revised standards by September 2019. This can include updating requirements to appoint suitable non-medical prescriber supervisors to support the delivery of programmes. We would normally assess changes relating to the revised prescribing standards via our annual monitoring process. However, as changes to delivery of competence links to revisions of learning outcomes and the credit value of the programme, we will consider all changes that the education provider has flagged through the major change process.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

A.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: On their review of the mapping document, the visitors were informed that no changes had been made to the way the programmes meet this standard. The visitors were made aware of a narrative to demonstrate how they meet a different standard which said that “the pre-requisite criterion for the module application is the completion of the Clinical Reasoning in Physical Assessment (CRiPA) (30 credit)”. The visitors were also made aware that from the module descriptor that one of the pre-requisites for entry onto the programme was learners need to complete CRiPA “or equivalent certificated learning.” The visitors were therefore unclear whether the selection and entry criteria includes “equivalent certificated learning”. The visitors need to see further evidence giving clarity about whether the selection and entry criteria includes the completion of “equivalent certificated learning”.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence giving clarity about whether the selection and entry criteria includes the completion of “equivalent certificated 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 29 January 2020 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	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Distance learning
Date submission received	15 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14946-W7D4Y6

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 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.

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:

Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Nicola Carey	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04374

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04375

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04400

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.

Amendments will be made to learning outcomes, and a new mode of delivery for the programme will be added – a distance-learning route.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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: Following their review of the evidence submitted, the visitors were not clear how the new distance learning (DL) route through the programme would be delivered. They were therefore unable to determine whether the admissions procedures would give DL applicants the information they required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the DL route.

Suggested evidence: Evidence clarifying how the distance learning route through the programme will work, and how learners will be given appropriate information.

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

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

B.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Reason: The visitors' understanding of the programme was that the new distance learning route would require significant additional resourcing, in terms of staff resources, learning resources and IT resources. However, it was not clear to them from the evidence submitted whether this extra resourcing was in place, and if so whether it was appropriate and accessible. They were therefore unable to be clear that this standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence clarifying whether the education provider expects to have to provide extra resources, and if so how it plans to provide such resources and ensure that they are appropriate.

B.14 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Reason: From the evidence submitted, it was not clear to the visitors how the distance learning route would be delivered. They were therefore unable to make a determination as regards how the education provider could reliably identify to learners where attendance will be mandatory.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the education provider will identify the parts of the programme where attendance is required.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Reason: The visitors were not clear from their review of the evidence how the learning outcomes would be delivered on the distance learning route. There was not a mapping

document which would enable the visitors to understand how the new learning outcomes linked to the standards for Prescribers. More broadly it was not clear to them how the new parts of the programme would be structured, and how it would function, in the absence of significant further evidence relating to this.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the learning outcomes will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

C.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors were not clear from the evidence supplied how theory and practice would be integrated in the new curriculum.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how theory and practice would be integrated.

C.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors were not clear from the evidence supplied what learning and teaching approaches would be used on the distance learning variant of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show what learning and teaching approaches would be used.

D.6 The designated medical practitioner must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

D.7 The designated medical practitioner must undertake appropriate training.

Reason: The visitors were not clear from the evidence supplied that the education provider could demonstrate consistently that the standards were met, as some of the terminology used was not clear. They considered that the documentation as presented was not clear around the different roles involved in supervision on the programme, for example the designated medical practitioners, the practice supervisors and the practice assessors. The documentation refers to the HCPC standards for prescribing when laying out the role of the practice supervisor and practice assessor, when these roles are described by the Nursing and Midwifery Council. The visitors considered that this posed a risk that HCPC registrant learners would not be clear about their role. They considered also that there needed to be much clearer explanation of the role of Practice Assessor, Practice Supervisor and DMP within the documentation.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which clearly lays out the different roles within the programme, their position in regard to the relevant professional and regulatory bodies, and the training each will receive.

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 29 January 2020 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 did have an outstanding concern around the mapping of the programme learning outcomes and assessment strategy with the relevant Competency Framework for all Prescribers, as required by the amended standards for prescribing. However, they understood that all education providers with prescribing programmes would be required to demonstrate that they met the revised standards for prescribing through the annual monitoring process during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 academic years. They considered that it would be reasonable and proportionate for the HCPC to use this mechanism to ensure that the standards were met. These programmes are due to go through the audit process in 2019-20.

The visitors also noted that some of the documentation had not been straightforward for them to understand, and suggest that to make sure the standards continue to be met in future the education provider should ensure that it is clear how the evidence presented shows that they meet the standards.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Southampton
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol), Full time
Date submission received	09 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15839-V2D1H5

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:

Stephen Davies	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04537

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

The education provider has informed us of an increase in the commissioned numbers onto the programme, from 15 to 19. They have made two permanent appointments, appointed a sessional lecturer and are in the process of agreeing funding for another full-time member of staff to meet the additional needs.

The education provider has also informed us they have taken a learner from Guernsey, who will be doing the first four periods of practice-based learning in Guernsey. The programme has liaised with the head of service in Guernsey and has provided supervisor training for the Guernsey supervisors to ensure that standards of the placements on Guernsey are equivalent and that the placements are monitored.

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 29 January 2020 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 Strathclyde
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology, Full time
Date submission received	12 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15859-G5P5G1

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:

Calum Delaney	Speech and language therapist
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 January 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 26
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04545

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

The education provider has indicated changes to the programme design and delivery in line with updated curriculum guidance from the professional body, The Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT).

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 29 January 2020 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 East Anglia
Name of programme(s)	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad, Part time Independent Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad FEHQ Level 6
Date submission received	11 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15032-L4D0J6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Janet Lawrence	Independent prescriber
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04427

Programme name	Independent Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad FEHQ Level 6
----------------	--

Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04454

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

The education provider has indicated they wish to close the undergraduate route and increase numbers for the postgraduate route. In turn they wish to move from four separate intakes (two for postgraduate and two for undergraduate) to three separate intakes for 80 postgraduate learners. The education provider has also indicated their intention to deliver the programme for one additional cohort at a new site, the Royal Marsden School (RMS), which is based in London. In addition to these changes, the education provider intends to make the programme accessible for chiropractors / podiatrists.

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 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: To evidence this standard the education provider provided web links to the UEA and Royal Marsden School (RMS) course directory pages that are available for learners. The visitors noted inconsistencies between the information available on the UEA and RMS websites. The information available on the RMS page makes no mention of HCPC-registered learners and instead suggests that the programme is only for nurses and midwives. The UEA website does include information related to HCPC-registered learners but there are inaccuracies for the changes indicated by the education provider, such as the inclusion of chiropodist/podiatrist learners. The education provider also provided a link to an online prospectus on the RMS website. The visitors found this to only mention nursing and midwifery learners rather than HCPC-registered learners. The visitors considered the evidence provided by the education provider to meet this standard was of differing information and not accurate to the programme. The education provider must provide an accurate and consistent draft of the information provided to potential applicants to ensure that it allows potential applicants to make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the course.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that potential applicants are provided with the relevant information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

A.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider provided links to the UEA and Royal Marsden School (RMS) course directory pages. The page on the UEA website did not have entry requirements stated on the page. On the RMS website the entry requirements were specially stated for nursing and midwifery learners and there was no information for HCPC-registered learners. The visitors were able to view requirements in the module outline document but could not clarify how this was communicated to potential applicants. The visitors considered the information around entry criteria for learners to be unclear. As the visitors cannot confirm the correct selection and entry criteria they are able to confirm it is appropriate and thus cannot confirm the standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the selection and entry criteria includes appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

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 29 January 2020 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 East London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	26 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15001-M3Z7L0

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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Paul Blakeman	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04406

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 110
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04407

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 moved from a 30-credit module framework to a 20-credit modular framework. Thus, the programme will change from its current format of 15 and 30 credit modules to a format of six 20 credit modules per academic year. Students will still achieve 120 credits at the end of each academic year. The current curriculum will be re-structured into the new credit system. The change to the credits has also resulted in a change to assessments to fit into the new module structure.

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 29 January 2020 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 the West of Scotland
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences, Full time
Date submission received	04 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15214-H6N6L0

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:

Carol Ainley	Biomedical scientist
Kathleen Simon	Biomedical scientist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04468

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 moving the delivery of the programme from their Paisley to their new Lanarkshire campus starting with new entrants to the programme, in September 2019. They are also making changes to the design, delivery and assessment of year one modules.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: In their review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted that the education provider’s new site based in Lanarkshire has teaching facilities, laboratories and equipment which the visitors considered effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme. The visitors also noted that there are currently external educators who will teach at the new site, along with the programme’s academic staff. The visitors were also made aware that the new intake of learners would commence their study at the new site whilst the rest of the learners on the programme will continue to be taught at the old Paisley campus. Given the distance between the two sites, the visitors were unclear if the education provider has a plan or strategy in place to manage this cross site delivery to ensure the programme is delivered effectively to all learners. As such, the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates resources to support both

theory-based and practice-based learning are accessible to all learners and educators on the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the education provider's planning process to ensure that educators are able to deliver the programme to learners across both sites effectively and that resources to support learning such as laboratory resources will be available to all learners and educators at both sites.

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 29 January 2020 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 Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300), Part time Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300), Part time Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300) Level 7, Part time
Date submission received	14 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15063-Q2X0T5

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.....	5

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Janet Lawrence	Independent prescriber
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04444

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300)
----------------	--

Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04445

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes reported to us via the major change process.

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300) Level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04488

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

The education provider has indicated a change to the names of the programmes that indicate the running of a level 7 programme. The HCPC has not approved a level 7 prescribing programme but upon further discussions with the education provider they have confirmed that the programme has been running since January 2015. In order for the HCPC to update the programme records we will need to ensure the level 7 programme is meeting our prescribing standards.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

B.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: Upon review of the documentation, visitors noted that some documents did not contain accurate terminology or wording in line with HCPC requirements. Firstly, in the Assessment of Practice document the visitors noted various sections such as the guidelines for practice assessors, roles and responsibilities and marking guidelines only make mention of Nursing learners or the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) standards. In the purpose and process section the HCPC standards for prescribing from 2013 are referenced, however this reference is now out of date as of September 2019. Furthermore, the visitors noted the use of Designated Medical Practitioner (DMP) throughout the documentation which is no longer a requirement of the HCPC. The visitors noted that if the documentation used in the teaching and learning is not accurate for HCPC learners then it is not appropriate to the delivery of the programme. The education provider must ensure that documentation that is used in the teaching of the programme is accurate and appropriate for HCPC-registered learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show the relevant teaching resources are updated for HCPC-registered learners to ensure their accuracy and appropriateness.

E.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider directed the visitors to the course specification template (CST), module guides, practice document and performance marking descriptors. When looking through the supporting documents the visitors noted the difference between the learning outcomes listed in the module descriptors and the course learning outcomes in the CST document. The outcomes differed in both number and content and so the visitors were unsure which outcomes related to the programme. To be certain the assessment methods are appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes, the visitors need clarity around which learning outcomes the assessments are measuring.

Suggested evidence: A definitive list of the learning outcomes and evidence to show how the assessment methods are appropriate and effective at measuring them.

E.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is an appropriately qualified and experienced prescriber and on the register of their statutory regulator with annotation(s) for prescribing where applicable.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted university academic regulations and the assessment handbook which explained that all programmes must have external review in the form of an external examiner. The visitors were confident that there would be external review of the assessment process but the regulations did not confirm the qualifications and experience required to be an external examiner. The standard requires that at least one external examiner is an appropriately qualified and experienced prescriber and appropriately registered with their statutory regulator. From the information provided the visitors were not able to confirm that at least one external examiner would meet these requirements. The education provider must therefore show how they ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is an appropriately qualified and experienced prescriber and on the register of their statutory regulator.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that at least one external examiner for the programme is an appropriately qualified and experienced prescriber and on the register of their statutory regulator.

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 29 January 2020 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	York St John University
Name of programme(s)	BHSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Part time
Date submission received	27 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-15076-L4C7B0

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.....	9

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BHSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 48 (across both routes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04448

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 2019

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 48 (across both routes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04482

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 also intends to have a new part time route for this programme, in addition to revising the programme by making changes to the curriculum and changing the way collaboration is done with the practice education providers. The learner numbers will increase to a maximum of 48 per cohort across both the routes.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider evidenced a web link for the new part time route programme. From reviewing this web link, the visitors noted that there is mention of the new part time route to be a six years part-time programme. But the visitors could not find any other information regarding the part-time route such as how is

it different from the full time programme in terms of course structure, fee, programme delivery, teaching hours or practice-based learning hours. The education provider also evidenced a power point presentation that is used on open days. The two mentioned slide numbers demonstrated about the length of the part time programme and breakdown of the programme into two semesters per year. Slide number 20 mentioned practice-based learning is offered in the summer time in year two of the programme, but it was not clear if this is the same as what's done in the full time programme. The same slide also had a note stating that 'NB years 3 and 4 can be constructed as students wish'. From this, the visitors were not clear what this meant, and if this was a case of mixing and choosing the modules or placements in year three and four. If so, the visitors were unclear how is this communicated in detail to potential learners. Additionally, it was also not clear how the breakdown of semesters with details of placements is communicated to potential applicants who did not attend the open day, as this information was not available on the website. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if and how information about all aspects of the part time programme will be available to potential applicants. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating clear information regarding the admission process for the part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. The evidence must cover all aspects of the programme to provide both the applicant and education provider with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating all aspect of the part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme that will be available to potential applicants and the education provider.

2.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: The education provider stated that there will be no changes to this standard, therefore no evidence was mapped. But from reviewing the web link evidenced for standard 2.1, the visitors noted the minimum entry requirements including the essential and valued criteria for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. However, the visitors were not clear if these requirements are for the full time programme, part time programme or is it for both the routes. Due to this lack of clarity, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what are the entry and selection criteria including academic and professional entry standards for the part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating entry and selection criteria including academic and professional entry standards for the part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider explained in the mapping document about the 'simulation team' meetings, which comprises of two academic staff from the education provider and two clinical lead physiotherapists. The evidence provided contained learners' feedback from York Hospital in 2018, whilst the second document contained an email conversation with one of the practice-education providers. From this information provided, the visitors were not sure regarding the exact role of the

simulation team. It was also not clear from the evidence if and how regular collaboration takes place between the education provider and practice education providers. Given the changes in the programme delivery for the part time route, the visitors could not determine from the evidence whether this aspect has been discussed with the practice education providers. The education provider had also stated about the changes in style of practice-based learning due to patient type changes. Due to lack of clarity on how regular the meetings take place, it was not possible to determine whether this will have any impact on practice-based learning provisions and how will this ensure the effectiveness of the programme. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how regular and effective collaboration takes place between the education provider and practice education providers.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating how regular and effective collaboration takes place between the education provider and practice education providers, and its impact on practice-based learning. It is expected that evidence will cover how collaboration takes place and will continue to do so on a regular basis.

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

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document there will be no changes to this standard, therefore no evidence was provided. From reviewing the open day power point slides provided as evidence for standard 2.1, the visitors noted there will be summer time practice-based learning in year two of the part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy at Level four. It was not clear to the visitors if this is a new change for the part time programme and, if this is the case, then it seemed from the slides that the MSc Physiotherapy programme will also have learners on practice-based learning at the same time. Due to this, the visitors were not clear if and how capacity and availability for learners on the part time and full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy will be determined during the summer time, will this have any impact on the practice education providers considering that learners from two different programmes will need to be accommodated at the same time. Therefore, the visitors need clarity on the summer time practice-based learning for learners on the part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, and how the education provider will ensure there is availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the full time and part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating whether the summer time placements for the part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy in year two at Level four is a new change. If it is a new change, then how does the education provider ensure there is capacity and availability of practice-based learning for learners on the full time and part time programmes. Evidence should also demonstrate if capacity and availability of practice-based learning will in anyway be affected by the MSc Physiotherapy programmes.

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

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document that the reason to only increase the maximum learners by eight across both the routes for the BSc (Hons)

Physiotherapy was to ensure that student staff ratio stayed below 20:1 There was also mention that the staff for these programmes will be complemented by visiting lecturers, which will comprise of both clinicians and service users. The education provider mentioned about evidencing 'staff list 2019' document, but the visitors could not locate this document from the submission provided. Due to this, the visitors were unable to determine if there will be adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place for the full time and part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes. Without being able to see information on what staff will be involved and what their relevant qualifications will be, the visitors could not judge whether the programme will be delivered by staff with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate there are adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise in place, to deliver both the routes of BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating how many staff will be teaching on the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy full time and part time programmes. Information should also demonstrate what qualifications and experience they possess, including clarity if they are full time or part time equivalent staff. It will be useful to know the roles and responsibilities of the staff dedicated towards these two programmes.

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

Reason: As per the standards mapping document, the education provider stated that they have adapted programme learning outcomes only, rather than module learning outcomes as per the wider policy at their organisation. The visitors reviewed the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document, revised programme specifications, revised module specifications and programme handbook provided as evidence for this standard. The visitors noted the SOPs mapping document provided was not an updated one as it reflected the old version of the SOPs relevant to the old modules, and not the new modules. Additionally the visitors noted the learning outcomes were mapped to the university learning outcomes which were wide ranging and generic, rather than specific to a module across all modules. From reviewing the programme specification, the visitors noted the learning, teaching and assessment methods mentioned are generic statements that did not highlight how it will be carried out for each module. Without being able to see module specific learning outcomes, the visitors could not determine how this will ensure that every learner completing the programme can meet all the SOPs. Additionally, because of a lack of information demonstrating what the assessment criteria is and how will it help in measuring the learning outcomes the visitors could not see how assessments are linked to any specific learning outcomes.. For example, the module specification for module 2PS500 indicates the assessment method as a 45 minute practical. The module specification highlights which learning outcomes are to be met, but is mapped to the education provider's generic learning outcomes. As such, the visitors need to see the specific learning outcomes for module 2PS500 and its relevant assessment criteria, in order to determine how the SOPs are being met. Additionally, this is a similar pattern the visitors noted across all the modules. Therefore, the education provider needs to provide an updated SOPs mapping document reflecting the new modules and address what the learning outcomes are for each module including their assessment criteria. The visitors will then be able to determine how the learning outcomes ensure that learners meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information addressing what the learning outcomes are for each module including their assessment criteria. How the education provider ensures that the SOPs are being met for the relevant part of the Register. Additionally a SOPs mapping document demonstrating the current HCPC SOPs, reflecting the latest version of the modules will be helpful in determining this standard.

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

Reason: As per the mapping document, the education provider evidenced a placement handbook, module specifications and programme specification documents for this standard. However, the visitors could not locate the placement handbook as it was not submitted as part of the submission. Therefore, they were unable to view its contents. Additionally, there was mention of a summer time practice-based learning at Level four and international practice-based learning at Level five for the part time and full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy. It was also not clear from the information provided if the summer time practice-based learning is new and only for the part time route at Level four. Additionally, there was not much information provided regarding the international practice-based learning placements at Level five. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if and how theory and practical aspects of the programme will be linked, to ensure the effectiveness of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how integration of theory and practice will remain central to the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information and clarity regarding the summer time practice-based learning and international practice-based learning at Level 5 for the part time and full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. Evidence must demonstrate how theory and practice will be linked together and support each other.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: The education provider stated there will be no changes to this standard, however the visitors noted there will be international practice-based learning at Level five for the part time and full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. The visitors consider that there must be an existing system to approve and monitor the quality of practice-based learning settings within the UK, but were not clear how is this applied to international practice-based learning. From the evidence provided, the visitors were not clear on what processes or system is in place for the international placements and it was not clear who will have overall responsibility for this. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating there is a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of international practice-based learning at Level 5 of the programme.

Suggested evidence: How the education provider approves the international practice-based learning for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes at Level five, and what systems are in place for monitoring.

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: The education provider provided revised programme specification, module specification and assessment matrix documents for this standard. As noted under condition for standard 4.1, the visitors noted the learning outcomes were mapped to the education provider's generic programme-wide learning outcomes, rather than module specific learning outcomes. Due to this, it was difficult to assess how the SOPs will be met for these programmes. One such example is the presentations used as assessment method. The visitors noted the education provider stated that presentations are measured against the learning outcomes, but the learning outcomes for each module have not been specified. The visitors could not determine how the presentations as an assessment method will ensure that learners will meet the SOPs on completion of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating the module specific learning outcomes and how it links with the assessment methods, to ensure that learners who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information the module specific learning outcomes and how it links with the assessment methods, to ensure that learners who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

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

Reason: The education provider evidenced the student guide to assessment, revised module specification, assessment matrix and programme handbook as evidence for these standards. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted the form used by practice education providers to carry out assessments. This is a generic form used to measure the learner's performance and learning outcomes by the practice education providers. As stated earlier in standards 4.1 and 6.1, the learning outcomes mentioned by the education provider are generic and wide-ranging rather than module specific learning outcomes. Additionally, it was noted by the visitors that two Level six placements have an additional viva which learners need to pass, but it was not clear from the evidence how will this be assessed. Due to this, the visitors could not determine how assessments will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. Additionally, without knowing the module-specific learning outcomes it was not possible to determine how assessment methods will be used appropriately and effectively at measuring the learning outcomes, Therefore, the education provider must provider evidence demonstrating the module-specific outcomes that will be used to determine the learning outcomes at practice-based learning, how will this be conveyed to practice-education providers and the method of assessing the two viva examinations at Level six of both the programmes.

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating:

- Module-specific learning outcomes including the ones relevant to practice-based learning;
- How this information is conveyed to practice-education providers;
- How this provides an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement; and
- How the two viva examinations at Level six practice-based learning placements are assessed.

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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).