

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Bangor University
Name of programme(s)	Non medical / Independent prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	30 November 2020
Case reference	CAS-16810-C4P9R6

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber) Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non medical / Independent prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04798

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 intended to re-organise the programme, affecting the structure and content.

**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.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced and, where appropriate, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**

**Reason:** The visitors considered the evidence relating to staffing for the amended programme. From this evidence the following issues were not clear to the visitors:

- What total FTE was available for the programme, and whether this had increased, stayed the same or decreased following the changes;
- Whether the education provider anticipated an increase, a decrease or no change in HCPC registrant learner numbers; and
- Whether the programme team for this programme will also be delivering the pharmacist programme, and if so what additional demands on time will result.

They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Staffing plan or grid for the programmes, or documents clarifying any additional recruitment that has taken place.

## 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 16 March 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	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	Dip HE Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	22 January 2021
Case reference	CAS-16872-C6M0T7

### 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:

David Whitmore	Paramedic
David Comber	Paramedic
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Dip HE Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04827

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 are going to add two further cohorts, each with 50 learners, to their existing cohort due to employer demand. These cohorts will start in February 2021 and March 2021, in order to accommodate the learners on the DipHE programme, which will be closing due to the amendments to SET 1 (Level of qualification for entry to the Register). This is a one-off arrangement to meet current operational need.

### 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 16 March 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 Birmingham
Name of programme(s)	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing for Pharmacists/Nurses/Physiotherapists/Podiatrists, Part time
Date submission received	27 January 2021
Case reference	CAS-16886-M8T0T8

### 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 for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

James Pickard	Independent prescriber
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing for Pharmacists/Nurses/Physiotherapists/Podiatrists
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04834

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

The education provider intends on making changes to the course structure, moving from a programme of two modules to three modules. They have made changes to the assessments on the two already existing modules and increased the number of study days from three to four in the module Scientific Principles in Practice.

### 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 16 March 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 Brighton
Name of programme(s)	Independent Prescribing, Part time Independent Prescribing (1), Part time
Date submission received	10 February 2021
Case reference	CAS-16869-D1L7B0

### 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 for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
James Pickard	Independent prescriber
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent Prescribing (1)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04825

Programme name	Independent Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04844

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

The education provider informed us of a number of changes they are making to their Independent prescribing programme. These included changes to its entry requirements, learning outcomes and assessments.

### 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 16 March 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 Chester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time MSc Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	09 December 2020
Case reference	CAS-16812-J7V7H5

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Sarah Illingworth	Dietitian
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04799

Programme name	Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 August 2018

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04800

Programme name	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04802

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

The education provider has informed us they have made changes to their staffing in 2019/20, so the number of academic staff has decreased from 4.8 FTE to 3 FTE. The education provider intends to appoint an individual to undertake a placement expansion project. It is anticipated that this person will support wider teaching activity. Also, the education provider has requested an additional 1.0 FTE member of staff. The education provider confirmed by email that learner numbers on the BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics programme have increased by an additional 10 learners, taking the cohort numbers from 22 to 32. The programme leader for the BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics programme has left and has been replaced on an interim basis by the programme leader for the MSc and Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics programmes. The education provider has also made changes to who is providing personal and academic support to learners, with this workload being redistributed among academic staff.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

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

**Reason:** The education provider indicated that there has been a reduction in staff, from 4.8 WTE to 2.0 WTE. The education provider also said they were interviewing for a 1.0 WTE dietetics staff member, and had approval to recruit a further 2.0 WTE. There has been the redistribution of workload in the department to ensure appropriate staff deliver across the programme.

The visitors noted the increase in student numbers and information about learner: staff ratios with additional teaching facilitated by visiting lecturers. The education provider provided the curriculum vitae of academic staff as well as example lecture timetables to include visiting lecturers. However, the visitors were unsure from the evidence provided how much time, as well as delivering the lecture, the visiting lecturer provides within the planning for assessment and support of academic staff to fill the staffing gaps.

Therefore, the visitors were unclear whether the resources provided for the programme allow for an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively, and whether educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider should provide further information about the process to determine that they need to employ a visiting lecturer to make sure the programme is delivered effectively and the role visiting lecturers undertake. The education provider needs to provide evidence, for example curriculum vitae, of how they ensure visiting lecturers have the relevant knowledge and experience to deliver the subjects they are teaching, or that the person who is teaching has the relevant skills to research and deliver education in a specific area.

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

**Reason:** The education provider indicated there has been no change to the way the programme meets this standard. The visitors noted there has been an increase in learner numbers and were unclear from the evidence provided whether there is adequate resources to support learning in all settings to include eg IT, VLE, rooms and facilities, equipment. The visitors were unsure whether the resources to support learning are adequate to meet the needs of the increase in learner numbers. The visitors therefore need further evidence that programme resources are readily available

to learners and educators to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must provide further evidence about how they assess their systems for accessibility and effectiveness for the increased numbers of learners. The education provider needs to provide information about they have planned for the increase in learners so there is effective access to IT, support, teaching and study spaces, and library resources.

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

**Reason:** The education provider informed the visitors they had been successful with their bid for funding from Health Education England North West's Clinical Placement Expansion programme to achieve additional placements. The visitors noted there has been an increase in learner numbers. The visitors could not see from the evidence if there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning. The visitors require further information about how the education provider justifies what you consider a suitable number of staff for the number of learners and the level of support specific learners need. The visitors also require information about how they make sure that the qualifications and experience of staff are appropriate to the specific aspects of practice-based learning they are involved in, and that they are able to support learning and assessment effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide further information about how they justify what they consider a suitable number of staff for the number of learners and the level of support specific learners need. The education provider also needs to provide information about how they make sure that the qualifications and experience of staff are appropriate to the specific aspects of practice-based learning they are involved in, and that they are able to support learning and assessment effectively.

### 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 16 March 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 Chester
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing (Independent), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (Supplementary), Part time
Date submission received	28 January 2021
Case reference	CAS-16864-N4M5R8

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

David Rovardi	Independent prescriber
Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (Independent)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04820

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (Supplementary)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing

First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04821

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 enhanced and formalised the communication between practice educators and academic staff. Communications will now take place at designated minimal intervals. The admissions team contact the practice educator prior to the start of the programme and receives a welcome letter and information about university key contacts and contact details. The education provider has updated the practice educator handbook. The education provider has created a new learning resource that explains the roles of the academic staff.

The education provider has increased service users activity. Service users are involved in programme planning and assessment. During the clinical practice hours, a service user evaluation is completed and included in the Competency Assessment Tool.

The programme team has increased in number so it now comprises two ANPs, a clinical nurse specialist, a practicing pharmacist and independent prescriber, and four community public health prescribers. They have also recruited a HCPC registrant who joined their prescribing team in January 2021. They have upgraded the clinical simulation suites.

The programme learning outcomes have been reviewed and updated, and are mapped to the RPS prescribing competencies.

The education provider has reviewed and updated the assessment strategy and as such:

- the Competency Assessment Tool has been updated;
- there is now one pharmacology exam rather than two; and
- the University-based OSCE no longer assesses clinical skills, but they are now assessed in clinical practice.

There is no longer a requirement to submit an additional academic piece of written work.

The education provider are changing the cohort numbers on the programmes, to six cohorts per year, and a maximum of 40 learners per cohort.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

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

**Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 16 March 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 Cumbria
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - Isle of Wight (IoW), University of Cumbria, WBL (Work based learning) BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - London Ambulance Service (LAS), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - South Western Ambulance Service (SWAS), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAMB), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - North West Ambulance Service (NWAS), Flexible BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - East of England Ambulance Service (EEAS), Work based learning
Date submission received	04 January 2021
Case reference	CAS-16769-S4M1D8

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 October 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 41
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04782

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - Isle of Wight (IoW)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 October 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 41
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04783

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - London Ambulance Service (LAS)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 October 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04784

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - South Western Ambulance Service (SWAS)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 October 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04785

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAMB)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 February 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04786

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - North West Ambulance Service (NWS)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 October 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04787

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science - East of England Ambulance Service (EEAS)
----------------	---

Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04852

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 told us that another ambulance service – the East of England Ambulance Service – would be running the programme.

It should be noted that although each of the programmes listed above is identical, we have recorded them separately to ensure that we can deal with the education provider’s provision at an appropriate level of detail.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** With regard to the addition of the East of England Ambulance Service (EEAS), the visitors were aware that this was a new route and location for an existing programme. They understood therefore that most aspects of the programme did not need to be reviewed through this major change process. However, they considered that given that the new route would involve new clinical learning environments, to fully understand how learners would be enabled to meet the standards of proficiency they would need to see a mapping exercise for the standards of proficiency. At present it was not clear to them how the education provider would ensure that the knowledge, skills and experiences set out in the standards of proficiency are met through learning and assessment on the new route.

**Suggested evidence:** A mapping exercise to show that the learning outcomes that will be used in the programme in EEAS, to ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency, will be the same as those used in the same programme in other locations.

#### **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 16 March 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 Leicester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	16 November 2020
Case reference	CAS-16794-T4Y9S7

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Janet Lawrence	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 October 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04793

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 notified us of a one-off increase in cohort size for the 2020-21 academic year, as a result of the problems with A-levels in summer 2020 related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted by the education provider, including a narrative of their plans for developing relationships to ensure appropriate availability and capacity of practice-based learning. The visitors considered that these plans appeared to be broadly appropriate, but they were unable to determine whether the standard was met because they were not able to see evidence of ongoing and future co-operation with practice partners. This kind of evidence would give them a clear idea of what processes were in place to ensure that the necessary placements would be ready when needed.

**Suggested evidence:** Minutes of meetings or evidence of meeting outcomes, or timetable of planned placements.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the staffing evidence provided. They noted that in this submission the education provider appeared to indicate that the staff time available after the planned adaptations for this larger cohort was lower than the staffing time that the education provider indicated would be available by June 2020, before this change was submitted. Given the increase of 28 learners, they were not clear how the education provider would ensure that the staffing remained appropriate. However, they were aware that the staffing table which they saw in the documentation did not seem to mention three of the staff members whose curriculum vitae were available.

In light of this, they were unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence clarifying the availability of appropriate staff and demonstrating sufficient coverage for the extra learners.

**Suggested evidence:** An updated staffing table or updated calculations showing the available FTE following the new recruitment.

### **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:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided, which indicated that the education provider had clearly planned to develop sufficient additional placements for the additional learners. However, the visitors were not clear on the detail of the additional placements, in particular the type and level of the placements. The visitors were aware that the need for the additional practice-based learning was still some way off, but they considered that they needed to see more evidence around the detail of what the education provider was expecting to have available in terms of appropriate range of placement as required by the standard.

**Suggested evidence:** More detailed accounts of the range of additional practice-based learning settings that have been secured, and how these will enable learners to meet the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency.

## **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 16 March 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 Manchester
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD), Full time
Date submission received	25 November 2020
Case reference	CAS-16806-T0F7L7

### 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:

Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Stephen Davies	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04797

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

The education provider informed us of an increase in learner numbers for the September 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 visitors reviewed the narrative given in the mapping document, which gave assurances that the resources available would be sufficient. However, the education provider did not support this narrative with specific evidence and so it was difficult for the visitors to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence outlining what resources are available – for example, equipment lists, descriptions of teaching spaces.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the narrative given in the mapping document, which described how the education provider has been identifying extra placement capacity.

However, they noted that there was no specific evidence relating to how the education provider would ensure that there were appropriate staff available in the new practice-based learning settings, and therefore they were unable to determine that the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence outlining how the education provider will ensure sufficient staff are available in new placement settings, for example, through audit processes or meetings with practice partners.

## 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 16 March 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 Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7), Part time
Date submission received	01 December 2020
Case reference	CAS-16825-T9N3H4

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04805

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

The education provider intends to add an additional cohort from April 2021. The education provider confirmed the maximum learner numbers per cohort will remain the same as currently approved. They also confirmed that overall learner numbers of this programme is up to 40 per cohort, which includes HCPC learners (up to 14), whilst the remainder include General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) learners. This in effect means, the April cohort will have up to 40 learners, whilst the September cohort will also have up to 40 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.

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

**Section 4: Outcome from first review**

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

**Further evidence required**

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

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

**B.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced and, where appropriate, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**

**B.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**

**B.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.**

**Reason:** The education provider informed the visitors they had increased their core teaching team with two new members of staff. The education provider had suggested when initially informing the HCPC of the change that they had recruited three new members of staff. The education provider provided curriculum vitae for Richard Lowe and Sharon Evans.

The visitors were informed that lecturers and practitioners from other taught programmes are available to support specialist aspects for IP students. However, the visitors could not find any other reference to existing staff, although the DPP handbook on their website lists three staff supporting the programme, including one of the new appointees.

The visitors were also informed that there had been no change to the resources available on the programme. However, with the increase in learner cohorts, the visitors were unclear the resources were accessible and effective.

Therefore, the visitors could not be sure:

- there is an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively;
- the educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively; and
- the programme resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must provide further information to ensure the visitors:

- there is an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively, including clarity whether two or three members of staff have been recruited;
- the educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively; and
- the programme resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 16 March 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 Southampton
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol), Full time
Date submission received	28 January 2021
Case reference	CAS-16884-S2G4N2

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Stephen Davies	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04833

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 regarding their intention to increase recruitment on the programme to 24 learners per cohort, from the currently approved numbers of up to 15 learners per cohort. This is in response to more commissioning demand, to ensure the number of learners being trained were sufficient to meet the requirement for qualified clinical psychologists in the NHS.

### 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 16 March 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 East Anglia
Name of programme(s)	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad, Part time
Date submission received	05 February 2021
Case reference	CAS-16863-K3Y0B7

### 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 for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PA, PH and TRad
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 March 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04819

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

The education provider stated that they were revising the assessment and programme structure.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 16 March 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 Worcester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	01 October 2020
Case reference	CAS-16282-V7R3Z9

### 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:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04766

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2013

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04765

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 both their BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programmes from 40 to 64 from September 2020, following a successful bid to the Department for Education for an additional 22 places on each programme. The education provider explained that there are currently 42 learners on each of the programmes.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the placement allocation documents and the AHP Faculty reports as evidence for this standard. In their documentation the education provider explained that they have strong partnership with the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Allied Health Professions (AHP) Council and that they are successful in

sourcing current practice-based learning. The visitors noted the education provider described the processes they have in place to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning to all learners on the programme. However, as the education provider did not provide evidence to show they have secured sufficient practice-based learning capacity, the visitors were unable to determine the effectiveness of the processes. The visitors considered that as the increase was due to come into place in September 2020 and the AHP Faculty had been meeting prior to this time, the education provider was expected to provide a more concrete evidence in their submission. The visitors considered that the education provider has not demonstrated how they will ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all 64 learners on each programme or how they will cope with the year on year increase in demand for practice-based learning over the next three years.

The education provider also stated that they have employed two full-time practice co-ordinators since 2018. The visitors were unclear if these posts are within the existing staff numbers, or additions. In addition, they could not determine whether these two posts are purely for the Occupational Therapy (OT) and the Physiotherapy (PH) programmes, or across all the AHP programmes. The visitors therefore require clarification on the additional staff and further evidence demonstrating that the education provider's process for ensuring of how the programmes will ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning is effective.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence of the effectiveness of the processes the education provider has in place to ensure all learners on the Physiotherapy and the Occupational Therapy programmes have access to practice-based learning. Examples of this could include minutes from AHP meetings with confirmation of new practice education providers for both OT and PH programmes; letter of support from practice education providers; and summary of roles of co-ordinators.

**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.**

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

**Reason:** The education provider referenced job descriptions and person specifications, among other documents as evidence for SETs 3.9 and 3.10, although they indicated no changes had been made to SET 3.11.

The visitors noted the descriptions of staffing but were unable to determine adequacy in number and knowledge and skills. The visitors noted:

- there is only a 0.5 FTE per programme to address the increased numbers;
- the one full-time staff to be recruited is a replacement Physiotherapy post – so this is not an addition;
- the Deputy Head of School (DHoSchool) post that is referred to 'will be an AHP' and will contribute to teaching on the Physiotherapy programme. There was no indication of how many hours they would be working and as such they could not determine how

much this individual would be able to contribute to the Physiotherapy programme and still undertake the DHoSchool role; and

- a reliance on Associate Lecturing Staff to meet the teaching demands of the programmes. The visitors noted the OT document - Associate Lecturer requests for Occupational Therapy, semester 1, 2019-20 - shows there are a lot of Associate Lecturers delivering core work not just as 'specialist / guest'. The visitors considered that this level of reliance may not seem to provide stability within growing programmes, and still leaves the academic faculty to cope with all the additional demands of running the programmes. For instance, academic and pastoral care and other roles. Additionally, the visitors were unable to determine how Associate Lecturers are supported to teach and mark at the appropriate levels as there was no information provided around their continued professional and academic development.

The visitors could not determine the education provider's plan for increasing staff as learner numbers increase year on year as there was no information provided to address this. Therefore, the visitors could not determine that the programme has adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver it effectively and request that additional information be provided.

#### **Suggested evidence:**

- Plan for Associate Lecturers for the 2020/21 academic year – number, areas they are teaching and what level;
- Staff development strategy for Associate Lecturers, including education support and learning;
- Staff planning for future years – school plan for additional posts; and
- Information about the number of hours the Deputy Head of School will be working, that is their FTE.

#### **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.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the Physiotherapy placement spreadsheet and the AHP Faculty Placement Charter among other documents submitted as evidence for SET 5.5. The visitors noted the education provider indicated there had been no change to how the programme met SET 5.7. The visitors noted from their review that an increase in availability and capacity of practice-based learning would be required and thus an increase in practice educators. The visitors noted that the AHP Faculty document indicated a projection of how learners will be allocated to practice educators. For instance, the document gave an example of how "a team of five WTE clinicians would have a target of between three and eight learner placements per year". However, there was no evidence provided to demonstrate that this is possible, particularly as the increase in learner numbers has already been effected.

In addition, the visitors noted the mapping document stated for SET 5.5 "The OTPT Therapy Placement Team and Herefordshire & Worcestershire AHP Faculty are collaborating to develop workshops and practice educator training opportunities..." However, there was no evidence provided to support this statement. As the visitors did

not see evidence to ascertain that there will be a suitable number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff and that the new staff would be appropriately prepared to support learning and assess learners effectively, they could not determine that these standards are met. They therefore request the education provider submit further evidence to demonstrate SETs 5.5 and 5.7 are met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for instance evidence of staff involved in practice-based learning for the academic year 2020 / 21. Evidence of workshop and practice educator training timetable demonstrating that practice educators undertake regular training appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 16 March 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](#).