

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Educational Psychology (Scotland (Stage 2)), Flexible)
Date submission received	04 August 2020
Case reference	CAS-16204-Q5J3M6

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:

Lisa Marks Woolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Rebecca Khanna	Occupational therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Educational Psychology (Scotland (Stage 2))
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04709

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: 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 12 November 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 Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	27 August 2020
Case reference	CAS-16075-T3S9T3

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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 33
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04624

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

The education provider informed us that they were amending the structure of the programme and making changes to assessment.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: 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 12 November 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) Physiotherapy, Work based learning MSc Physiotherapy and Leadership, Work based learning
Date submission received	23 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16194-J6C8R4

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:

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04705

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy and Leadership
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04706

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 propose running their BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and MSc Physiotherapy and Leadership programmes at their campus in London. The award given will be the same at the London site as that at the main campus. The education provider informed us the programme design, content and delivery will be the same on both campuses. Additional staff will be recruited to teach the work based learning route across both campuses. Placement provision on the programmes at the London campus will be set up as a circuit between the apprentices' employers and there will be an increase in learner numbers, from 174 to 200 across the entire physiotherapy provision

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: To demonstrate how they meet this SET, the education provider informed the visitors the recruitment and interview process will remain the same. However, the visitors considered the addition of running the programmes at the London campus would impact on the information provided throughout the admissions process. The visitors could not find any paperwork which described the admissions process for the London-based programmes. Therefore the visitors need further evidence of the admissions process to the London-based programmes as well as details of when prospective applicants would have access to the relevant range of information.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the admissions process to the London-based programmes as well as details of when prospective applicants would have access to the relevant range of information.

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

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

Reason: To meet these standards, the visitors were made aware the education provider is recruiting for an Assistant Professor of Physiotherapy, on a one-year fixed term contract. However, although the visitors were informed the programme will be supported by the existing team and managed by the professional lead, they had not received details, such as qualifications and experience, of the staff who will be teaching all aspects of the programme at the London campus. The visitors could therefore not be sure there was an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively, and that educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further information to demonstrate:

- there is an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively; and
- that educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively.

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

Reason: To meet these standards, visitors were made aware that learners based at the London campus will have access to all of the existing resources. The health building will have a simulation ward and community house to mirror the immersive high fidelity simulation resources available on the Coventry campus. However, although the visitors were informed there was a simulation ward and community house, and library facilities to mirror the resources available on the Coventry campus, they had not received details of these resources. Therefore, the visitors could not be sure the resources available at the London campus are readily available to learners and educators. The visitors need further evidence of the programme resources at the London campus, and how the education provider ensures they are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the programme resources, including teaching spaces and learning resources, at the London campus, and how the education provider ensures they are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider informed the visitors that learners studying at the London campus will complete the same number of placements as required by all students at Coventry University and that the placement team will ensure that the London learners will have access to the same range of clinical experiences as students at the Coventry campus. However, the visitors were unable to find information about the number, timing or type of practice-based learning in the proposed London-based programme and so were unsure whether the way practice-based learning is designed means learners are able to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for physiotherapists. The visitors need further information about practice placement provision to ensure the design and content of practice-based learning ensures learners achieve the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further information about practice placement provision such as a schedule of placements to demonstrate the design and content of practice-based learning ensures learners achieve the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider informed the visitors they have a new online resource for clinical educators, which explains the programme with a focus on placement provision, supporting students during their placements and how students are assessed whilst on placement. The physiotherapy subject leader, apprentice course director and placement co-ordinator will work with the staff delivering the content on the London campus to ensure the equity of the placement evaluations and auditing. The visitors were also informed placement educators for the London-based programme will have access to all resources available to existing placement providers, including placement connect and the new online resource for clinical educators. Clinical educator days and mentor days will be delivered on the London campus as well as the Coventry campus.

However, the visitors could not find any details about the number of staff in the practice-based learning settings who have received the required training to be able to support learners during their practice placements. The visitors were unsure whether there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further information to justify and demonstrate there is a suitable number of staff for the number of learners and the level of support specific learners need.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further details to justify and demonstrate there is a suitable number of staff for the number of learners and the level of support specific learners need.

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 12 November 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) Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	24 August 2020
Case reference	CAS-16191-Y8J5Q3

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:

Gemma Howlett	Paramedic
Gordon Pollard	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04704

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

The education provider informed us they were making changes to the assessment on the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 12 November 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 Essex
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time
Date submission received	02 September 2020
Case reference	CAS-16271-R0Y8N6

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:

Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04761

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

The education provider is proposing to increase the number of learners on the programme from 11 to 18 following award of an increase in commissions for the 2020 intake.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The mapping document stated that there are no changes to how the programme meets this standard. The visitors considered that the increase in learner numbers from 11 to 18 would have an impact on the resources that are available to support learning. As no evidence was provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure that all 18 learners as well as educators on the programme, have access to resources such as computers and space in teaching rooms that are required to deliver the programme effectively. As such, the visitors could not determine that this standard was met and request that the education provider provide evidence to demonstrate the standard continues to be met, following the increase in the number of learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating the programme has adequate resources, effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and that these are accessible to all 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 12 November 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	30 September 2020
Case reference	CAS-16203-J8V1K3

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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04708

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

The education provider is making changes to some of the taught modules across the three levels of the programme. This includes replacing some modules with alternatives and updating the content of others.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	Master of Podiatric Surgery, Part time Master of Podiatric Surgery (degree apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	10 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16155-Z3V1M7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Stephen Bendall	Orthopaedic surgeon
Paul Blakeman	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Thomas Galloway	Podiatric surgeon
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Podiatric Surgery
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Podiatrists practising podiatric surgery
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04671

Programme name	Master of Podiatric Surgery (degree apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)

Entitlement	Podiatrists practising podiatric surgery
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04692

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

The education provider informed us that they were introducing a degree apprenticeship route.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors were broadly satisfied with the documentation submitted to them explaining the structure of the degree apprenticeship. As this was already an approved programme they did not need to review all the curriculum and assessment elements which had been brought into the apprenticeship from the existing programme. Enough information was available for the visitors to make a recommendation. However, they

considered that it would be useful for them to see greater detail about the relationship that the employers who would be taking apprentices would have with the University of Huddersfield. For example what, meetings or contacts would take place, and how often, and under what remit. This is because the main change in going to the apprentice model is that the relationship that the University of Huddersfield have with the employer becomes direct. Clarity is therefore needed around how primarily the learner, the employer, and the university interact consistently.

This would be useful to satisfy the visitors with regards to how the provider and the employer would manage the programme together and to deal with issues that arose or any problems might occur.

Suggested evidence: Details of the committees or groups that would form part of the working relationship between the University of Huddersfield, and information about how they would be used to ensure effective programme management under the new relationship.

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

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors were satisfied that the relationship between the University of Huddersfield and the partner employers had been appropriately elaborated in the additional documentation and so they considered that their concerns in that area were now met. They noted that the education provider was intending to use many of the same structures and channels of communication for this degree apprenticeship as they were for the existing approved programme.

They considered that this was appropriate and that it met the standard at threshold. However, they wished to note that this programme had different demands than the existing programme and that the kind of issues which might need to be raised between learners, the University of Huddersfield and the partner employers were therefore potentially different. They suggest therefore that the education provider keep under review the mechanisms they use in this area.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Name of programme(s)	Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential Route), Flexible
Date submission received	30 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15060-L6H7P6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Beverley Cherie Millar	Clinical scientist
David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential Route)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04441

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 stated that they intend to add another specialist

discipline, of Clinical Microbiology, to their curriculum.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the education provider's submission for this standard, which included detailed evidence of how the admissions process would work. However, the visitors considered that some aspects of the process were not clear. For example, it is not clear whether applicants with MSc degrees in disciplines other than Clinical Microbiology would be eligible to apply, and indeed which qualifications would generally be considered appropriate and which would be not. In order for applicants to make an informed choice, a list of appropriate qualifications which would be eligible for admission to the programme should be provided e.g., MSc Biomedical Science, PhD in Physiology, Medicine, IBMS specialist portfolio

Additionally, the visitors were also unclear about the following issues:

- How the education provider ensured that that the guidance in the "Clinical Microbiology Handbook" was discipline specific;

- How the education provider will define “high-level experience of autonomous professional practice and expertise” with respect to applicants For example will only applicants who are currently HCPC Biomedical Scientists be considered for this programme or can other applicants such as scientists/academics who have worked within the field of clinical microbiology but are not currently on the HCPC register be eligible to apply?
- How the education provider determines whether applicants from disciplines other than Clinical Microbiology, which are mentioned in the “Clinical Microbiology Handbook”, namely Clinical Biochemistry, Clinical Immunology and Haematology, can be considered for this programme; and
- How the education provider defines “high level experience”, i.e. is there a set time frame which the applicant must have spent within the clinical microbiology setting and where can this setting be i.e., NHS, private laboratory, academic institution.
- The Programme Handbook which is available on the IBMS website and which was not supplied in the major change documentation, guides applicants and reference is made to the curriculum handbook, as such the Curriculum Handbook must clearly define eligibility for applicants in terms of qualification and experience.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to clarify the points noted above, and / or a narrative pointing to where they are addressed in the documentation.

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

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

Reason: It is important before an additional modality is introduced into the current programme that evidence is provided relating to the evaluation of the current programme. As the Education provider has been awarding/validating the Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential Route) for the last three years it would be prudent to provide reflective evaluations of the current systems which are in place relating to the other three modalities namely Clinical Biochemistry, Clinical Immunology,

Suggested evidence: Documentation from evaluations of numbers which applied for the programme and which were accepted and numbers reject and why, Details of the External Examiner including the External examiner’s credentials and experience External examiner reports, mentor and applicant testimonials and any other documentation as appropriate relating to how the Educator Provider will moderate the programme in relation to the delivery of Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential route) within the modality of Clinical Microbiology need to be provided.

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

Reason: The visitors were not clear from the evidence submitted how service users and carers would be involved specifically in the new modality. They considered that it was highly important for service users to have input into Clinical Microbiology as it was a distinct discipline of its own and was highly important within the clinical scientist profession. It is important that such service users and carers are involved in the key modality specific areas of their health care provision and advice to ensure safe and

appropriate treatment and infection control and prevention guidance and as such can contribute to the programme outputs and goals.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider intends to ensure service user and carer involvement that is specifically appropriate to the Clinical Microbiology.

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

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

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

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

Reason: The education provider's evidence for this standard included reference to the IBMS Advisory Panel for Medical Microbiology (APMM), which would provide appropriate support to the existing staff in order to deliver the new modality. However, the visitors were not clear from this evidence what the nature of the Clinical Microbiology support on the APMM would be, for example how it was ensured that those members of the APMM who would be providing the support were selected and recruited. They were aware that clinical scientists from the virology specialism might be able to contribute to the curriculum development and assessment, and considered that this would be appropriate and useful.

The visitors considered that they needed to see the following evidence relating to those who would be mentoring and assessing practical competencies of learners on the Clinical Microbiology modality:

- how the skills and experience of prospective mentors will be assessed and deemed appropriate/approved by the education provider;;
- the detailed role of mentors who will be used in supervision, and how this role will be appropriately communicated to both learner and mentor;
- how the education provider will ensure appropriate training for mentors and assessors;
- how assessors were selected for their role in terms of skills, experience and clinical scientist profession;
- how they will ensure that assessors are operationally independent from the awarding body, to ensure no apparent or real conflicts of interest;

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate how the personnel available for the programme will be appropriately deployed, prepared and trained to ensure that the programme is delivered as intended.

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

Reason: The education provider stated in their evidence (Curriculum Microbiology Handbook, page 7), concerning learners' existing knowledge, that they recognise that "some of the learning for these areas that will have taken place may not have been at

master's level...However, this provides the foundation for further development to enable the application of knowledge for the specialist to be at master's level, therefore fulfilling the requirements for demonstrating the HCPC standards of proficiency for clinical scientists have been met.”

The visitors considered that they would like to see further detail about what this means, particularly in terms of which programmes would be deemed acceptable as having provided appropriate prior knowledge. This is especially important in light of the programme prerequisite that applicants be at Level 7 (Master's).

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how the education provider determines which programmes will be considered to have provided appropriate prior knowledge for learners.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted under this standard. However, it was not clear to them that the education provider had submitted enough information about how the programme would ensure that the whole programme prepared learners appropriately to be effective practitioners within the discipline. They considered that there was a lack of clear information about the detail of all four sub-specialisms that a clinical microbiologist would need to cover (namely, Bacteriology, Virology, Mycology & Parasitology). In particular, as a major responsibility of a clinical scientist is within the acquisition of evidence based guidance based on their own research or that of the peer-reviewed literature, extensive expertise and evidence may fall solely within one of these sub-specialisms. As such an academic knowledge of all of the above four disciplines is fundamental and evidence must be provided by the applicant that all such areas were covered during formal education or subsequent training / experience. The visitors considered that they had not seen enough evidence that the modality Speciality Specific Academic curriculum focuses on rapidly developing and changing areas within Clinical Microbiology which have fundamental relevance to current practice and service delivery. They therefore require further evidence around this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the curriculum will fully prepare learners to practise safely and effectively by giving them a full understanding of all the current areas and developments that they will work across.

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

Reason: The visitors were not clear from the evidence submitted how the education provider would ensure that assessment of work submitted for consideration of the Clinical Scientist profession within the modality of Clinical Microbiology would be assessed objectively, fairly and reliably. In particular they considered that they needed more clarity around the two-stage end-point assessment used. With regards to this, the education provider had noted that they had available “clinical scientist and biomedical scientist expertise”. But the visitors could not see detail relating to who the relevant individuals would be, and so could not make a determination about their suitability for assessing the Clinical Scientist profession within the Clinical Microbiology modality.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to clarify how the education provider will ensure appropriate professional Clinical Scientist input into assessment of the new modality of Clinical Microbiology.

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 12 November 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	Edinburgh Napier University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Pre-Registration in Occupational Therapy, Full time MSc Pre-Registration in Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	31 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16072-J1V9P8

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Angela Ariu	Occupational therapist
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Pre-Registration in Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04621

Programme name	MSc Pre-Registration in Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2019

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04622

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

The education provider informed us that they were planning to increase learner numbers.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of East Anglia
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	28 September 2020
Case reference	CAS-16288-R0M8B5

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-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 February 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04768

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 number of learners on the programme from 20 to 30 per intake. They explained the increase would match the high level of quality applicants onto the programme and this will in turn allow the programme to train additional occupational therapists required within the current workforce.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Science, Distance learning
Date submission received	15 September 2020
Case reference	CAS-16252-T0X8V8

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:

Jason Comber	Paramedic
Paul Bates	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Science
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 March 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04746

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

The education provider has informed us of an increase in the learner numbers, from 30 to 38, on the final cohort of the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 12 November 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](#).