

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	15 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16932-X2F2Q9

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:

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04856

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

The education provider has informed us that they intend on increasing the number of learners per intake from 15 to 30. They have informed us that this will be supported both in the classroom and pastorally by the recruitment of an additional 1.0 FTE lecturer.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 27 April 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 Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time BSc (Hons) Dietetics with a Year Abroad, Full time
Date submission received	18 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16898-C8C3G0

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04839

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics with a Year Abroad
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2021

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04862

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 introduced an additional award, BSc (Hons) Dietetics with a Year Abroad to their existing, approved BSc (Hons) Dietetics programme.

The new programme is an optional opportunity given to learners to undertake a study abroad year between levels 5 and 6. This additional opportunity became available to learners in the 2020-21 academic year.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 27 April 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	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	17 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16874-R0D9P6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Jo Jackson	Physiotherapist
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 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04828

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2004

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04829

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

The education provider informed us of their intention to restructure all modules within their BSc (Hons) and MSc Physiotherapy programmes. They explained the reason for the restructuring was to update the content and focus of the programmes and move to a more blended model. The education provider also made changes to the delivery and assessment of the practice-based learning modules on the BSc (Hons) programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 27 April 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 Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Medical Imaging, Full time
Date submission received	26 January 2021
Case reference	CAS-16850-V7L2Q7

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:

Rachel Picton	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Medical Imaging
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04817

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 allowed more learners to enrol onto this programme during the September 2020 cohort, due to the government’s review of A-level results. This led to up to 75 learners, whilst the programme is currently approved for up to 60 learners per cohort. To accommodate this one off change, the education provider adjusted the placement model, duration and 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: 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.

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document that there has been a restructure within the department and there are currently six full time equivalent (FTE) staff, as part of the programme team. The evidence submitted contained a list of academic staff profiles. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors could not determine how six FTE staff is adequate to manage the additional increment of 15 learners. The visitors did not see any information to suggest what arrangements, if any, have been made to ensure there are adequate number of staff to support all learners. Therefore, the visitors could not make a judgement on this standard, as they could not determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme to support the increment in learner numbers.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. As such, they must provide information on their existing staff and confirm if any adjustments have been made to accommodate the increment in learner numbers.

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.

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

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document that expansion in placements are in place via new practice education provider partnerships, whilst existing partners agreed to accommodate some of the increment in learner numbers. Additionally, the education provider mentioned the introduction of flexible rostering that will involve learners attending practice-based learning during evenings and weekends. The visitors considered the evidence provided and noted the support learners will have via three learning support tutors, learning and academic support, along with wellbeing services. However, the visitors could not see any information showing what arrangements will be in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs, including pastoral support to learners, during evenings and weekends. The mentioned services, as part of the evidence submitted, made reference to support offered during weekday hours only. For example, the Student Wellbeing Service is open from Monday to Friday, between the hours of 8:30am to 5pm. From this, the visitors were not sure what arrangements have been considered to ensure learners will have the relevant academic and pastoral support, during evenings and weekends. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how it will ensure there are effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners during evenings and weekends.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how it will ensure there are effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners during evenings and weekends.

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

Reason: To accommodate the increment in learner numbers, the education provider stated in the mapping document that adjustments have been made to the structure and duration of practice-based learning. This included reducing the number of practice-based learning hours, introducing flexible rostering options and using some mandatory activities as part of expanded placement areas to accommodate any shortfall. From reviewing the evidence submitted, visitors could not see any details regarding the learning outcomes of the mandatory activities for the expanded placement areas. From this, the visitors could not determine which learning outcomes will be met as part of the mandatory activities, within the expanded placement areas. Based on this, it was not clear how will this help learners in achieving the standards of proficiency (SOPs). As such, the visitors could not determine how the proposed changes to the structure, duration and range of placements will support in achieving the learning outcomes and SOPs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate the learning outcomes to be achieved as part of the mandatory activities, within the expanded placement areas. Based on this, the education provider must demonstrate how this will help in the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 27 April 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 Sheffield
Name of programme(s)	MMedSci Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	18 February 2021
Case reference	CAS-16900-B0N9H5

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:

Elsbeth McCartney	Speech and language therapist
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MMedSci Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 26
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04842

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

The education provider has informed us they intend to establish an additional part time route. This programme will use the existing infrastructure of the full time programme, but learners will complete it at a slower pace and with more flexibility over three academic years. The education provider has confirmed the part time programme follows the full time programme in terms of content and overall design. The processes and procedures already approved on the full time programme, will map on to the part time programme in the same way.

The education provider aims to recruit a maximum of five learners to the part-time programme. They aim to grow the part-time programme to a maximum of ten learners over the next five years. The part time programme will have a dedicated programme lead who will work alongside the programme lead for the full time MMedSci.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the new MMedSci programme is hoping to attract learners who want to study part-time. The visitors were aware that learners could therefore study whilst potentially continuing with other activities including employment. The visitors considered that to be able to make this choice, potential applicants need to

know the pattern of study across the three years of the programme, in terms of dates, days and the hours during which attendance could be required. The visitors were unable to find this information in the documentation provided. The visitors also saw that in section 4 of appendix F, the number of weeks does not add up to the total given, and where they appear in the calendar is not stated.

The visitors therefore consider the information provided as part of the admissions process is not clear, and so does not allow for informed decision-making. The visitors need further information about the pattern of study, including consistent information about the number of weeks, across the programme so applicants have all the information that they need to make a fully informed decision about taking up a place on a programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the timetable for the three years of the part time MMedSci programme, giving calendar weeks, days within these weeks and the hours in the day during which university attendance may be required.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the new MMedSci programme is hoping to attract learners who want to study part-time. The visitors were aware that learners could therefore study whilst potentially continuing with other activities including employment. The visitors considered that to be able to make this choice, potential applicants need to know the pattern of study across the three years of the programme, in terms of dates, days and the hours during which attendance could be required, including periods in practice-based learning. The visitors were unable to find this information in the documentation presented. In section 4 of appendix F, the visitors saw the number of placement sessions given but they were not clear where they appear in the calendar.

The visitors therefore considered that learners and practice educators are not fully informed about the expectations regarding practice-based learning. The visitors need to see further evidence of the timetable for the three years of the part time MMedSci programme, showing when practice-based learning sessions are held, giving calendar weeks, days within these weeks and the hours in the day during which attendance on placement may be required.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the timetable for the three years of the part time MMedSci programme, showing when practice-based learning sessions are held, giving calendar weeks, days within these weeks and the hours in the day during which attendance on placement may be required.

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.

- not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 27 April 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	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	15 December 2020
Case reference	CAS-16831-M0N7J0

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:

Susan Lennie	Dietitian
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04806

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

The education provider has informed us that they have increased the number of learners on the programme from January 2020, from 15 to 20.

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	No
Completed major change standards mapping	No

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 noted that the education provider recruited an additional five learners and they commenced the programme in January 2020. The education provider assured the visitors that there is availability for A, B1 and B2 placements. However, the visitors received no evidence to confirm this provision. The education provider also said that, at present, there is insufficient placement availability to meet the needs of the additional five learners. The visitors considered the learners would undertake placement C in May 2021. The visitors considered that this lack of placements would affect students' progression, and for those who may be recruited in future cohorts. The visitors could therefore not be sure whether the education provider has an effective process to make sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning that meets their learning needs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the placement provision for A, B1, B2 and C placements for 20 learners in the 2020 cohort, as well as going forward. This is to ensure there is an effective process in place to make

sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 27 April 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 Surrey
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	04 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16836-H9C8D3

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
David Comber	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04811

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 significant changes to the structure of practice-based learning, and the related assessment strategy.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 27 April 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 the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	17 December 2020
Case reference	CAS-16858-R4G8B1

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:

Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Dawn Blenkin	Occupational therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04818

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 choose to honour offers made and enrolled more learners on this programme during September 2020 cohort leading to a total of up to 89 learners, after the government’s review of A-level results. Whilst the programme is currently approved for up to 65 learners per cohort, the education provider is seeking approval for a maximum of up to 85 learners per cohort on a permanent basis going forward, meaning they are already over subscribed for the academic year 2020/21. The education provider has made some adjustments to accommodate this change which includes using bigger teaching rooms, having more back-to-back practical sessions, recruiting two additional full time equivalent (FTE) occupational therapy senior lecturers and three more FTE posts for business planning.

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: From reviewing the ‘OT Placement Liaison Record’ document, the visitors noted the education provider has a robust system for liaising and tracking placements with practice education providers for learners on this programme, however information was not up to date. The visitors could not find information confirming how many placements per academic year are used, in comparison with how many placements are available to the education provider. Based on this, the visitors could not determine

whether there will be sufficient practice-based learning opportunities for the increment in learner numbers who joined the September 2020 cohort.

Additionally, within the 'Placement capacity meeting notes' document, the visitors noted learners in year two have not undertaken their first year placement due to Covid-19 and contingency plans involve getting as many as possible scheduled for a catch-up placement during Summer 2021. It was also stated this meant there is a high possibility that some learners will have a placement at the end of the programme resulting in a fourth year of study. The visitors could not see any information about what plans are in place to adjust those who might miss the catch-up placement during summer 2021 cohort and how the education provider will manage the additional pressure this could potentially cause on placement capacity. This is also considering the education provider's plans to have up to 20 more learners per cohort from September 2021.

Additionally, the 'Placement capacity meeting notes' document mentioned the education provider is currently bidding for a Southwest Apprenticeship tender, potentially for a degree apprenticeship programme. It was also stated that this will have an impact upon overall placement capacity in the region and there was a need to ascertain what placement capacity limits will be. There was also mention of University of Gloucestershire going through the approval process for an Occupational Therapy programme, which meant placements within the region could potentially be utilised for this programme. The visitors did note the education provider stated use of 'wide geographic spread' including the whole of the Gloucestershire region as one of their strengths in securing adequate numbers of placements. However, it was not clear if placement mapping has been done or a more formalised plan agreed to ensure all learners will have access to practice-based learning on this programme. The visitors considered this was an important aspect so that there will be no overlap with the proposed degree apprenticeship programme or the University of Gloucestershire's programme.

Considering the above-mentioned points, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating there is an effective process in place to determine the capacity and availability of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate and clearly articulate the process for determining the capacity and availability of practice-based learning for all learners. The education provider must provide information confirming:

- the placement capacity limit available to them on this programme;
- what steps or planning has taken place to ensure existing and new cohorts with increased learners will have access to practice-based learning; and
- how will it be ensured that placement capacity will be available to all learners within the specified duration of the programme. This is considering the possible strain and pressure in the geographical area, with the introduction of degree apprenticeship and similar profession delivery by the University of Gloucestershire.

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 mapping document suggested there are no changes to this standard for this major change. As noted above under standard 3.6, the visitors could not determine

whether there is an effective process to determine the capacity and availability of practice-based learning for all learners. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether all existing and future learners will have access to an appropriate range of practice-based learning experience and settings.

In addition to this, the visitors could not gather how learners will progress during practice-based learning considering the contingency plans to have summer cohort placements whilst some will have placements towards the end of the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine how the flexibility in the duration and structure of placements will ensure continuity to support the achievement of learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs). Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate and explain how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs for occupational therapists.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must clarify whether all learners will have access to a range of practice-based learning. Additionally, the education provider must demonstrate and explain how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs.

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

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

Reason: From reviewing the evidence submitted for standard 3.6, the visitors reviewed the 'OT Placement Liaison Record 20-21' document. This document was a record of placement audits containing details of practice education partners, relevant contact details, audit progressions and dates of upcoming audits. The visitors observed there were some practice education providers whose audits were due in 2019 or 2020. Without seeing any further information or updates, it was not clear if this was an up-to-date audit document or whether some of the practice education providers have ceased taking learners since 2019 and 2020. Though it was clear that the placement coordinator is responsible for overseeing placement allocations at the start of each academic year, it was not clear how it is ensured placement audit records are updated regularly. Based on this, the visitors could not be sure if there was an effective system in place for regularly approving and monitoring practice-based learning. As such, visitors could also not determine how the education provider ensures assessment and monitoring of practice environment so that it is safe and supportive for learners. Therefore, the education provider must provide clarity and demonstrate how it ensures placement audit records are regularly updated. From this, the visitors will be able to determine whether there is a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality and environment safety of practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how it maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality and environmental safety of practice-based learning.

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

Reason: From reviewing the mapping document and evidence submitted for this standard, the visitors noted there is a system of reviewing the number of practice educators and their skills by conducting a bi-annual audit. Considering the request for additional information above under standard 3.6, the visitors could not be sure whether all learners on the programme will have access to practice-based learning. There was no information provided in the evidence to suggest what arrangements or steps have been taken, to ensure whether there will be a suitable number of practice educators to accommodate the increment in learner numbers. As such, it was not possible to make a judgment if there will be enough support provided to accommodate the increment in learner numbers during practice-based learning. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate if there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate if there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, to support the increment in learner numbers.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the **27 April 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) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	02 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16234-N7W8Q8

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:

Paul Bates	Paramedic
Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 120
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04732

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 reported to us that they were reviewing, updating and re-organising the programme. In their original notification form the education provider suggested that they would be adding additional programmes – an apprenticeship and a foundation year for the current programme – but during the process they decided that they would not proceed with these during this process.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 27 April 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](#).