

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time DipHE Operating Department Practice (South West), Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	19 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16933-F3N4Z2

### 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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Adele Nightingale	Operating department practitioner
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04857

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice (South West)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner

First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04858

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 August 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04859

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 had enrolled more applicants for September 2020 cohort, due to the impact of COVID-19 and the government's review of A Level results. This led to a total of up to 65 learners on the DipHE Operating Department Practice, and up to 70 learners on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme. The education provider made a number of changes such as recruiting three additional staff and using a blended learning approach to accommodate the increment in learner numbers. Additionally, as per the new academic regulations and examination board procedures, the mandatory requirement for 1800 clinical hours for the above mentioned programmes has been removed.

### 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.

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

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

**Reason:** There was no evidence mapped for these standards, but under SET 3.5 the education provider confirmed how collaboration takes place between them and practice education providers via regular monthly meetings. There was also mention of “superhub” meetings which have been introduced as part of COVID-19 contingency plan to maintain ongoing dialogue between the education provider and practice education partners, to discuss placement capacity and practice educators’ availability to ensure continued support for learners. From reviewing the evidence submitted, visitors noted examples of agendas which included topics such as placement capacity and logging of action matters. However, the example agendas provided did not include the content of communications that have taken place to arrange placements for the increment in learner numbers. Additionally the “superhub” meeting information provided were generic templates with no contents or summary of discussions provided. As such, visitors could not gather what commitment and level of support has been agreed by practice education providers to accommodate the increment in learner numbers. Based on this, the visitors considered there is more information needed to show what level of commitment has been made from practice education providers to ensure all learners will have access to practice-based learning. From this, they will be able to determine how the programme will continue to be sustainable.

Additionally, visitors could not see information regarding the process in place to manage the availability and capacity of practice-based learning to support the increment in learner numbers. The visitors considered there might be an impact on placement capacity across the three years of the programme, due to the increment in learner numbers. From reviewing the overall submission for this major change, there was mention of introducing “virtual clinical placement, but it was not clear what will be involved within the virtual clinical placements”. The visitors noted the mapping document stated that “placement bubble” plan would see 50 percent of learners undertaking practice-based learning with the other 50 percent supported by the “virtual placement” and clinical skills and simulation based training. However, it was not clear what process will be used to ensure there are no overlaps and that all learners have access to placements. The ‘Practice Assessment’ documents provided as evidence were assessment forms to be completed by practice educators, but did not provide information regarding what will be involved within “virtual clinical placement”. Additionally, it was not clear from the documentation whether all placements including simulation-based training, will be clinical or virtual for learners to attend across these programmes. Without having information regarding placements and how capacity will be managed, visitors could not determine how it will be ensured that future demand for placements will be met as the programme continues to year two and further on. As such, it was not possible to determine if there is an effective process in place to ensure

the availability and capacity of practice-based learning to accommodate the increment in learner numbers

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate and clarify:

- the commitment provided by practice education providers to accommodate the increment in learner numbers;
- what communications and arrangements have taken place with practice education providers;
- if placements will be virtual or clinical, or a mixture of both;
- how future demand for placements will be met, and
- the process in place to determine the capacity and availability of practice-based learning for all learners, including articulation of how this will be managed as learners progress onto years two and three.

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

**Reason:** It was stated in the major change submission that the education provider has recruited three additional staff as part of the programme team, whilst the mapping document stated that these recruitments meant that the programme teaching staff now consists of a total of ten staff members. Visitors noted the ten0 curricula vitae (CVs) submitted for this standard, however, it was not clear which three of the ten staff are newly recruited.. Additionally, the visitors could not gather what the full time equivalent (FTE) commitments were for the existing and the newly recruited staff. It was also not clear to visitors in what capacity and for what aspects of teaching the additional posts recruited will be utilised. The visitors could also not make a judgement on how the staffing numbers will be managed, to support the increment in learner numbers over the next three years. Therefore, the visitors could not make a judgement on whether there will be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

- Provide information that shows the FTE posts of current and newly recruited staff;
- clarify what capacity the additional newly recruited posts will contribute towards the programme; and
- clarify how staffing would be managed to support the increment in learner numbers over the next three years.

### **5.1 Practice-based learning must be integral to the programme.**

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

**Reason:** As noted above under SETs 3.1 and 3.6, visitors require more information regarding what placements have been secured to accommodate the increment in learner numbers and information regarding “virtual clinical placement” and whether the simulation skills delivery will be delivered virtually or within a clinical setting. From reviewing the evidence submitted, it was not clear to visitors who has been delivering the virtual clinical placements. As such, it was not possible to determine what partnership arrangements have been agreed with practice education providers, to deliver what aspects of practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors require further information regarding these aspects to determine that practice-based learning will continue to be integral to the programmes.

In addition to the above mentioned aspects, visitors noted it was stated in the mapping document under SET 5.2 “clinical skills and simulation based training will continue to support the achievement of the learning outcomes in order to meet the standards of proficiency”. From reviewing the ‘Year Planner’ document, it was clear what the proposed structure and timetabling for placements will look like as part of the “placement bubble” plan. As visitors still require more clarity regarding the “virtual clinical placement” as noted under SET 3.1 above, there was no information provided within the evidence to suggest what range of placements will be provided to learners as part of the “placement bubble” plan. Based on this, it was not clear how it will support the structure of practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not make a judgement on how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs).

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

- what placements will be available on this programme to accommodate the increment in learner numbers, including information regarding the range of placements are on offer as part of the “placement bubble” plan;
- what placement and learning opportunities the “virtual clinical placement” would entail, and who will be delivering these placements;
- clarity on whether clinical skills and simulation based training will be delivered virtually or within a clinical setting; and
- how the above mentioned aspects ensure the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and 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 06 July 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)	DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time DipHE Operating Department Practice (South West), Full time
Date submission received	06 April 2021
Case reference	CAS-16959-B2X8D7

### 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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Adele Nightingale	Operating department practitioner
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04865

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice (South West)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 January 2018

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04866

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

The education provider informed us that they were making changes to the programme based on an internal review, including changes to CPD, assessment and internal monitoring.

### 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.

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

**Reason:** From their review of the documentation, the visitors were unclear regarding the programme lead role and the arrangements, if any, for supporting it. The job description supplied appeared to still be in draft form from 2015. Additionally they were not clear what was meant by “dotted line” academic leadership, and the programme lead support document appeared to be incomplete – it did not have a date or a signature, for example.

The visitors also noted that that the curriculum vitae (CV) provided for the programme lead seemed to be out of date, so require some clarification about her qualifications, and if necessary how she is supported and what experience is available in the team to support her.

**Suggested evidence:** An updated CV for the programme lead; an updated job description for the programme leader; clarification of what “dotted line” leadership refers to and whether the lead support document is complete.

#### **6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear that the learners would understand what was required of them in the drug calculation assessment. The evidence referred to in the mapping document was not clear on the point, because it mentioned 40% a number of times, even though the drug calculations component was a pass/fail assessment. The visitors therefore require further information to clarify that it will be made clear to all learners that they must pass this assessment, rather than being able to score 40% and still proceed on in the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** A module descriptor or module handbook which lays out for learners exactly what is required in the pass/fail drug calculation module.

#### **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 06 July 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 Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Integrated Apprenticeship, Full time
Date submission received	30 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16940-B1W4T0

### 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:

Luke Ewart	Operating department practitioner
David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04860

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Integrated Apprenticeship
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04870

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

The education provider has developed a new degree apprenticeship route, which is being introduced to be delivered alongside the current approved BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme. The new degree apprenticeship programme has been developed in line with the current approved programme with the only difference being the integrated End Point Assessment to meet the requirements of a degree apprenticeship. The education provider is also proposing a decrease in the number of annual programme hours for both the existing and the new 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.

#### **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 education provider stated no changes to how the degree apprenticeship programme meets this standard as the same recruitment process would remain in place with the Trust providers. However, the visitors noted in their review that there was no information about what the implications are if a learner decides to discontinue from the programme. For example, if the discontinuation was due to failure of assessments or changes to the learner's personal life which then impacts on their ability to continue on the programme. As this information was not provided explicitly in the programme documentation, the visitors could not determine that applicants would have the relevant information they need to make a decision about the programme. The visitors therefore request further information to determine whether this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Information for potential applicants to clarify the implications of discontinuation from the programme. For example, return to a substantive role with the employer or other employment.

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

**Reason:** As evidence for this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to the staff curricular vitae (CVs). The mapping document also stated that the current programme lead will be supported by an Apprenticeship lead who will oversee the new learners and support the programme lead as learner numbers increase. The visitors noted that the CVs submitted did not identify the apprenticeship programme lead and as such, they were unable to determine how the degree apprenticeship programme would be effectively managed. Therefore, the visitors request that the education provider submit additional evidence that demonstrates effective management and clear responsibility for the degree apprenticeship programme.

**Suggested evidence:** CVs for the HPLs and paramedic science lecturers along with an identified programme lead for the degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, visitors would like confirmation of what does HPL stand for, as it was not clear from the documentation what it means.

### **3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Reason:** As evidence for this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to the staff curricular vitae (CVs). Although the mapping document stated that the current lead meets this standard and that the new apprenticeship programme lead would also meet the standard, the education provider did not provide evidence that demonstrates how the standard would be met for the degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors also noted that the CVs provided did not identify the programme lead for the degree apprenticeship. As the education provider did not demonstrate there is an appropriate and effective process of identifying a suitable person to lead the degree apprenticeship programme, and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement, nor did they identify the lead, the visitors were unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process for ensuring that the persons appointed to have overall professional responsibility for the programme are appropriate. The education provider could consider

providing evidence such as person specification, expression of interest or their recruitment and selection policy to demonstrate how recruitment to the role would be undertaken. The education provider should also identify the programme lead for the degree apprenticeship programme.

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated no changes to how the degree apprenticeship programme meets this standard. They explained that current placements will be continuing for the new apprenticeship learners. From their documentary review, the visitors noted that there was mention of “External learning opportunities”. However, it was not clear if these opportunities are external to the Operating Department or external to the employing Hospital / Trust. If external to the employing Hospital / Trust, it was not clear how this will be managed. The visitors therefore require clarification around the different providers that would be delivering practice-based learning and evidence, to demonstrate the agreement in place with the providers to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence, such as a memorandum of agreement or a reciprocal agreement between practice education providers and the education provider.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted from their review of the documentary submission that the number of staff has decreased from five to three since 2018, although they noted that staffing is supported by HPLs and paramedic lecturers. Given the increase in learner numbers with the introduction of the degree apprenticeship, the visitors were unable to determine how the same number of staff would be able to deliver both programmes effectively. They therefore require the education provider to evidence how they will ensure both programmes are adequately staffed.

**Suggested evidence:** CVs for the HPLs and paramedic science lecturers that would be delivering both programmes. The evidence submitted should also show the proportion of the staff’s time spent working on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice and the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Integrated Apprenticeship programmes.

### **4.6 The learning and teaching methods used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that section 3.3 of the programme handbook states that there is a minimum number of hours required to complete the programme, but it is unclear what the minimum number of hours is, as it was not explicitly stated in the documentation, although a breakdown of hours for each year was provided. As such, the visitors could not be certain that the learning and teaching methods used would appropriately and effectively deliver the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors also noted that the Course Information Form identified 20 academic credits to the End Point Assessment (EPA) which brings the total number of level 6 credits to 125. However, they noted that the full-time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme has a total of 120 credits. The visitors considered that there is a discrepancy in the number of academic credits on the degree apprenticeship programme and the full-time

programme. Therefore, they require the education provider to provide a rationale for this so they can determine the appropriateness of the teaching and learning methods to deliver the learning outcomes.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the rationale for the increased number of academic credits on the degree apprenticeship programme. If this was an error, the education provider should submit an amended documentation.

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

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

**Reason:** The education provider indicated no changes to how the degree apprenticeship programme meets these standards. However, in their documentation review, the visitors noted that the information provided in the Practice Learning Partners Commitment Statement was not specific to the ODP programme and HCPC but is relevant to the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC). The visitors noted that the document was signed on behalf of the practice education provider, East and North Herts NHS Trust, however, it related to nursing students and learners on NMC approved programmes. As such, the visitors were unable to determine that there is commitment specific to the Operating Department Practitioner (ODP) programmes and therefore, they could not determine whether these standards are met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence such as a reworded statement that articulates the commitment from the practice education providers relevant to ODP and the HCPC.

## 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 06 July 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	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	PG Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	15 June 2021
Case reference	CAS-17028-K1D4W3

### 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
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04922

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.

They have informed us a new programme, PG Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing, will start from September 2021. The education provider has used the existing programme as a starting point to establish the new programme. The education provider has made changes to the duration of the programme, and the assessment design.

**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 06 July 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)	MA Art Therapy, Full time MA Art Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	21 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16990-H5D4K6

### 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:

Janek Dubowski	Arts therapist - Art therapist
John Crossfield	Arts therapist - Art therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Art Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04884

Programme name	MA Art Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist

Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04885

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 completed a periodic review of the programme. As a result, the part time programme will be spread over four years, rather than three. The education provider has informed us that there will no longer be part-time versions of full-time modules. The programme learning outcomes have been amended and they will now reflect the standards of proficiency. There are also new module learning outcomes. All learners will take all eight modules. All modules will be equally weighted, and four modules will contain practice-based learning. Module titles and content will reflect contemporary practice and there is a variety of 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 06 July 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 Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship), Full time
Date submission received	01 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16916-M3N7L3

### 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.....	8

### 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:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Jane Grant	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 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04848

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist

First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04849

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

The education provider has proposed to run a degree apprenticeship programme, from September 2021. The proposal includes to have a maximum of up to 15 learners per annual cohort.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: 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:** From reviewing 'Appendix 1', the visitors noted discrepancies regarding the length of the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship). It

was stated on page one that this will be a three years programme, whilst under section 13 on page four it stated the programme will be delivered over 42 weeks. The diagram on page 61 of the same document made reference to year four of the programme. Based on this, it was not clear what is the actual duration of the proposed programme and how will this information be made clear to applicants during the admissions process. As such, the visitors could not make a judgement on whether the admissions process will give the applicant the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must clarify the length and duration of the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme and how will this information be conveyed to potential applicants, as part of the admissions process.

## **2.6 There must be an appropriate and effective process for assessing applicants' prior learning and experience.**

**Reason:** Visitors had reviewed the 'Programme specification' document, detailing the enrolment process for apprentices onto the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme. It was noted in the mapping document that an initial needs assessment will be undertaken collaboratively with the learner and employer, by university academic staff prior to enrolment on the programme. This initial needs assessment will also be used to explore any previous learning and inform accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL) to the apprenticeship programme. However, the visitors could not see any information regarding what previous learning and experience of applicants will be considered. Considering the nature of the programme, it was not clear what APEL criteria will apply for apprentices who may not have the minimum formal academic qualifications requirement. As such, the visitors could not determine what APEL process will be used and applied with regards to admission to the degree apprenticeship programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate what APEL process will be in place, with regards to admission to the degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, what APEL will apply to for apprentices who do not have the required formal academic qualifications for entry onto the degree apprenticeship programme.

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

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

**Reason:** From reviewing the evidence submitted for these standards, the visitors noted the statement in the mapping document, confirming the proposed degree apprenticeship programme was developed as part of a successful bid from the Occupational Therapy programme team with North East & Yorkshire NHS Trusts and Health Education England. From reviewing the evidence submitted, the visitors could not see any information showing what input and support has been provided by the employers. Without seeing information regarding the employers' input, the visitors could not determine whether there has been feedback or analysis about whether the proposed programme will be fit for purpose.

Additionally, visitors could not see information regarding what collaboration has taken place between the education provider and practice education providers, regarding the

proposed degree apprenticeship programme. As such, visitors could not also determine how regular collaboration will be going forward once the programme commences. Therefore, the visitors could not make a judgement on the quality and effectiveness of the collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether the programme will continue to be fit for purpose.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate what input and support has been provided by the employers, to ensure the degree apprenticeship programme will be fit for purpose. Additionally, the education provider must also confirm what collaboration has taken place with practice education providers and how regular will it be going forward.

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated in the mapping document that the placement arrangements will be overseen and managed by an experienced placement unit team. Additionally, the Occupational Therapy programme team will utilise their current experience to manage placement capacity on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. From reviewing the evidence submitted, the visitors could not find any information regarding the availability of placements for the proposed programme. Whilst it was clear the placement unit team will manage and oversee the process, there was no information to suggest what communications have taken place with practice education providers to discuss and arrange placement capacity on the degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, the visitors reviewed the email contents regarding resources and placements. The email confirmed appointment of staff, but mentioned about intention and no confirmation regarding securing placements for the degree apprenticeship programme. Based on this, the visitors could not gather whether practice placements have been secured for the first year, and how will it be ensured that future demand for placements will be met as the programme continues to year two and further on. Therefore, it was not possible to determine what process exists to ensure the capacity and availability of practice-based learning for all learners.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate the process in place to determine the capacity and availability of practice-based learning for all learners, on the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme. The education provide must clarify if any communications and arrangements have been agreed between them and practice education providers and how will it work going forward, to ensure the process is effective going forward.

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

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated in the mapping document that the curriculum, modules and learning outcomes for the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme, will remain the same as the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. Visitors reviewed 'Appendix 9' and 'Appendix 3' documents that highlighted the modules that will be taught over three years. Within 'Appendix 3' document on page one, it was stated that it is yet to be confirmed if there

are any existing modules with any revisions. From this, it was not clear whether existing modules under the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme will have some modifications made for the degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, as noted under standard 2.1 it was not clear whether the proposed degree apprenticeship programme will be delivered over three or four years. Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine whether all of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) will be covered by the learning outcomes in the programme. As such, they could not make a judgement on whether learners completing the degree apprenticeship programme will be able to meet all the SOPs. This in turn also meant that there was lack of clarity around the curriculum and modules to be taught on the degree apprenticeship programme. Therefore, the visitors could also not make a judgement on whether the programme will reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate and clarify which modules will be taught on the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme, and whether any of the modules will need to be modified. Additionally, the education provider must provide clarity regarding whether the same curriculum of the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy will apply on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. From the above mentioned points, the education provider must clarify how will it ensure that learners will be able to meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register.

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated in the mapping document that there are two modules where learners will share the module and work inter-professionally with physiotherapy learners. From reviewing the modules, it was not clear how this will work in practice if learners on the degree apprenticeship programme attend lectures only once a week. The 'Appendix 3' document had a statement underneath the list of modules on page one stating about combined modules on physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes, but it was not explicitly clear which modules this refers to. Additionally, visitors noted this statement in 'Appendix 6' document on page three: "The apprentice learners will be taught completely separately to the BSc course". From these findings, the visitors were not clear how and what approach will be taken for the inter-professional learning (IPL) on the degree apprenticeship programme. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how learners will learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate how the shared modules will ensure IPL takes place on the degree apprenticeship route, including clarity on which are the shared modules. Additionally the education provider must also clarify how learners will learn with and from other learners and professionals, on the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme.

#### **5.1 Practice-based learning must be integral to the programme.**

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

**Reason:** There was no evidence provided regarding these two standards, as per the mapping document submitted. From reviewing other submissions provided for this

major change, the visitors found limited or no information regarding placements for the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme. For example: There was no indication of where the placements will be for the proposed 15 learners per year on this programme. The 'Appendix 6' document and email content provided as evidence confirmed staff and physical resources, but there was no information confirming how additional placements will be secured and what range of placements will be on offer for this programme. As such, the visitors could not determine how practice-based learning will be an integral part of the degree apprenticeship programme

From reviewing the 'Appendix 1' document, visitors noted that on page nine in section 13.6 it was stated that placement was 1042 hours, whilst on page 65 it stated that "Total placement hours over 3 years is 1082.5". Additionally on page four of the same document under section 13.3, visitors noted this sentence: "The learner will complete the course with 1000 hours of practice which is a requirement of the HCPC". Considering these references as examples, the visitors could not gather what are the exact number of placement hours on this programme. Additionally, being a regulator HCPC does not set any specific limit on the number of hours for practice-based learning.

Without exact information on duration of practice-based learning, it was not clear how will it support the structure. As such, the visitors could not make a judgement on how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what placements will be available on this programme for 15 learners per year. Additionally, they must clarify how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate what placements will be available on this programme for 15 learners per year, including information regarding the range of placements. Additionally, they must clarify how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.**

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

**6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** It was stated in the mapping document that the assessment strategy for the proposed degree apprenticeship programme will largely remain the same as the existing BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. Additionally, there will be an end point assessment towards the end of the programme. From their review of assessment layout under 'Appendix 6' document, the visitors noted there was no information to suggest what assessments will take place during practice-based learning on the degree apprenticeship programme. As such, the visitors could not determine how the assessment strategy will ensure learners will be able to meet the learning

outcomes during practice-based learning on the programme. From this, it was not clear how learners will meet SOPs before completing the programme.

From reviewing the assessment layout, the visitors also noted there seemed to be at least two assessments for most of the modules. Additionally they also noted that six of the assessments are either individual, group or poster presentations along with practical examinations. Considering the nature of the degree apprenticeship programme, where learners are expected to attend lectures one day a week it was not clear how will this be achievable. It was difficult to determine how learners on the degree apprenticeship programme will achieve the learning outcomes with the same assessment strategy, as they will be spending less time on campus compared to learners on the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether the assessment methods used will be appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes on the degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, it was also not clear how this will ensure assessments will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

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

- what assessments will form part of practice-based learning on the proposed BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme;
- how will the assessment strategy ensure learners will be able to meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register;
- how the assessments will ensure they are providing an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement; and
- whether the assessment methods will be appropriate to and effective at measuring the learning outcomes.

## 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 06 July 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 Lincoln
Name of programme(s)	Practice Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Independent/Supplementary Prescriber Preparation Practice Certificate, Part time Independent/Supplementary Prescriber Preparation Post Graduate Certificate, Part time
Date submission received	17 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16984-Q7C8K0

### 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 .....	4
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:

David Rovardi	Independent prescriber
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04881

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

Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04882

Programme name	Independent/Supplementary Prescriber Preparation Practice Certificate
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 October 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04895

Programme name	Independent/Supplementary Prescriber Preparation Post Graduate Certificate
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 October 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04896

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

The education provider is making several changes to their existing approved level 6 and level 7 Non-medical prescribing programmes. These include renaming of the programmes as well as changes to the admissions procedure, management and resources, design and delivery, practice-based learning 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: 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.

### **C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards set out in the Competency Framework for all Prescribers, as appropriate to the prescribing mechanism(s) delivered by the programme.**

**Reason:** As evidence for this standard, the visitors reviewed the RPS Competency Framework mapping where they saw how the learning outcomes are mapped to the standards. Additionally, they reviewed other evidence for standards C5 and E1/E2, including the Individualised Consultation – Reflecting writing and the Prescribing Governance – Case Study, Assessment Briefing Templates 2021-22 amongst other documents. The visitors noted that these documents made numerous references to the learning outcomes, with a comprehensive mapping across the assessments, portfolio review and RPS framework. However, the visitors were unable to locate a clear definition of the individual learning outcomes from the evidence submitted. As none of the documents submitted provided clear definitions of the learning outcomes mapped to the standards set out in the Competency Framework, the visitors could not determine how these standards would be delivered by the learning outcomes. They therefore request further evidence to demonstrate this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence providing the description / detail of the individual learning outcomes.

## 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 06 July 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	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	01 February 2021
Case reference	CAS-16866-M8Q5K4

### 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:

Janet Lawrence	Independent prescriber Supplementary Prescriber
Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 May 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40 across the whole prescribing provision
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04822

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

	Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 April 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40 across the whole prescribing provision
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04823

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 March 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40 across the whole prescribing provision
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04840

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 March 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40 across the whole prescribing provision
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04841

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 will be increasing the learner numbers across both entitlements at level 7 from 40 to 60 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.

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.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:** From the standards mapping, the education provider informed the visitors that they had made no change to how they meet this standard. The visitors also noted the education provider's intention of increasing the number of learners per cohort from 40 to 60 learners. However, the visitors were unclear what, if any, increase in resources or increased access to resources, is in place to support the additional learners in the educational setting, rather than practice-based learning. The visitors were therefore unclear how the education provider will ensure there are sufficient resources available to all learners. The visitors require further information that there are sufficient resources available to all learners and educators.

**Additional evidence:** The education provider needs to provide further evidence that there are sufficient resources available to all learners and educators in the educational setting, rather than practice-based learning. For example, evidence of additional equipment, books, IT facilities and / or licences and any minutes from meetings where discussion about resourcing 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 06 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time
Date submission received	14 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16881-C8W6V0

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

# Section 1: Our regulatory approach

## Our standards

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

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

## How we make our decisions

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

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

## HCPC panel

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

James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04831

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 that they were making certain changes to the programme to update the content and align it more closely with the newly-approved Masters degree in podiatry.

## 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 06 July 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	Regent's University London
Validating body	The Open University
Name of programme(s)	DPsych Counselling Psychology, Full time
Date submission received	31 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16906-R6F2D6

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards 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.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

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

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	DPsych Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04843

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 changes that have been made to the programme at the governance and management level. These changes stem from an organisational restructure. We were also informed of changes made to staffing that followed the departure of certain 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.

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

**Section 4: Outcome from first review**

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

**Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** In their review of the parts of the documentation relating to staff numbers, the visitors noted that there was a discrepancy between the staffing figures given on the major change notification form (MCNF) and those given in the submission. The MCNF states there will be 4.4 full time equivalents (FTE) available. However, in the submission the visitors could see only 3.4 FTE and another document states that there is a loss of two staff members, amounting to 1.0 FTE reduction in staffing. Without some clarity around what staff time is available to the programme, the visitors were unable to

determine whether this standard was met, and require further evidence demonstrating that there is sufficient staff time available to the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Staffing plans, curriculum vitae or other planning documents showing the distribution of staff across the teaching and learning 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 06 July 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](#).

## Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors considered that the standard was now met at threshold, but noted that if the education provider did not continue to make effective use of guest speakers there would be a risk that the standard might not be met in future. They therefore suggest the education keep under review the availability and suitability of the guest lecturers on whom the programme is relying.

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics (Pre-Registration), Full time accelerated
Date submission received	06 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16960-F9N0K5

### 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
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics (Pre-Registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04867

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 making changes to some of the modules, to improve integration with their other allied health programmes. These changes were largely focused on structure and organisation rather than 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: 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 06 July 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](#).