

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc Hons Operating Department Practice (South West), Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Degree Apprenticeship, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (South West) Degree Apprenticeship, Full time
Date submission received	17 September 2020
Case reference	CAS-16197-C2H9R9

### 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:

Rebecca Helen Lowes	Operating department practitioner
David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
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 August 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04707

Programme name	BSc Hons Operating Department Practice (South West)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 January 2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04726

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 March 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04775

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (South West) Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 March 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04776

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 their intention to run a degree apprenticeship programme based on their BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice provision, at both sites in Birmingham and in the South West. The selection and entry criteria will change to incorporate those learners who undertake a portfolio route. The education provider has also informed us that practice-based learning strategies will need to be developed, which may involve changes to the programme.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the visitors were informed there had been no change to the way the SET was met and that a joint interview process for recruitment and selection remains in place. However, the visitors were aware of the employed status of learners and were unclear what the impact is on the employment status of learners who are unable to continue on the programme. For example, for the failing or failed learner, or the learner whose circumstances have changed. The visitors considered applicants need to be provided with all the information they need to make a fully informed decision about taking up a place on the programme, and considered this information was not made available for learners. The visitors therefore need to be sure that information provided throughout the admissions process is clear and thorough, and allows for informed decision-making.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to demonstrate that information provided throughout the admissions process is clear and thorough, and allows for informed decision-making.

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

**Reason:** To meet this standard, the visitors were informed that a programme apprenticeship lead will be appointed, and that the faculty lead for apprenticeship programmes will liaise with the head of department and programme lead for regular review of the programme. However, the visitors were unclear about the management of the apprentice learners, as they will be employees working primarily in the workplace setting as opposed to the academic setting. The visitors therefore were unclear of the structures to take into account the workplace setting of learners.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide further evidence that there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme, that the structures within the workplace are clear, and that there are transparent processes to deal with any issues or problems which arise in the workplace.

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence these standards, the education provider informed the visitors staff were in post, and that when the apprenticeship programme is approved, there will be a senior lecturer in post for the Apprenticeship lead and staff numbers increased to reflect an increase in learner numbers. The visitors were also informed all learners have access to learner, IT, library and academic services provided by the education provider.

However, the visitors were made aware that the education provider has proposed up to an additional 40 learners at the site in Birmingham and up to 50 learners additional in the South West.

The visitors were unclear what the impact of such an increase in learner numbers will be in regards to whether there is an adequate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

The visitors were also unclear how the education provider ensures that programme resources are readily available to learners and educators to support learning and teaching given such an increase in learner numbers.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide further evidence of how:

- they will ensure there are an appropriate number of staff able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively; and
- programme resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

**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.**

**5.8 Learners and practice educators must have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning.**

**Reason:** The education provider informed the visitors there is no change to the way the programme meets these standards.

However, the visitors were made aware that the education provider has proposed up to an additional 40 learners at the site in Birmingham and up to 50 additional learners in the South West.

The visitors are therefore unclear whether the number of staff involved in practice-based learning are adequate due to the proposed increased numbers of learners. The visitors were also unclear whether the staff involved in practice-based learning are trained appropriately and have appropriate information to be prepared for the change in delivery of the programme to the apprenticeship.

The visitors need further evidence that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning; practice educators are appropriately prepared and trained; and practice educators have the information they need to be prepared for practice-based learning, so they understand their roles and what is expected and required for practice-based learning to be safe and effective.

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

- there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning;
- practice educators are appropriately prepared and trained; and
- practice educators have the information they need to be prepared for practice-based learning, so they understand their roles and what is expected and required for practice-based learning to be safe and effective.

## 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 27 January 2021 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) Medical Imaging (Diagnostic Radiography), Full time
Date submission received	16 December 2020
Case reference	CAS-16837-Q8Y8R7

### 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
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Medical Imaging (Diagnostic Radiography)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	95
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04812

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 increased their cohort size from 74 to 95 for their 2020 intake, following the 2020 government review of A-level results, which has resulted in a larger number of applicants meeting the entry requirements onto the programme. The education provider is also amending their practice-based learning model which results in an overall loss of 21.5 hours.

**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 27 January 2021 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 Gloucestershire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	20 November 2020
Case reference	CAS-16799-T4P2K3

### 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:

Timothy Hayes	Paramedic
Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04795

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 their requirements around required hours in practice-based learning (the HCPC does not stipulate requirements but the education provider had previously structured practice-based learning assessment around hours requirements.)

### 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 27 January 2021 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	King's College London
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPSy), Full time
Date submission received	27 November 2020
Case reference	CAS-16805-P1P6P6

### 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:

Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Dawn Blenkin	Occupational therapist
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 September 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 29
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04796

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 their intake size from 20 to 29 for the 2020-2023 cohort as a result of an increase in Health Education England (HEE) commissioned places for their Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPSy) programme. Although the education provider is not certain whether the increase will be sustained for future intakes, this is an increase of almost 50% to the existing cohort at least, over the next three years.

**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 27 January 2021 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	Nottingham Trent University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Work based learning
Date submission received	05 October 2020
Case reference	CAS-16269-B7S6V3

### 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:

David Comber	Paramedic
Matthew Catterall	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04760

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.

From March 2021, the education provider intends to deliver this programme across two sites. This includes their existing campus in Clifton, whilst the second location will be in Mansfield. The current cohort of up to 40 learners will remain the same, however learners will have the option to enrol at either of the campuses. The campus in Mansfield will part of a new partnership with West Nottinghamshire College, is due for completion by December 2020. This new campus will include a clinical skills building to provide the necessary resources and facilities for this programme

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Major change notification form	Yes	
Completed major change standards mapping	No	The education provider submitted evidence only with reference to certain standards. With request for additional information under section 4, the education provider has been requested again to submit a mapping document.

**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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the recruitment process will remain the same for this programme with a high expected probability that those residing in North Nottinghamshire, including North and Central Lincolnshire, are likely to apply for this programme to study at the Mansfield campus. Visitors noted a generic criminal conviction checks policy on the education

provider's website, but could not determine whether this policy will apply to employees wishing to study in Mansfield or whether this will be carried out by their employers. Based on this, the visitors could not determine they were not clear how, and at what stage of the admissions process, this information would be communicated to applicants. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate the process in place to determine the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks of applicants wishing to enrol at Mansfield campus.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate the process in place to determine the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks of applicants wishing to enrol at the Mansfield campus.

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated that the programme at West Nottinghamshire College in Mansfield will be delivered in partnership with local ambulance trusts. However, there was no supporting evidence provided of how the programme will be supported by either West Nottinghamshire College or the local ambulance trusts in Mansfield. Without seeing any information regarding the partnership agreements, the visitors could not make a judgement if the programme will be sustainable and fit for purpose in Mansfield. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what partnership agreements and commitments are in place to deliver the programme in Mansfield, that will ensure the programme will be sustainable and fit for purpose

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate what partnership agreements and commitments are in place to deliver the programme in Mansfield, that will ensure the programme will be sustainable and fit for purpose

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

**Reason:** Without a SETs mapping document, there was also no evidence or information provided to suggest what monitoring and evaluation systems will be in place, considering the new proposals to deliver the programme across two campuses. The visitors understand there will be existing processes in place for programme being delivered currently at the Clifton campus, but it was not clear if same would apply at Mansfield campus. This is because as per the major change form submitted, it was indicated that West Nottinghamshire College's commitment is to only provide onsite facilities to learners. Therefore, the visitors could not see any information regarding how the education provider will monitor and evaluate the programme's quality and effectiveness at the Mansfield campus. As per the requirement for this standard, it is expected that education providers will have processes to critically review current arrangements and respond to any identified risks, challenges and changes. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure there are processes in place to review and monitor the programme delivery at the Mansfield campus

**Suggested evidence:** Information demonstrating what processes are in place to regularly evaluate and monitor effective monitoring of programme across both the campuses, in particular for the Mansfield campus.

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

**Reason:** From reviewing the evidence submitted, the visitors could not see any information suggesting what collaboration has taken place with West Nottinghamshire College and partner practice education partners to discuss the new proposals from March 2021. Without seeing any further information such as details of any meetings or minutes of meetings, the visitors could not determine what discussion and agreements have taken place between the different stakeholders. Additionally, the visitors also could not determine what arrangements are in place going forward to ensure regular collaboration between all stakeholders. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if there was and will be regular and effective collaboration between all stakeholders. The education provider must therefore demonstrate what collaboration has taken place to discuss the new proposals, and how regular collaboration will take place going forward.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate what communication has taken place between all stakeholders to confirm the new arrangements from March 2021, including information on how regular collaboration will take place in future.

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

**Reason:** As noted above under SET 3.5, the visitors could not see any information suggesting any communication regarding discussions and arrangements for the new proposal to accommodate learners across both campuses from March 2021. Additionally, it was not possible to determine if considerations have been made by all stakeholders jointly to determine capacity and availability of practice-based learning to accommodate all learners across both campuses. Based on this, 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. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if this standard is met as it was not clear whether all learners across both campuses on the programme 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 have learners split between 40 per cohort across both the campuses.

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

### **3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** Without any information provided, the visitors were not sure if learners, service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme at Mansfield. As it is not clear what the new arrangements will be at the new campus, the visitors were not sure if learners, service users and carers will be involved in the programme the same way as they are currently at the Clifton campus. As their involvement is a key requirement of our approved programmes, the education provider must demonstrate how the involvement and monitoring will take place. From this, the visitors will be able to determine how their contribution will add to the overall effectiveness of the programme at the Mansfield campus.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate how learners, service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme at the Mansfield

campus. The information or evidence must also suggest how their involvement will contribute to the overall effectiveness of the programme.

### **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 reviewing the evidence submitted, the visitors noted the Mansfield campus building design plans include a procurement list of items to be purchased. However, visitors could not see any information suggesting what arrangements will be in place to provide academic and pastoral support for learners at the Mansfield campus. The visitors were not clear if services such as physical and mental wellbeing will be available to learners at the Mansfield campus, to ensure commitment to supporting and helping learners achieve and successfully complete the programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what arrangements will be in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners at the Mansfield campus.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate what arrangements will be in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners at the Mansfield campus.

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

**Reason:** There was no information or evidence provided suggesting the process for receiving and responding to learner complaints once the new arrangements come into effect from March 2021. As the Mansfield campus is part of West Nottinghamshire College, the visitors could not determine where or how learners can make a complaint regarding any aspect of the programme. As such, the visitors were not clear what process will be in place to deal for receiving and dealing with learner complaints. As this standard applies to all parts of the programme, it was not clear what complaints process will apply for learners during practice-based learning based in a placement setting near Mansfield campus. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate the process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints, particularly for those who will be based at the Mansfield campus.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate the process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints, particularly for those who will be based at the Mansfield campus. The evidence must also cover the process for practice-based learning.

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

### **3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.**

**Reason:** Without a SETs mapping document submitted, the evidence submitted did not have any information to suggest what arrangements will be in place at the Mansfield campus to determine:

- the responsibility for protecting service users and carers who interact with learners will be taken;

- how conduct, character or health related issues will be assessed that could affect a learner's ability to meet HCPC standards. Additionally, what support mechanisms will be in place;
- how concerns about a learner could be raised by anyone involved in the programme;
- how learners will be enabled to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, while being both on campus or at practice-based learning; and
- the policy or process in place to deal with any concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

The visitors recognise that there will be existing policies for learners based at the Clifton campus. However it was not clear how will it be applicable for learners studying at the Mansfield campus who will be based in a practice-based setting local to the Mansfield campus. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what policies and support mechanisms will be in place for learners at the Mansfield campus.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate what policies will be in place at Mansfield campus to ensure:

- There is an effective process in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health
- There is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users

## 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 27 January 2021 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)	Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professions (v300) PG level 7, Part time
Date submission received	17 November 2020
Case reference	CAS-16795-F1P8J6

### 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:

Nicola Carey	Independent Prescribing
Rosemary Furner	Independent Prescribing
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professions (v300) PG level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04794

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 increase learner numbers up to 75 by having three cohorts per year (up to 25 learners per cohort), from the currently approved 10 learners per two cohorts. This in effect means, the current annual limit of 20 HCPC learners will increase up to 75 per year over three intakes from 2021, in January, May and September. Though learners are responsible for arranging their own practice-based learning on this programme, the education provider has confirmed that practice educator trainings will now be held thrice a year to accommodate the three cohorts

**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 27 January 2021 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	30 November 2020
Case reference	CAS-16790-J5R7Q9

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Timothy Hayes	Paramedic
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 120
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04790

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

Following a successful bid to partner with the North East and Yorkshire Ambulance Services, the education provider is putting some of their Ambulance Services staff through a 'secondment' onto their existing BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme, with a few changes. The education provider explained that this is not a work-based learning route as the successful candidates will join the existing programme as full-time learners. The education provider's proposal is to have one intake of 20 learners per academic cycle from each provider starting in September 2020.

As the programme is approved for up to 120 learners and there are currently 81 learners on the programme, there would be no direct impact on staffing and resources as a result of the additional learners. However, the change to bring staff from the ambulance trust is likely to affect how the programme delivers some of our standards.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

<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 27 January 2021 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 South Wales
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Part time Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Full time
Date submission received	02 November 2020
Case reference	CAS-16259-W1J6L3

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Alexander Hudson Craufurd	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
David Packwood	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04756

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist

Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04757

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

The education provider informed us that they were going to re-organise some aspects of programme delivery in response to feedback received from 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.

#### **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 indicated in their mapping document that they would be making changes to how they meet this standard. These changes were that learners would no longer have joint teaching and learning with learners on a related therapeutic programme, the Cognitive Behavioural Psychotherapy. Instead the programme would expect learners to learn with and from learners and professionals in other relevant

professions in multidisciplinary teams, during their practice-based learning. This would be recorded in their non-clinical logs. The education provider also noted that there would be a requirement for an NHS placement, which would involve multi-disciplinary working.

Students are exposed to different professional groups and multidisciplinary teams on placement, which they evidence in their non-clinical log in their practice portfolio. Additionally, they are required to undertake a placement in the NHS, which will involve multi-profession working.

However, while the visitors considered that this was an appropriate approach, they were not able to see from the documentation provided how the education provider would ensure that all learners were having access to sufficient and appropriate inter-professional education (IPE). It was unclear how this learning would be monitored and how the education provider would ensure a consistent spread of experience across all learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence relating to how the education provider ensures that all learners are getting appropriate access to opportunities for IPE, for example records of monitoring or auditing placements for appropriate IPE opportunities.

## 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 27 January 2021 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).