

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Academy for Healthcare Science
Name of programme(s)	Certificate of Attainment, Full time Certificate of Equivalence, Full time
Date submission received	02 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-15124-Y8L0R1

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:

Patrick Kimmitt	Clinical scientist – Clinical Microbiology
David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate of Attainment
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 260
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04466

Programme name	Certificate of Equivalence
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 500
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04467

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

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

This specific major change case relates to the Clinical Microbiology specialism within the Infection Sciences modality. The education provider informed us that they were adding a new learning outcome in this modality.

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

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 25 March 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	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	13 January 2020
Case reference	CAS-15907-G3B6Y7

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 five of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

David Comber	Paramedic
David Whitmore	Paramedic
John Archibald	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 100
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04565

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

The education provider has informed us that the programme will be redesigned to take into account developments within the profession and to meet the requirements of a new institutional academic structure. The education provider has indicated the curriculum will be revised, and will take into account new interprofessional modules. The education provider has informed us the modes of assessment may be updated as well.

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 25 March 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 there were an appropriate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. The visitors saw that one member of staff, Michael Clewes, will be module lead for eight modules, and will teach on a further seven. Mr Clewes is also the course director and the placement co-ordinator. The visitors considered this was a large workload for one individual. The visitors would like to highlight this for visitors looking at future assessments, to ensure

there is an appropriate number of staff able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

The visitors also considered that assessments provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. The visitors were made aware in regards to assessments that the marks are ratified at exam boards at the end of each semester. The visitors considered this was tight in terms of time to ensure adequate and appropriate feedback from the programme team to learners. The visitors would like to highlight this for visitors looking at further assessments, to ensure assessments are effective at deciding whether a learner is fit to practise by the end of the programme.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	De Montfort University
Name of programme(s)	Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology, Full time Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology (Degree Apprenticeship), Full time
Date submission received	13 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15746-X0D2B3

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.....	10

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:

Elizabeth Ross	Hearing aid dispenser
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
First intake	01 January 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04496

Programme name	Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser

First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04613

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 are incorporating the Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology programme within an apprenticeship programme. The apprenticeship programme appears to widely represent the existing programme due to the way the Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology is set up. However, there will be some changes to the existing programme to incorporate the set of apprentice 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: 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.

2.3 The admissions process must ensure that applicants have a good command of English.

2.4 The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Reason: For these SETs, the visitors were informed the education provider had added more information online, during its open / information day and during the application process. The visitors considered there were inconsistencies and a lack of clarity in the documentation given to applicants.

In regards to English and Maths requirements, the visitors were made aware the process remains the same but that there had been additions made to meet the apprenticeship standards. As part of the mapping document, the visitors were referred to the programme webpage. The visitors considered there was a lack of clarity in regards to the education provider's requirements in regards to the applicant's level of English. The visitors were made aware information from Specsavers indicated that for those whose first language is not English, they must demonstrate the ability to communicate in English to the standard of level 7 of the IELTS. However, the apprenticeship programme handbook said applicants who have qualified outside of the UK, whose first language is not English, need to be able to demonstrate the ability to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 of the IELTS, with no element below 6.5. The visitors need clarity of the information given to applicants regarding the level of English required to meet entry requirements to the programme.

Also, the apprenticeship programme handbook stated the standard entry requirements are 'GCSEs grade c or grade 4 in Maths, English (or equivalent to level 2 qualifications). A different reference in the same document said the requirement was 'level 2 English and Maths required prior to the EPA'. The visitors considered this was unclear whether the English language requirements were needed in order to enrol onto the programme, or whether they were just needed before learners take the EPA.

In regards to criminal conviction checks, the visitors were informed that there was no change to the way the programme meets this SET. The visitors were referred to the apprenticeship programme handbook and an extract from the programme webpage. The programme handbook said one of the standard entry requirements was to 'have a *satisfactory* [emphasis added] DBS status or equivalent'. However, the Specsavers Apprenticeship FAQs said the criteria was '*enhanced* [emphasis added] DBS check, [which] needs to be cleared by the university'. The visitors were therefore unclear what level of criminal conviction checks an applicant was required to complete. The visitors need to see further information of the criminal conviction checks the applicant is required to complete in order to be accepted onto the course.

The visitors were made aware from the programme handbook that the minimum age of learners is 18. However, the visitors were informed in the eligibility criteria document that the minimum age of learners for funding is 16. The visitors were therefore unclear what the minimum age of learners is, and considered that it would not be clear to applicants.

Although the visitors were informed the education provider had added more information the visitors were unclear which documents applicants could access and when they could access them.

The visitors were aware the supporting information for apprentices document stated that the apprenticeship programme is offered to employees of Specsavers. However, the visitors were also made aware the Foundation Degree has worked with other partners such as Hidden Hearing, Amplifon and the NHS. The visitors were unclear whether there are other apprenticeship partner organisations and, if so, what documentation was provided by them.

The visitors were unsure if the arrangements for apprenticeship applicants and non-apprenticeship applications were dealt with equitability. As applicants from the non-apprenticeship route still need an employer in place to provide supervision the visitors were unclear how the entry routes would work together within the admission process.

The visitors were made aware the End Point Assessment (EPA) sits outside of the approved programme and cannot be taken until completion of this. The visitors understood the EPA is arranged by the employer and undertaken by an independent provider. However, the visitors could not see clear and specific information applicants had about the EPA before applying for a place on the programme. The visitors were made aware of the methods of EPA but could not see information about how this assessment would be organised in terms of timescales and reassessment options. A weblink to the EPA plan for Hearing Aid Dispenser apprenticeship standard was given in the apprenticeship programme handbook, however the visitors were unclear if a new applicant would have the understanding at this early stage to clearly follow this information.

The visitors therefore need further information:

- clarifying the roles within the admissions process for both learners and the education provider;
- clarifying the minimum age of learners on the programme;
- clarifying whether or not the education provider is working with other partner organisations as well as Specsavers;
- of what documents are available to applicants and when applicants can access them;
- of the criteria in regards to Maths requirements;
- of the criteria in regards to what level of criminal conviction checks the applicant is required to complete in order to be accepted onto the course;
- clarifying the information which is given to applicants about the EPA to ensure that the education provider has overall responsibility for overseeing the admissions process;
- how the admissions process for the apprenticeship programme works in tandem with that of the non-apprenticeship FD programme;
- clarifying the level of English required to meet entry requirements to the programme; and
- whether the English language requirements were needed in order to enrol onto the programme, or whether they were just needed before learners take the EPA.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further information

- clarifying the roles within the admissions process for both learners and the education provider;
- clarifying the minimum age of learners on the programme;
- clarifying whether or not the education provider is working with other partner organisations as well as Specsavers;

- of what documents are available to applicants and when applicants can access them;
- of the criteria in regards to Maths requirements;
- of the criteria in regards to what level of criminal conviction checks the applicant is required to complete in order to be accepted onto the course;
- clarifying the information which is given to applicants about the EPA to ensure that the education provider has overall responsibility for overseeing the admissions process;
- how the admissions process for the apprenticeship programme works in tandem with that of the non-apprenticeship FD programme.
- clarifying the level of English required to meet entry requirements to the programme; and
- whether the English language requirements were needed in order to enrol onto the programme, or whether they were just needed before learners take the EPA.

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

Reason: To meet this standard, the visitors were informed the entry criteria remains the same but that there had been additions made to meet the apprenticeship standards. However, the visitors were unsure who has final control over the admissions process between the education provider and the employer partners. The visitors considered the lines of responsibility in the application process between employer partners and the education provider were unclear. The visitors were unable to see information on how the decision to accept onto the programme would be made, taking into consideration the two organisations involved. The visitors need to see further evidence to show that the education provider has overall responsibility for overseeing the admissions process, and that this information is available for employers, applicants and the education provider.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further information how the decision to accept onto the programme would be made, taking into consideration the two organisations involved, and which demonstrates to employers, applicants and the education provider that the education provider has overall responsibility for overseeing the admissions process.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Reason: To evidence this SET, the visitors were informed the education provider has a range of policies which come from its equality and diversity charter. The visitors were provided with a copy of, and a weblink to, this charter, and information about how the programme was reviewed in terms of its equality and diversity policies. However, the visitors could not find information about the equality and diversity policies in place which relate specifically to the admissions process and how they are monitored. The visitors therefore require further information as to the policies in place to ensure the admissions process is open and impartial and does not discriminate unfairly against certain applicants.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence of the equality and diversity policies in place which relate specifically to the admissions process and how they are monitored

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: To evidence this SET, the visitors were informed the education provider is on the Register of Apprenticeship Training Providers and has been approved by the Education Skills Funding Agency to deliver apprenticeships. The visitors were made aware the programme handbook said that Specsavers is the programme's initial apprenticeship partner. However, the visitors were also made aware the Foundation Degree has worked with other partners such as Hidden Hearing, Amplifon and the NHS. The visitors were unclear if new practice partners are planned. The visitors were also unclear if the current employer / practice partners have formally committed to employing apprentices and are committed to this programme being their Registered Training Organisation. The visitors therefore need further information to clarify whether further employer partners are planned, and whether the current employer / practice partners have formally committed to employing apprentices and are committed to this programme being their Registered Training Organisation.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide information to clarify whether further employer partners are planned, and whether the current employer / practice partners have formally committed to employing apprentices and are committed to this programme being their Registered Training Organisation.

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

Reason: To meet this SET, the visitors were informed there was no change to the way the programme meets the SET. The visitors were referred to information about the education provider's processes for monitoring of programmes, and the process for raising concerns in practice-based learning and involvement in the programme. The visitors were unable to see information specifically about the collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers. The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider works in regular partnership with those who provide practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they work in regular partnership with those who provide practice-based learning, for example, through meetings, asking for feedback and other communication.

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

Reason: To meet this SET, the visitors were informed that entry onto the course is subject to the learner either being employed or sponsored by a suitable employer / organisation. The visitors were unsure if the anticipated larger intake would have an effect on placement capacity for non-apprentice programme learners, who would be employed or sponsored by the same organisation as apprentice learners. The visitors therefore require more information about how the education provider ensures the availability of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide more information about how it ensures the availability of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

Reason: From the evidence for this SET, the visitors were informed the education provider has several academic staff who are all clinically qualified and who are experienced across all sectors of audiology. The visitors were also informed the education provider intends on recruiting at least one other lecturer in the short term. The visitors were informed there are also additional support and roles. The visitors received contact information as to the roles of individuals on the programme at the education provider. The visitors also received details of the management structure on the programme.

However, the visitors were not clear if the apprentice numbers are additions to the non-apprentice numbers and whether they are taught together or in different cohorts. The visitors were also unclear about the timescale of recruitment and, considering the potential size of the planned intakes, what plans were in place regarding staffing numbers to effectively deliver the programme.

The visitors therefore require further information about the programme management and details of the teaching of learners on the programme in relation to those on the non-apprenticeship programme. The visitors therefore require further information about the timescales of recruitment to ensure there is an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further information about the programme management and details of the teaching of learners on the programme in relation to those on the non-apprenticeship programme. The education provider also needs to submit further information about the timescales of recruitment to ensure there is an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

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: To evidence how the programme meets this SET, the visitors were made aware that the education provider will have Individual Learner Record and Individual Learner Plans. The visitors also saw other information about resources on the programme. However, the visitors could not find information how the apprenticeship programme will be delivered alongside the non-apprentice Foundation Degree programme, to ensure the resources to support learning in all settings will be accessible to all learners. The visitors therefore need to see further information about how the programme will be delivered alongside the non-apprentice Foundation Degree programme to ensure resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further information about how the programme will be delivered alongside the non-apprenticeship

Foundation Degree programme, to ensure resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

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

Reason: The visitors were unsure how the programme structure would accommodate the requirements of both the apprenticeship programme and the non-apprenticeship cohort. It was noted that the apprenticeship learners undertake three components within the programme. Non-apprenticeship learners would not undertake all of these components. The visitors were unclear if these extra components impacted on the teaching within the non-apprenticeship programme. The visitors were also not clear whether the current arrangements for the non-apprenticeship programme will also be applied or will be appropriate for apprentice learners, particularly within the requirements of programmes structure in terms of time in employment and time in formal training laid out by the Institute for Apprenticeships (IfA).

The visitors need to see evidence of the structure of the course delivery to meet IfA and the education provider's requirements and if this will give an effective course delivery to all learners, apprenticeship and non-apprenticeship. The education provider needs to provide further evidence of any impact of the extra components for the apprenticeship learners within the teaching of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the structure of the course delivery to meet IfA and the education provider's requirements and if this will give an effective course delivery to all learners, apprenticeship and non-apprenticeship. The education provider needs to provide further evidence of any impact of the extra components for the apprenticeship learners within the teaching of the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors were informed that how the education provider met this SET was enhanced by the apprenticeship requirements. With different employer / partners involved in providing practice based learning, the visitors were unclear if this would lead to different contractual arrangements between different placement providers. The visitors need to receive further information how practice provision would be provided in an equal manner to the whole student cohort.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence how practice provision would be provided in an equal manner to the whole student cohort.

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

Reason: Although the education provider noted no change to this SET, the visitors noted the education provider has introduced new assessments teaching elements to the programme, for example the Individual Learner Record (ILR) and Individual Learner

Plan (ILP). The documentation cited in the SET mapping did not all relate to these new assessments and the visitors could not assess what changes these introductions would make to the assessment structure. The education provider indicates the ILP and ILR are tripartite between learner, employer and education provider. The visitors were unclear how this would operate for the non-apprenticeship cohort.

The visitors need to see information given to learners and within the documentation from the education provider regarding the ILP and ILR and its assessment structure, as well as information on consistency across student cohorts with regard to the ILP and ILR.

Suggested evidence: Information given to the student and within the documentation from the education provider regarding the ILP and ILR and its assessment structure. Information on consistency across student cohorts with regard to the ILP and ILR.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 March 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 Greenwich
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London), Full time
Date submission received	26 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15923-F0P9X9

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 Hoswell	Paramedic
David Comber	Paramedic
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04567

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2012

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04568

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

The education provider is intending to introduce a degree apprenticeship programme in the September 2021. To prepare the current programmes for the addition of this programme they have made changes to the structure of practice-based learning and module content that will be implemented from September 2020. We will consider this notification form as a change to the existing programmes only

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 March 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 Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	25 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15974-L7C1J6

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:

Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04581

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 discontinued an interprofessional education module. As a result of this, they have updated modules in the second year of the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 March 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 Leicester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time Operating Department Practitioner (Integrated Degree), Work based learning
Date submission received	15 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15797-Y0C8M6

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:

Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04511

Programme name	Operating Department Practitioner (Integrated Degree)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 April 2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04528

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes identified 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 was adding a degree apprenticeship 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.

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 offered a narrative of how potential learners would be apply to apply through their employer organisations. They stated that potential applicants would have access to all necessary information, and would be expected to demonstrate a clear understanding of the programme and its aims. However, this narrative was not supported by evidence so the visitors were not clear about the details of this process, for example what information would be supplied, at what stage, and whose responsibility this would be. Similarly, they were not clear about

the specific understandings that applicants would be expected to demonstrate in the admissions process.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate:

- How the education provider will ensure that the information available to potential applicants is complete and accurate, and provided at an appropriate stage;
- What understandings applicants will be expected to demonstrate during the admissions process; and
- Who will be responsible for the provision of information and the assessment of applicants.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider provided a narrative explaining that the programme would be registered with the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (IATA), and would be subject to QAA inspection. However, the visitors considered that this did not provide sufficient detail to enable them to make a decision about whether the standard was met. They did note that the education provider intended to use the monitoring and evaluation systems already in place on the existing approved programme. However, because the apprenticeship has a different structure, which would see learners spending a lot more time in practice-based learning with their sponsoring employers, it was not clear that the existing systems would be suitable. The visitors did not see evidence relating to the detail of how the education provider would monitor and evaluate while learners were with employers. They understood about the IATA registration but considered that more detail was required on how exactly this would enable appropriate monitoring.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating how the education provider will ensure that practice-based learning settings will be appropriately monitored and evaluated.

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors understood that an extra 0.5 FTE of staff time would be added for the apprenticeship route. However, they were not clear what number of learners the education provider intended to recruit on to the programme, and what upper limit the education provider was seeking approval for. They were also unsure from the evidence provided what extra workload the education provider was anticipating for staff as a result of the degree apprenticeship route, and how they would ensure that staff understood the potentially different requirements on the apprenticeship. They were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that there will be sufficient extra staff time available for the degree apprenticeship to cover all the requirements.

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 25 March 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	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences), Full time BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS), Full time BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS), Part time
Date submission received	02 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15822-X8K7S4

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	7

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Sara C Smith	Biomedical scientist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04523

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04524

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04525

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04526

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04551

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04552

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 replace the four existing BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences – Life Sciences programmes, with a new single programme title ‘BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS)’. The new BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS) programme will be a co-terminus degree award programme, which will allow learners on the existing IBMS accredited BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme. to transfer on to this programme at the end of year two, after which they will have to do a twelve month practice-based learning placement during their third year. Additionally,

the education provider has proposed to revise the practice-based learning and module learning outcomes for this programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The education provider has proposed making changes by developing a new co-terminus degree award programme. The changes also include transferring learners from the existing four BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences – Life Sciences programmes, to the new programme which will involve a twelve month practice-based learning placement during their third year. This will include support from practice-based learning to accommodate learners for a 48 week placement. From reviewing the documents submitted for this major change, the visitors noted the last set of ‘BMS advisory minutes’, showing collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers, was for December 2018. Though there was nothing mapped for this standard as the education provider stated no changes made to this standard. However, without any further evidence or information provided the visitors could not determine if there has been any more formal communication since December 2018. From this, the visitors could not ensure ongoing support from the local NHS trusts for the proposed changes to the programme. It was also not clear if aspects such as availability and capacity of practice-based learning have been discussed in the last year. Due to this, the visitors

could not determine if this standard has been met as it could not be established whether there has been regular collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers to discuss the proposed changes.

Suggested evidence: Information or document demonstrating regular collaboration has taken place between the education provider and practice education providers to confirm discussions or support for the proposed changes to the programme. As per the requirement of this standard, the education provider must also clarify if and how regular and ongoing collaboration will take place.

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

Reason: From reviewing the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors noted the education provide mentioned the close proximity of communication between the Placement Education Facilitators (PEFs) within the NHS Trusts and the Programme Leader, to ensure provision of placements for all learners on the existing four BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences) programmes. The evidence also mentioned the bi-annual Biomedical Science Advisory Board meeting, which consisted of discussions regarding practice-based learning provisions.

From reviewing the "Appendix 7" document, the visitors noted under 'section 2.2 Applied Research Project' that learners will be on day release' to carry out finishing their final year project within the workplace. The visitors were not clear if the day release means learners will be at the practice-based learning setting once a week in the final year to complete this project. From this, the visitors were not clear if and how, capacity and availability for the final year learners completing this project has been determined. Without seeing any further collaboration of evidence beyond December 2018 minutes between the education provider and practice education providers, the visitors were not sure if there have been discussions to consider how capacity of learners doing their project in the final year will be looked at in addition to supporting learners who will be on the 48 week placement. Due to this, the visitors were not sure if all learners doing the 48 week placement and the final year project will have access to practice-based learning at the same time. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must clarify:

- what does 'day release' for final project year learners mean and the number of days/length of time they will need access to practice-based learning to complete the project; and
- how capacity and availability of practice-based learning will be determined to accommodate learners on the 48 week placement and those doing the final year project.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider stated in the mapping document that the learning outcomes for the new 12 month placement are simply an amalgamation of those on the "Life Science placement" to help in supporting the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs). From reviewing the

submission, the visitors noted in "Appendix 3" document on page eight, it was stated that the education provider will undertake two placement visits per year to ensure that learner' performance is progressing satisfactorily and to ensure that learners are receiving the necessary training as required.

From this, the visitors were not clear regarding what form of communication will take place between the learners, practice education providers and the education provider in between the two regular mentioned visits. It was also not clear to the visitors how it is ensured that support is provided to learners before or after the visit. Additionally, it was also not clear from the documentation provided if and what kind of support and assistance will be provided to learners who will be on the new 12 month placement. Due to no clarity on how learners will progress at the practice-based learning, the visitors could not determine how will this help in achieving the learning outcomes and the SOPs. Therefore, the visitors could not judge how the structure and duration of practice-based learning will support learners in achieving the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide clarity and information:

- demonstrating what form of communication will take place between the learners, practice education providers and education providers, before and after the regular visits carried out by the education provider;
- how learners on 12 months placements receive support as they will be most likely away from the education provider; and
- how it is ensured that progress at the practice-based learning will provide support to learners in achieving 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.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

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

Reason: From reviewing the "Appendix 3" document, the visitors noted it was a list of "assessors". The list included the assessors' names, relevant discipline, hospital name and whether they are trained but not yet verified. From seeing this list, the visitors could not determine on who "assessors" actually are. It was not clear if they are staff working in the practice-based learning who are responsible for delivering and assessing learners or whether they are learners taking the required level of competence on this programme. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if there will be adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Additionally, from reviewing the "Appendix 9" document the visitors noted there will be an Applied Research Project to be undertaken within the practice-based learning. If this is not available, then learners will complete a laboratory-based project within the education provider's premises. Without seeing any further information, the visitors could not determine if this topic has been discussed between the education provider and practice-education provider. Additionally, it has been mentioned under condition for SET 3.5 where the visitors could not seeing any further information regarding collaboration

between the education provider and practice education provider. Due to this, the visitors could not judge if the practice educators will have the relevant knowledge and skills to provide support to learners on the Applied Research Project in the practice-based learning.

As stated regarding "Appendix 3" document, the visitors were not clear regarding the roles of assessors'. From this document, the visitors noted the 'Trained but not yet verified' column as blank against some of the named individuals. Due to this, it was not clear how the programme ensures every named individual is made to do the required training and how the records are updated. Additionally, the visitors could not see any information in other relevant submissions regarding how and if any logs are kept or maintained with regards to training of practice educators. Due to this, it was not possible to judge if and when practice educators undertake regular training, which will be appropriate and help in providing support to learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide information or documentation:

- clarifying who are the 'Assessors' and what is their role in the context of this programme;
- demonstrating what steps or communication has taken place to ensure there will be enough and sufficient practice educators to provide support to learners, for the Applied Research Project;
- demonstrating if practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to provide support to learners undertaking the Applied Research Project at their practice-based learning place; and
- how is it ensured practice educators undertake regular training appropriate to their role for this programme. Additionally, is there a log or record of the practice educator training maintained.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 March 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 Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time BSc (Hons) Podiatry (degree apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	11 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15843-C4G6V4

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:

James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Andrew Hill	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04541

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry (degree apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist

Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04547

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 their intention to start a degree apprenticeship route alongside the existing BSc (Hons) Podiatry.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 March 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 Salford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Degree Apprenticeship, WBL (Work based learning)
Date submission received	12 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15877-V3B2L8

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1999
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 29
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04549

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04563

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

The education provider wants to have a work based learning (WBL) degree apprenticeship route through the existing part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. The degree apprenticeship will have two new modules focusing on practice, which will replace two modules regarding inter-professional learning. Additionally, the degree apprenticeship will have a third new module which will help learners to prepare for the end point assessment

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The education provider provided curriculum vitae of Linda Hollingsworth and Helen Carruthers, role description and person specification documents as evidence for this standard. The education provider mentioned in the standards mapping document that Helen is the programme leader for the degree apprenticeship route and part time route, whilst Linda is programme leader for the full time route. From reviewing the documentation, the visitors agreed that both are suitable qualified and experienced for the role. However, the visitors could not see information about the process in place of recruiting a programme leader, including details of how a suitable replacement will be appointed, if deemed necessary in the future. Additionally, the visitors noted the successful candidate should have 'Current HCPC registration as a Physiotherapist (or equivalent)' as stated in the person specification document.

From this, the visitors were not clear if the programme leader should be a physiotherapist who is on the HCPC register. The visitors were also unclear as to what 'equivalent' means. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate the process in place to recruit a programme leader including details of how a suitable replacement will be appointed if required. The education provider must also clarify if the programme leader should be only someone who is on the Register as a physiotherapist.

Suggested evidence: Process in place to recruit a programme leader, including details of how a suitable replacement will be appointed if necessary. Additionally, clarity is needed if the future programme leader will only be someone who is on the HCPC register as a physiotherapist.

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 25 March 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 Salford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	19 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15967-B1V6Q0

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:

Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 56
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04578

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 proposing changes to the design and delivery as well as the assessment of some of the programme modules, starting from September 2020.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 March 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	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	24 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15894-N4T5K4

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:

Peter Abel	Biomedical scientist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04557

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 making changes to the programme design and delivery, which includes changing from a 15 / 30 credit to a 20 / 40 credit module delivery model from September 2020. This change has also led to a review of the programme’s curriculum.

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.**
- 4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**
- 4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**
- 4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**
- 5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.**

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

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

Reason: As evidence for these standards, the visitors reviewed the Programme Specification, Module delivery, learning outcomes and assessment plan, Revised Course Information leaflet amongst other documents. From their review, the visitors could see basic information around the changes that are being made to the programme. The visitors noted a link to the education provider's website <http://www.staffs.ac.uk/undergraduate/subjects/biological-and-biomedical-sciences/> that was provided at the bottom of the Revised Course Information leaflet. The visitors were unable to open this link ("page not found" error appeared) and as such, they could not access the relevant core information about the changed and new modules in order to assess how the redesigned curriculum delivers the SETs listed above. The visitors were also unable to find relevant modules on the education provider's website. As the visitors could not access information about the changed and new modules, they could not determine whether:

- the learning outcomes will ensure that learners who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for biomedical scientists;
- the learning outcomes will ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs);
- the revised curriculum remains relevant to current practice;
- the revised programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with and from, professional and learners in other relevant professions;
- the new structure, duration and range of practice-based learning supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs for biomedical scientists;
- the new assessments will ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs; and
- the new assessments provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

The visitors therefore require that the education provider provide a working link to the relevant modules or alternate means of viewing them to determine whether these standards continue to be met.

Suggested evidence: A working link to the changed and new modules or another means of viewing them, such as documentary submission of the module information.

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 25 March 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	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	07 January 2020
Case reference	CAS-15876-X1W5T4

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:

Alexander Harmer	Operating department practitioner
Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 January 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04548

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 propose running their BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Apprenticeship) programme in the north west of England, at and for BMI Healthcare in Manchester. The award given will be the same at the Manchester site as that at the main campus. The provision will be a trial programme initially. The education provider intends to continue with this arrangement, and should it not work learners will transfer to study at the main campus. The education provider informed us the provision in Manchester will take significant elements of the existing programme. They said by email they are seeking to enter in to a sub-contracting agreement with BMI Healthcare to enable them to co-deliver the teaching. The education provider confirmed they will manage practice-based learning, and programme design and delivery and assessment will not change.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

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

Reason: To evidence these SETs, the education provider said BMI Healthcare provide an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme at Manchester and that they will ensure that all tutors are able to demonstrate their ability both to teach and assess to the appropriate level and provide

full academic support for the modules they are intending to deliver. The visitors were informed staff are fully qualified Health Care Practitioners with relevant skills and experience. However, the visitors had not seen details of those staff working at the new site and were unsure whether there is the same quality of staff and the appropriate expertise provided across both the education provider and BMI Healthcare site. The visitors therefore need further information of the qualifications, experience and knowledge / expertise of the staff teaching at the BMI Healthcare site.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further details, for example, curriculum vitae, of the qualification, experience and knowledge / expertise of the staff teaching at the BMI Healthcare site.

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

Reason: The visitors were made aware there will be a system of staff development in place for the provision at the new site. However, the visitors were unclear about how this will be planned for the staff at BMI Healthcare to ensure the staff will be supported in the educator role. The visitors therefore need to see further information of training / induction and staff development for BMI Healthcare staff so the visitors know staff are able to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence of training / induction and staff development, for example, a plan, for BMI Healthcare staff so the visitors know staff are able to deliver the programme effectively.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 March 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	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	27 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15986-W3K1D8

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Gail Fairey	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04583

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)

Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04612

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

The education provider informed us that they were introducing a degree apprenticeship 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: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 March 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)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time MSci Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	14 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15393-F4J5L3

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04472

Programme name	MSci Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04483

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 run an integrated master's (MSci) programme alongside the current BSc programme. All learners will complete the relevant learning outcomes to be eligible for to apply for registration in the first three years of the programme. However, learners on the MSci programme will complete an alternative module to the dissertation at the end of the BSc programme. Then in year 4 modules will be offered that allow learners to demonstrate appropriate masters level learning.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: 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: To evidence this standard the education provider has provided an open day presentation for the programmes, a flow chart of the transfer points and requirements

for the programmes and the marketing course overview for the MSci. The visitors were made aware that learners can apply for both the BSc (Hons) and MSci as separate programmes with differing entry requirements but also that learners would have the opportunity to transfer between each programme as they progressed through the course. The visitors noted that the marketing course overview did not state this possibility for potential applicants, nor did the open day presentation. Additionally, the education provider has intended that the MSci programme would be approved for five learners. The visitors could not determine the mechanism if the MSci programme was 'full' from initial applicants. The education provider highlighted in the flow chart that transfer was possible depending on learners progressing with 60% in years one and two. The visitors considered that the evidence suggests transfer onto the MSci is solely based on a learner's progression. The visitors considered that the information available for potential applicants does not confirm the full process and criteria for learners to transfer between the programmes. For example, the visitors considered that it would be possible for learners to enrol on the BSc (Hons) programme and then be unable to transfer onto the MSci should the programme be already at maximum capacity. The education provider must ensure that potential applicants and learners currently on the BSc (Hons) programme are aware of the process and criteria for transfer between the programmes. The visitors need to see clear information about the application process and route onto each programme will allow learners to make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on each programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show the application process for the programme and how this will be communicated to learners from differing routes of application

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

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

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: To evidence this standards the education provider highlighted a document that provided an overview of resourcing and presented the staff team in the MSci staff handbook. The education provider has indicated that the five additional learners on the MSci programme will be taught by the existing BSc (Hons) teaching staff listed in the handbook. The visitors noted that there are currently 11 members of the teaching team but could not see the proportion of their time spent working on the programme. The visitors could not see how the teaching team's working time would be diverted to working on the MSci programme and how they will ensure this does not affect the BSc (Hons) programme. The education provider must ensure that there is sufficient staffing for both programmes whilst also considering any other potential commitments for staff outside the BSc (Hons) and MSci programmes.

Furthermore, the resourcing document stated that the modules will be appropriately resourced. However, the visitors were unable to see specific evidence of how the education provider has ensured this. The visitors were also unable to view the teaching activities that are specific to the MSci programme and so were unable to confirm that the appropriate recourse are in place. The education provider must show that programme resources will be readily available for all learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

As the visitors cannot confirm that teaching and physical resources are being appropriately and effectively shared between the BSc (Hons) and MSci programmes, they cannot also confirm that the MSci programme is currently sustainable. The education provider must show that the MSci programme is appropriately staffed and resourced whilst also ensuring that there is no detriment to the BSc (Hons) programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show the number of staff in place are adequate to deliver an effective programme. Evidence to show the resources to support learning in all settings are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

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

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: To evidence these standards the education provider highlighted their Royal College of Speech and Language Therapist (RCSLT) mapping document for the BSc (Hons) programme, the MSci handbook and a copy of RCSLT's published curriculum guidance. As the RCSLT mapping document related only to content in the BSc (Hons) the visitors could not confirm that the content in the MSci is relevant to current practice or reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in curriculum guidance. The MSci handbook has stated that the programme content and learning outcomes have been informed by RCSLT curriculum guidance but the visitors were unable to view any descriptions of what specifically would be covered in the MSci year. The visitors could therefore not judge that the content in the MSci would be relevant to current practice or reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in curriculum guidance. The education provider must demonstrate that the curriculum for the MSci programme is relevant to current practice and reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in relevant curriculum guidance.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the MSci programme curriculum remains relevant to current practice and reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of the profession.

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

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

Reason: The education provider has indicated there will be five additional learners on the MSci programme. However, as discussed above in the request for further evidence around standard 2.1, the visitors were unclear if learners would come directly from the existing BSc or would apply directly onto the MSci programme. The visitors considered there could potentially be an additional 5 learners taking part in practice-based learning and could not see how the education provider and partner organisations would resource the extra learners. The education provider must clarify if extra capacity is required, how they will ensure this and that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff available.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how capacity and availability of practice-based learning will be ensured for additional learners on the programme. Evidence to show how numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced practice-based learning staff will be ensured for the additional learners.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

Reason: The standards above relate to the teaching and assessment of professional behaviour including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) throughout the programme. As the visitors were unable to see the teaching content of the MSci they were unable to determine that the programme and learning outcomes ensure the SCPEs are sufficiently covered throughout the programme. The education programme must show that the programme ensure learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. Furthermore, they must show how assessment throughout the MSci programme ensures that learners are able to demonstrate they meet the expectations of professional behaviour.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the MSci programme ensures learners are able to understand and demonstrate understanding of the expectations of professional behaviour including the SPCEs.

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 25 March 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	01 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15047-X4Y3F2

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04442

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	MC04443

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 introducing a degree apprenticeship route to their existing approved BSc (Hons) Podiatry and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy provisions. The education provider has stated that the new programmes will commence in September 2020 and will follow the modular structure of the current traditional undergraduate programmes. However, they will have a blended learning approach with modules being delivered within the university, by distance learning and within the workplace.

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 visitors reviewed the UEL 2019 validation document for Physiotherapy and Podiatry as well as the programme specifications for both

programmes. The visitors could see from their review the programmes' entry criteria is made available to applicants prior to them making a choice about taking up an offer of a place on the programmes. However the visitors could not see information about the process that the education provider has in place in situations where an applicant (Trust employee) does not meet the entry criteria for the programmes. The visitors could not be sure how the education provider and the employer would handle such cases as there was no information about this within the programme documentation. As such they could not determine that this standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Further information showing how prospective applicants will be made aware of what would happen to their employment status if they do not meet the entry criteria for the programmes, so they can informatively decide whether or not to apply in the first place.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: The visitors noted within the validation document that the education provider is anticipating a cohort size of 20 learners on each of the programmes. However from email correspondence within the programme team, the visitors noted a statement suggesting there will be a maximum of 30 learners on each programme. The visitors considered that the information provided within the submission around learner numbers is conflicting. As such they could not determine the commitment of partner organisations to the programmes, and as a result they could not determine whether the programmes will be sustainable or not.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification around the maximum number of learners expected on the programmes.

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

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

3.15 There must be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.

Reason: In their review of the documentation the visitors could see a description of the processes and the committee in place for monitoring and evaluating the programmes. However the visitors were unclear how the learners will fit into this. For instance, the visitors were not clear about what would happen if there was a dispute between a learner and their employer or in a case where a learner fails to progress. The visitors also noted that the programmes are four year programmes which means learners in their fourth year may be out of synchronization with other learners on the traditional route. This could also mean that they may not have the traditional year representatives and as such may not be able to feed into the student representative system and meetings about programmes through the traditional academic year committees. The visitors therefore would require to see further evidence showing there are systems in place to regularly and effectively monitor and evaluate the degree apprenticeship programmes. The education provider will also need to further demonstrate how learners on this programme will be able to contribute to the overall programmes and that there is an effective system for receiving and managing their complaints.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of learners' involvement in the programme. This should demonstrate how learners on the programmes will be able to feedback on the programme and how their feedback/complaints will be evaluated/responded to.

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

Reason: The visitors were made aware from their review of the documentation that the education provider intends to use some of the practice education providers for the traditional provisions also for the degree apprenticeship programmes. However, the visitors could not see how the education provider will manage the impact that the additional learners may have on availability and capacity of practice-based learning (PBL) for all learners. The visitors therefore require that the education provider provides further clarity around how they will manage the impact of the increased number of learners on PBL by evidencing the effective systems they have in place to ensure availability and capacity of PBL for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Information that shows how the education provider will ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to pages 53-55 of the validation document. The visitors reviewed these pages as well as other pages within the document. The visitors noted that page 28 of the document states, "Our apprenticeships involve approximately 40% off the job training, this being a combination of day release to University and protected self - directed/tutor directed study time in the workplace". However, the visitors noted that page 55 of the document talks about a 26 weeks of full time practical work which appeared to be in conflict with the timetable. They also noted that the timetable demonstrates that learners would have one day a week studying. As such, it was not clear to the visitors when learners' protected study time with the employer would be. The visitors considered that they will need further clarity around the structure and duration of practice-based learning and how these will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) before they can determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification around the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning to ensure it supports the achievement of learning outcomes and the SOPs for physiotherapists and podiatrists.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the "Preparation and Support of Clinical Educators" section of the validation document as evidence for this standard. The visitors could see that practice educators (PEs) would have the opportunity to access regular training and workshops which may be targeted at PEs with different levels of experience or which may focus on different aspects of supervision. However, the visitors were unclear if the education provider had any plans to provide specific training for staff that will supervise and assess degree apprenticeship learners. The visitors considered that the

progression of a degree apprentice may differ from that of learners on the traditional route, taking into consideration possibility of differing expectations or possible issues about workplace modules that may be different. As such, the visitors considered that they will need to see further evidence that clarifies whether practice educators will undertake any special training which is appropriate to the learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme before they can consider this standard as met.

Suggested evidence: Further information that shows that PEs will undertake specific training appropriate to their role, learners' need and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 March 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 Westminster
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences, Part time BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	11 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15420-P3P2G4

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:

Peter Abel	Biomedical scientist
Ian Davies	Biomedical scientist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04475

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04486

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 developed a new degree apprenticeship route. The education provider confirmed in a telephone call that these changes and first learners were in place from September 2017. The new programme delivers the same curriculum as the part time programme. The education provider has added an end point assessment to the programme to meet the requirements of a degree apprenticeship, and has made other changes to the delivery of the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The education provider supplied a completed standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document. In the mapping document for this standard the education provider disclosed how the current programme lead is currently HCPC registered and appropriately qualified for the role of programme lead. This standard is intended to ensure that the education provider (not the HCPC) ensures that the individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified on an ongoing basis, and the visitors were not clear how the information for the current programme lead ensures this. We need to see evidence that there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable programme lead and if necessary, a suitable replacement. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified, experienced and from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are appropriate.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider's process ensures the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

2.4 The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Reason: The education provider has provided an overview of the process to assess applicants Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) that will be checked at an enhanced level by the employer. The education provider has also indicated that the process is not different for the apprenticeship programme. However, the education provider has also stated in the standards (SETs) mapping document that two employers will not be carrying out this enhanced check for applicants. The visitors therefore considered that the process has differentiated itself from the process. The education provider must clarify how it ensures that sufficient criminal conviction checks are being carried out on all applicants. Due to the collaborative nature of degree apprenticeships the employer and education provider must work together to ensure these checks happen but if admissions criteria and processes are applied by a separate organisation, the education provider must still have overall responsibility for overseeing them.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the education provider ensures that all applicants undergo appropriate criminal conviction checks during the admissions process.

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 25 March 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	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	06 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-15027-B5M4W0

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.....	10

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:

Gemma Howlett	Paramedic
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04425

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04455

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 course structure and assessment strategy for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme. Additionally, it wants to increase their learner number from 40 to a maximum of 75 learners per cohort for 2019/20 in year one, and from 40 to 50 learners for year two. The education provider also intends to introduce a degree apprenticeship route through the existing BSc (Hons) programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the web link provided in the mapping document for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. From reviewing this link, the visitors could not see any information regarding the proposed programme. The visitors also noted the mapping document stating that the admissions procedures for the proposed BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme will follow the apprenticeship standard, and will be monitored by the education provider and the apprentice's employer. Without any further information regarding this, the visitors were not clear what the admissions procedures are.

Additionally, it was stated in the mapping document that specific information in relation to the admissions procedure and entry criteria for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) will be made available on the website once approved by the HCPC. Due to being unable to see contents of the specific information, the visitors were unable to determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how applicants would have access to information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence or information demonstrating what information covering all aspects of the programme will be provided to applicants, and how they will have access to this information to ensure they have all the information they require regarding the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship)

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From reviewing the information provided in the mapping document, the visitors noted there is demand to increase the size of the workforce from the respective practice education providers 'North East Ambulance Service' and 'Yorkshire Ambulance Service' (NEAS and YAS). It was also noted from reading that these trusts have increased the placements available to accommodate the short-term learner number increase. Without seeing any further information, the visitors could not determine what commitment is provided by the practice education providers to provide enough resources to deliver the programme. Additionally, without seeing any evidence demonstrating the agreement between the education provider and YAS, the visitors could not determine how the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme will remain sustainable considering the increase in learner numbers.

With regards to the proposed BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme, the visitors could not determine how the new programme is secured and supported within the education provider and by all stakeholders involved, such as employers. As this is supposed to be an employer-led programme, the visitors could not find any information on who will manage what aspects of the programme. The visitors could not find any evidence as to how the relationships and management structures with employer partners operate for the proposed BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate the programme-management structure outlining clear roles and responsibility for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme, and how it will ensure the programme will be effectively managed.

Suggested evidence: Information or evidence demonstrating:

- what resource agreements are in place with NEAS and YAS to accommodate the increased learner numbers for BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme;
- the nature of the relationship with partner organisations and their roles and responsibilities for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme; and
- management structures for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme including who oversees the management systems and structures within the partnership agreements.

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

Reason: The visitors noted there was no information evidenced for this standard, but from reviewing statements throughout the mapping document it seemed like there is an intention of a possible partnership between the education provider and Yorkshire Ambulance Service. However, without much information provided the visitors could not determine what the actual partnership agreements are and how regular collaboration takes place between the education provider and practice education providers for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. Due to the different mode of delivery for this programme and the different way in which the education provider will need to work with the employers, the visitors will need to see how this collaboration would work and whether it will be regular and effective. As such, the visitor require further information about how regular and effective collaboration between the education provider, practice education providers and employers on the programme will be to ensure this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of partnership agreements with the employers and how regular communication and collaboration takes place.

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 this standard, the education provider stated in the mapping document that practice-based learning agreements are in place with North East Ambulance Service (NEAS) to accommodate 50 learners, whilst Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS) will accommodate 25 learners respectively, for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme. From reviewing the documentation provided as evidence, the visitors noted it was a placement agreement document between the education provider and NEAS. The agreement highlighted the different terms and conditions between the two parties including various procedures, but the visitors could not see what the plans are in place to accommodate the short-lived increase in learner numbers. The visitors saw evidence of learner numbers being accommodated by NEAS for practice-based learning. However, it was not clear to the visitors if these numbers are determining capacity allocation only for ambulance placements, or whether is it inclusive of non-ambulance placements. From this, it was not possible to determine if non-ambulance placements has been taken into consideration as well.

Additionally, there was no evidence provided demonstrating the placement agreements with YAS and how capacity allocation determined is to accommodate the aforementioned 25 learners for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme. The visitors could also not determine how the capacity for the increased learner numbers will be managed along with the existing learners on the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme, and the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. Therefore,

the visitors could not determine if there is a process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners across both the programmes.

Suggested evidence: The process for identifying and allocating practice-based learning and how capacity is determined to accommodate the increased learner numbers with NEAS and YAS, considering the existing learners on the programme. What arrangements are in place for the ambulance and non-ambulance placements for both the programmes, including clarity whether the capacity determination numbers include or exclude the apprentices.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: Due to no evidence mapped for this standard, the visitors could not ascertain how much involvement service users and carers will have in BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme or the nature of that involvement. As such, the visitors could not determine if the standard has been met. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of who the service users and carers will be, and how will they be involved in the new programme. The education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates the process to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement within the new programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must be able to demonstrate who the service users and carers are, and how they will or have already contributed to the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The education provider stated there will no changes to this standard, and therefore no evidence was provided. However, the visitors had reviewed the documentation evidenced for standard 4.1. The document was a course specification outlining the revised learning outcomes for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. From reviewing this document, the visitors read that the competencies and skills required for paramedic practice are assessed using Practice Assessment Document (PAD). They also read that PAD is based on the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) for learners. From reviewing the PAD documents, the visitors noted the information contained in it was related to the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme's practice-based learning policies. As such, the visitors could not ascertain how is it ensured that the learners are made aware of the professional behaviour, including the SCPEs. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how the learning outcomes will ensure that learners will be able to understand and meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating how the learning outcomes will ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

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

Reason: From reviewing the mapping document, the visitors noted that no changes will be made to this standard for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. As the proposed BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme will be different to the existing BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme, in that it will take place predominantly in the practice-based learning environment, the visitors were unable to determine how inter professional learning (IPL) will be delivered. The visitors could not determine how learners will learn with and from learners from other relevant professions to help deliver learners' ability to communicate and work with those outside their profession. As such the visitors could not see how the proposed BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme will ensure that learners benefit from IPL. Therefore, the visitors require further information which demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that learners on the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Information about how the education provider makes sure that learners on the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme will learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professionals.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Reason: The education provider stated there will be no changes to this standard, hence no evidence was provided. However, the visitors could not determine how appropriate consent is obtained from service users who will interact with learners for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. Also, the visitors did not see evidence of the formal protocols to obtain consent from learners when they participate as service users, or for managing situations when learners decline from participating as service users in practical sessions. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence of the formal protocols for obtaining consent from learners before they participate as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. They also require evidence that demonstrates how learners are informed about the requirement for them to participate, and how records are maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. In particular, the visitors require evidence to show what alternative learning arrangements will be put in place so there would be no impact on their learning where learners decline participation particularly for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the formal protocols to obtain consent from learners when they participate as service users, including managing situations when learners decline from participating as service users in practical sessions. Also the evidence must also address how consent is obtained from service users who will interact with learner. The requested evidence is specifically for the new the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme.

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

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Reason: The education provider had stated that practice-based learning agreements are in place with 'North East Ambulance Service' and 'Yorkshire Ambulance Service' (NEAS and YAS). However, from reviewing the evidence for this major change, the

visitors could only see evidence of a contract between the NEAS and education provider. The visitors could not determine on the status of partnership between the education provider and YAS. This is because they did not have information confirming what ongoing partnership agreements are in place with YAS. Due to this, the visitors could not determine on the quality of practice-based learning and whether it is safe and supportive for the additional learners to be accommodated on the existing BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme.

Additionally, the visitors could also not determine how the partnership with both the trusts will work, particularly for the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. The visitors could not determine whether the current approval and monitoring arrangements in place for the existing BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme will be the same for the proposed BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. Due to this, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that the practice-based learning environment is safe and supportive for learners and service users. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what system they maintain for approving practice-based learning for the new programme, considering the nature of work based learning and how it will be monitored.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating:

- the practice-based learning agreement with YAS in place to accommodate the additional learners on the existing BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme, which ensures it is safe and supportive for learners and service users; and
- partnership agreements in place for the proposed BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme highlighting the quality monitoring mechanisms.

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

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The education provider evidenced appendix 28 document for standard 5.5, which is a practice-based learning agreement between them and North East Ambulance Service (NEAS). There was no evidence mapped for standard 5.6 as the education provider stated there will be no changes. In addition to no information provided regarding the practice-based learning agreements with Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS), the visitors were unclear how the education provider will ensure that there are appropriately qualified and experienced practice educators to provide support to the additional learner numbers for the existing programme and the new BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme.

It was stated in the mapping document that NHS ambulance trusts have identified further placement provision, which requires an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are available to accommodate the additional 75 learners for the existing BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme. Without more information apart from this statement, the visitors were unable to determine what qualifications the education provider requires practice educators to have, and how the education provider will ensure that practice educators supporting learners on the existing programme will be appropriately qualified and experience.

The visitors also considered how this will ensure there are appropriate and adequate staff for the learners on the new BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. The education provider must provide further evidence to show the following:

- the qualifications and experience of practice educators considered to accommodate the additional 75 learners;
- how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff at the practice-based setting for the number of learners for both the programmes; and
- practice-based learning agreements with YAS.

Suggested evidence: Information regarding the qualification and experience required for the additional practice educators to accommodate the additional learners. The education provider must provide further evidence to show the following:

- the qualifications and experience of practice educators considered to accommodate the additional 75 learners;
- how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff at the practice-based setting for the number of learners for both the programmes; and
- practice-based learning agreements with YAS.

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.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme specification, unit specifications and Practice Assessment documents (PAD) for this standard. From reviewing the PAD documents, the visitors noted that the practice educators are responsible for grading the assessments. The visitors noted some competencies were non-graded and not essential. However, the visitors were unclear how the PAD ensured consistency with marking. The visitors also noted that some learning outcomes were vague.

For example, in the 'Year one PAD document', the visitors noted there are four areas of skills that will be assessed and the grading criteria range of marks was clear. One of the areas to be assessed under paramedic skills and interventions was 'can perform basic life support (BLS)'. The visitors were not clear up to what standard are the learners supposed to perform BLS and at what stages of BLS do they receive the relevant grading.

In year two of the PAD document, the visitors noted one of the patient assessment skills included assessing 'the ability to undertake a detailed patient assessment utilising a medical model'. Without any further information on what the detailed patient assessment includes and of what body system, the visitors were not clear how learners will be made aware of the minimum expectations. Additionally, on page 13 of the document the visitors noted some statements which stated that this is not a pass or fail placement. From this, the visitors were not clear if and what learning outcomes are essential to ensure those who complete the practice-based learning will have the

required knowledge, skills and understanding to practice their profession safely and effectively. The visitors were also unclear about how the education provider ensures that practice educators will have the relevant information and training to be able to carry out these assessments. Due to this, the visitors were not clear how this will make sure that learners who complete the programme achieve the SOPs. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if the assessment methods used will be appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes. The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how the assessment strategy and design will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information on what competencies and skills to be assessed are essential and what is the required threshold or minimum expected level for each competency, such as the BLS. Additionally, how is this communicated to learners and practice educators to ensure learners are able to meet the SOPs. The education provider must also clarify on what assessment methods will be used to ensure learning outcomes are being met.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

In their response to the request for additional documents under section 4, the education provider confirmed that they wished to suspend their request for approval of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic (Apprenticeship) programme. Therefore, the additional documents submitted by the education provider related purely to the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme.

Bearing this in mind and 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 BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme remains approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 March 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](#).