

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Association of Clinical Scientists
Name of programme(s)	Certificate of Attainment, Flexible
Date submission received	05 August 2020
Case reference	CAS-16217-D5H5G4

### 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:

Geraldine Hartshorne	Clinical scientist
Colin Jennings	Clinical scientist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate of Attainment
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 January 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 97
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04723

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

In the course of our annual monitoring process, we identified a reduction in the number of learners on this programme from the approved 330 to 97 and brought this to the education provider’s attention. They explained the reduction was as a result of the introduction of alternative education providers for Clinical science, in addition to the Association of Clinical Scientists. This has resulted in a decline in application numbers onto 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.

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

**Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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	The University of Bolton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time Degree Apprenticeship for Operating Department Practitioners - Level 6, Flexible
Date submission received	28 August 2020
Case reference	CAS-16244-S1Q8N0

### 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:

Joanna Finney	Operating department practitioner
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	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 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04739

Programme name	Degree Apprenticeship for Operating Department Practitioners - Level 6
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Operating department practitioner

First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04740

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

The education provider has made changes to their assessment design, so it is varied and reflects professional practice. Assessment components have been reduced to decrease conflicting demands on learners and to allow a focus on the production of work to meet learning outcomes. The education provider is also replacing the 3-term 40 credit module in year 2, HLT5026 Research, with HLT5027 Care for the Surgical Patient.

The education provider made changes to most modules within the programme, to some or all of the following:

- Learning outcomes;
- Indicative content;
- Summative assessment;
- Summative assessment strategy; and
- Duration and credit allocation.

### 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 September 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) Occupational Therapy, Work based learning
Date submission received	22 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-16023-R1Y5V9

### 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:

Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04596

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 additional cohort of 50 learners for the programme from an external site based in London.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that a set of slides used as an Open Day Welcome clearly stated that the attendance at the academic site in each year of the programme would be 1 day per week. However, in the change notification it states that delivery of the programme would increase to two days per week in year two. The information about London delivery only appears in the last slide and is not specific about exactly where this is occurring or that the proposed site for the September 2020 intake is a temporary arrangement. As such they considered the information to be inconsistent and not complete for learners. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to clarify the finalised information that will be provided for applicants in order for them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clarifies the amount of academic attendance per year and evidence that demonstrates that potential students for the apprenticeship from the additional partnership agreements are fully aware of the planned temporary and

proposed permanent arrangements for the Academic programme delivery with timescales when these are likely to occur.

### **3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that that the proposal is for up to 50 additional learners at the new London site and that the venue is currently being acquired and that architect plans are available on request. It is not clear if these are plans of University House London or the proposed new venue. The visitors also noted that the programmes currently delivered at University House London appear to be business related. The visitors are therefore uncertain if this building is suitable or can be adapted to provide the equivalent learning resources that are available to the Occupational Therapy students undertaking the same programme at the Coventry site. Without sight of the proposed plans for the new building, the visitors are also not certain what resources are intended to be available there to provide equity of learning experience with the Coventry based learners in the future. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show the new site is appropriate for the programme to ensure it remains fit for purpose.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of what resources will be available to London based learners in both University House London and the proposed new building that demonstrates that the learner experience will be equitable regardless of where the learners undertake their Occupational Therapy (OT) academic programme and that these resources will be sufficient to support intakes of up to 50 students.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted the intention to use the University's 'flying faculty' to be able to staff the London venue and to appoint a London based Outreach Programme Lead. The visitors noted the inclusion of CVs for flying faculty members, and could see that they are appropriately qualified and experienced. However, the visitors could not find any information about how the flying faculty members will be used to ensure that the programme is effectively delivered at both sites. It is not clear if this will affect the experience and support for learners of the programme(s) delivered at Coventry. The visitors therefore require further information how the flying faculty will be managed between the two sites to ensure that appropriate support is maintained for learners and both programmes can be delivered effectively. The education provider must clarify how the current staff provision can be managed to deliver programmes with increased demand from learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the flying faculty will be managed to meet the increased demand on them. Evidence to show that the number of staff is appropriate to the effective delivery of the programme at both sites.

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

**Reason:** In their narrative for this standard the visitors noted that a named person will work closely with managers of the apprentices joining the London delivery. The visitors are unclear if this individual is an additional post for London or additional responsibility for a member of the Coventry based team. The visitors require further information about

how this individual is able to manage their potential teaching commitments and ensuring regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the individual involved in collaborating with practice education providers is able to carry this out alongside their teaching commitments.

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

**Reason:** The visitors note that the initial base in London will be at University House which appears to deliver business programmes and contains a variety of classroom layouts. It is not clear how the new occupational therapy programme staff and learners will have access to the learning resources specific to occupational therapy that are currently used in the delivery of the programme at Coventry. The visitors could not find any information about where or when the new Health and Life Sciences building will be available for these London based apprentice occupational therapy learners or whether there will be other professions in addition to occupational therapy and Nursing associates present at this site. The education provider must provide further evidence that outlines the resources that are essential for the programme and how they are made available to learners at the new site.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about how the staff and learners will obtain access to the equivalent occupational therapy resources available at Coventry to ensure effective and appropriate delivery of the programme both initially at University House and subsequently in the new acquisition.

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

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted the visitors note that there are well established resources to support the wellbeing and learning needs of the learners at University House. However the additional cohort will result in an addition of 50 students per year who may need to use the resources. The visitors could not determine from the submission whether the resources in London can accommodate an increase in demand of this size.

**Suggested evidence:** Confirmation that the resources at University House can accommodate this potential increase in demand and details of what will be the arrangements when learners move to the new building.

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

**Reason:** The education provider did not provide evidence for this standard. However, the visitor's note that the initial base in London will be at University House which appears to deliver business programmes. It is therefore not clear how the occupational therapy learners will have the opportunity to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions and may consequently not have equity of learning experience with Coventry based occupational therapy learners. There are two days interprofessional learning experience identified in the first three years of the programme

but the visitors could not determine when and where this will be delivered for the learners at the new site.

**Suggested evidence:** The amended commentary for this SET and details of how the interprofessional days are delivered /planned to be delivered to ensure equity across both academic sites.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the **24 September 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	Edge Hill University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	15 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16190-R1D4S9

### 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:

Joanna Finney	Operating department practitioner
Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
Rabie Sultan	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 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04703

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

process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

Due to UK lockdown restrictions in March because of COVID-19, the April 2020 intake was deferred. The education provider as a one off change proposed to have learners from the April intake join the September 2020 intake. This will result in a combined total of up to 100 learners for the September 2020 intake, as this programme is approved for up to 50 learners per cohort with two intakes per year. Learner numbers will be split into two groups of up to a maximum of 50, to be based at the campuses at Ormskirk and St James' facility in Manchester.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 Exeter
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging, Work based learning
Date submission received	31 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16236-D4X6V9

### 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:

Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rachel Picton	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 March 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04736

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 intend on increasing the number of cohorts they run, from one to two per academic year. They also intend on increasing the maximum cohort size, from 30 to 36 learners per cohort.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 Liverpool
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma (PGDIP) Therapeutic Radiography & Oncology, Full time
Date submission received	08 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16134-H1D5J9

### 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:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Amy Taylor	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma (PGDIP) Therapeutic Radiography & Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 January 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04738

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 new programme (Post Graduate Diploma (PGDIP) Therapeutic Radiography & Oncology) to replace their existing PGDip Radiotherapy programme starting from January 2021.

**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.

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed evidence provided for this standard, including the programme specification and the Assessment guidance document. The visitors also reviewed the education provider’s Code of Practice on Assessment. Throughout their review, the visitors were unable to identify details of the assessment policies that clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme, as this was not provided. The visitors also noted that there was no statement that all modules must be passed and are none compensatory. They noted that the module descriptors do not convey this information; some indicate that they are non-elective although this is not indicated on all of the descriptors. On some of the modules, for instance Radiotherapy

Theory and Clinical Practice 3 (HEAD, NECK & THORAX) (RADT 724), the visitors noted the statement “progression: by the end of the academic year in order to progress all learners must meet the minimum clinical competency requirements of the PGDIP Therapeutic Radiography & Oncology programme.” The visitors noted this statement could be misleading to learners and could indicate that the academic component does not need to be passed for progression. Therefore, the visitors require that the education makes clear within the assessment policies, specific requirements for progression and achievement.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to ensure that learners understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme and how these policies are clearly communicated to both learners and educators.

## Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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)	MSc (Pre-Registration) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	29 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-16073-G4L4W7

### 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:

Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Clare Attrill	Speech and language therapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc (Pre-Registration) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04623

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 increasing the yearly cohort size on the programme to a maximum of 35. They had previously increased the numbers internally from 15 to 22 in November 2018 and are now looking to gain approval for the change from 15 to 35.

**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.

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
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.

**3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the Faculty Strategy Plan and Manchester Met Education Strategy as evidence for this standard. The visitors noted that the Head of Department has committed to providing physical resources to the programme, however, this was for an unspecified increase in learner numbers. The visitors noted that although the programme was approved for a maximum of 14 learners in 2015, 22 learners were admitted in 2018 and the education provider is now seeking approval for up to 35 learners on the programme. As the evidence did not demonstrate commitment to providing resources for up to 35 learners, the visitors were unable to determine that the programme has enough support from senior management and as such, they could not determine that the programme is sustainable. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the programme remains sustainable.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that the programme is sustainable with 150% increase in number of learners.

### **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 their documentary review, the visitors saw references that showed there was unused practice-based learning capacity locally and also plans for the education provider to involve independent practitioners in practice-based learning. The visitors noted that the email correspondence from North West Association of Speech and Language Therapists in Independent Practice (ASLTIP) showed interest in providing practice-based learning for learners on the programme. However, the email also listed challenges such as insurance, invoicing and audit. This is to be discussed at a meeting scheduled for September 2020. The visitors understood that many additional practice-based learning will be required for the increase in cohort. However, they noted there was no evidence of commitment in general and more specifically of how many placements would be available through the ASLTIP route. Therefore, the visitors request that the education provider submit evidence of how they will ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing sufficient availability and capacity of practice-based learning for the increased number of learner.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard including the example of jointly time-tabled activities and the unit handbooks. The visitors noted that there was no reference to increase in staffing to accommodate the increase in learner numbers. Although they noted that there were plans to increase efficiency through joint teaching with other programmes, the visitors considered that the increase in cohort will greatly increase requirements in areas such as assessment, dissertation and clinical supervision, and learner support. As such they require that the education provider evidence how they will ensure adequate number of staff in place to deliver all parts of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating there is adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to ensure assessment, dissertation and clinical supervision, and learner support needs will be met for the increased number of learners.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the mapping document stated that “there is capacity to increase Practice Educator education within the existing programme of training.” The visitors saw from their documentary review that not all eligible Practice Educators are currently on the database, as meeting the Practice Educator criteria would require them to undertake relevant training. As such, the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure a suitable number of staff for all learners on the programme and the level of support specific to learners’ need. The education provider must demonstrate that the required number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are available for practice-based learning.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that there is adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and trained staff for the practice education needs of the increased learner numbers.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the **24 September 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	Medway School of Pharmacy
Validating body	Universities of Greenwich and Kent
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, Distance learning Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing, Distance learning Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	30 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16135-K4S3J3

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

James Pickard	Independent prescriber
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04652

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing

First intake	01 May 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04653

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 October 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	5
Assessment reference	MC04689

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

The education provider has indicated they will be including a new prescribing programme in the form of a 40 credit module that sits within MSc Advanced Clinical Practice programme, which is delivered by the University of Greenwich. This module will be optional for learners currently undertaking the MSc programme. As it is optional, the registerable award will be completion of the specific prescribing module rather than the MSc programme. The content of this module will be made up of content from the approved prescribing programmes that are currently delivered by the Medway School of Pharmacy. In accessing this module, learners will have taken part in learning that is part of the current approved programmes within their MSc programme. So as not to repeat learning, 20 credits of the approved programme have been mapped to a module that all learners take part in as part of the MSc programme, the MSc learners will therefore only complete 40 credits of the prescribing programme. Learners will complete this module through a blended learning approach alongside the existing 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.

### **D.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:** To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted their document that would serve as a guide for practice educators. The visitors were able to see an overview of the expectations for practice educators and how they will interact with the learners in their role. However, the visitors could not see mention of how practice educators would be prepared in order to support learners and assess them effectively. Furthermore, it was not clear how practice educators would have this training updated as the programme changes and evolves. As such the visitors could not determine this standard was met. The education provider must provide further evidence to show how practice educators are initially trained and how their training is updated to ensure they are able to provide appropriate and effective support for learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Information around the training of practice educators and how this training is refreshed over time.

## **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	22 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16166-Y2H2Q3

### 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
Rabie Sultan	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 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04683

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist

First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04684

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

The education provider has proposed to modify the existing modules, learning methods, educational philosophy, learning outcomes and assessment methods for both the programmes. Additionally, the education provider is providing more inter-professional learning opportunities and changing the second practice-based learning to a full time opportunity, only on the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) 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.

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the **24 September 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) Dietetics, Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	30 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16157-W9B0Y0

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Andrew Jones	Paramedic
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 February 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04672

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic

First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 69
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04673

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 revising the following shared modules on their BSc (Hons) Dietetics and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programmes:

- SOHP401: Preparation for Professional Practice;
- SOHP501: Project Studies; and
- SOHP501: Project,

which are delivered across programmes within the School of Health Professions. This would involve changes to the way these modules are designed and delivered as well as their assessments. The education provider also informed us of changes to some module codes.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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) Podiatry, Full time BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Work based learning
Date submission received	27 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16211-F8Q4Z5

### 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 Independent Prescribing POM – Administration, POM - Sale / Supply (CH) Podiatric Surgery
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines - Sale / Supply (CH)
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1

Assessment reference	MC04719
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines - Sale / Supply (CH)
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04748

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 degree apprenticeship programme is being introduced to be delivered alongside the current approved programme. The new programme will contain the same curriculum as the full time programme with adjustments to three modules. The education provider has added an end point assessment to the programme to meet the requirements of a degree apprenticeship.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	16 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16176-W7Y1R7

### 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
Stephen Boynes	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 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04691

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 January 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04722

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 stated they were introducing a degree apprenticeship.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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	Swansea University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	16 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16186-S8V6B3

### 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:

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Andrew Jones	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 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04696

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 increase the numbers of learners on the programme to 75 rather than the 50 it has been approved for. This would apply from the September 2020 cohort.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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 Suffolk
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	11 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-16116-Y7D3Q2

### 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:

Andrew Jones	Paramedic
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 April 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04637

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 increase learner numbers from 25 to up to 40 per cohort. This will be achieved by increasing staffing and practice educators for this programme. Additionally, the education provider will also appoint an education officer to act as the link and manage communication between the education provider and practice education providers.

### 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.

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

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated in the mapping document that they are part of the 'Paramedic Partners group' chaired by Health Education England consisting of regional education providers, who meet on a bi-monthly basis to discuss and provide feedback regarding practice-based learning. From reviewing the evidence submitted, the visitors reviewed the Paramedic Partners group meeting agenda which was

scheduled in October 2019. Without seeing any further information such as minutes of this meeting and when the other meetings took place, the visitors could not determine what discussion and agreements have taken place between the different stakeholders. It was also not clear whether discussions took place regarding the proposed increment in learner numbers, and arrangements for their ambulance and non-ambulance placements. From this they could not determine how regular and effective communication takes place between the education provider and practice education provider.

The 'Uos commentary submission' document provided mentioned about course committees meeting three times in a year to review resources, as part of the programme's internal quality assurance process. These meetings are used to review learning and teaching resources on the programme, whilst this process gets reviewed on a yearly basis. Without seeing any further information regarding the process or meetings, the visitors could not determine whether considerations have been discussed and actioned with regards to the proposed changes in this major change to increase staff and practice educators on the programme. Based on this, the visitors could not make a judgement of the effectiveness of the programme's evaluation and monitoring systems.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must provide:

- information such as minutes of the meeting highlighting what information and discussions have taken place during the Paramedic Partners group meeting;
- evidence highlighting how regular the education provider and practice educators collaborate; and
- more information on the internal quality assurance process, specifically regarding the course committees.

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated in the mapping document that they are part of the 'Paramedic Partners group'. It was also mentioned that this group consists of regional education providers who meet on a bi-monthly basis, to discuss and provide feedback regarding the capacity of practice-based learning across the region. The education provider evidenced an agenda of a meeting in October 2019. Without any further information regarding this meeting or how regional education providers determine capacity across the region, the visitors were not clear if there was a process in place to ensure there will be sufficient availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. Additionally, the visitors could not determine if considerations have been made as part of the process to determine capacity and availability of practice-based learning with increased learner numbers, in the ambulance and non-ambulance settings. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether all learners on the programme including the proposed additional learners will have access to practice-based learning.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must clarify the process in place to determine availability and capacity for learners on this programme, considering proposals to increase learners on this programme. The evidence must also demonstrate whether there are considerations made for learners to have access to ambulance and non-ambulance practice-based learning settings.

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

**Reason:** For this standard, the education provider stated in the mapping document that the programme team now comprises of 4.6 FTE (full time equivalent) staff members. The evidence mapped for this standard included a job description of 'clinical lecturer/instructor'. Without seeing any further information, the visitors were not clear if an increment of 30% in staffing numbers will be sufficient to accommodate the increment of up to 60% learners per cohort. Additionally, the visitors could not see any information demonstrating what arrangements are in place to review the staff numbers on this programme to support the overall learner numbers, considering increment from next cohort and learners who will join this programme over the subsequent years. Therefore, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on how the programme will remain sufficiently staffed.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme for all learners,

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

**Reason:** The education provider evidenced 'Uos commentary submission' document and a job description of Education Training Officer. From reviewing these documents, the visitors could not see any evidence showing what considerations or arrangements with regards to physical resources have been made with regards to increment in learner numbers. The visitors could not determine what strategy has been considered to accommodate all learners, to support their learning and teaching activities of the programme. Therefore, the visitors could not make a judgement on how it will be ensured that resources to support learning in all settings will be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme once learner numbers increase on this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate what arrangements have been made to ensure learners will have access to the necessary resources, for effective delivery of the programme.

### **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 stated in the mapping document "All Practice Educators (PEd) are qualified paramedics registered with the HCPC". From reviewing the 'Uos commentary submission' document, the visitors noted that practice education providers have demonstrated commitment to support learners, through the Education and Training Officer who will act as a link between them and the education provider. However, the visitors could not see any further information regarding what has been agreed to support the increment in learner numbers from the next cohort. As noted under SET 3.5, the visitors could not see any information regarding the minutes of

'Paramedic Partners group' to view what arrangements have been discussed and agreed. Based on this, the visitors were not clear if additional practice educators have been recruited or how many will be recruited for this programme. Therefore the visitors could not determine if there will be a suitable number of appropriately qualified and experienced practice educators with relevant knowledge, skills and experience to accommodate the increment in learner numbers on this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate how many practice educators will be in place to support the increment in learner numbers. Additionally, how will it be ensured the additional practice educators will have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners on this programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 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](#).