

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	Graduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Postgraduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	16 June 2021
Case reference	CAS-17034-W0V2F6

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:

Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Janek Dubowski	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Graduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04913

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing]

First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04914

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 making the following changes to both these programmes:

- introducing a revised admissions policy with requirement to pre check on the practice educators' details, prior to accepting an applicant onto the programme;
- changing two 30 credit modules into one 60 credit modules;
- increasing involvement of service user and carer involvement;
- recruited three new staff to enhance the delivery of pharmacology; and
- Amendments to the assessment strategy

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 August 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	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Forensic Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible
Date submission received	24 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16148-W1F4K1

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Kevin Browne	Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist
Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Forensic Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Forensic psychologist
First intake	01 January 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 475
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04662

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

The education provider intends to revise the structure of the programme by offering candidates the option to enrol on a two, three or four year pathway. As part of the admissions process, candidates will be required to submit a Plan of Training to the Registrar team to show how they will meet the competences. This will be formulated with their co-coordinating supervisor. Learners will also be required to attend the mandatory candidate training within six months of enrolling onto the programme. In addition, there were also changes proposed for assessment of competences, through two formative portfolios followed by a summative portfolio and final viva examination.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Reason: From their review of the mapping document and referenced pages of the candidate handbook, visitors noted that learners are required to engage and attend various meetings including the mandatory induction. It was also noted on page 27 of the candidate handbook that learners will not be permitted to submit any work for assessment if they have not undertaken an induction. However, visitors could not see any information to suggest what the consequences are should learners not attend the mandatory meetings and induction. From this, it was not clear how the education

provider deals with learners who miss such mandatory parts of the programme. As such, it was not clear to visitors what systems are in place to monitor attendance of these important meetings and inductions. Therefore, visitors could not determine if this standard has been met as it was not clear what appropriate action will be taken should learners fail to attend these compulsory aspects of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate the consequences of missing mandatory aspects of the programme and how this is communicated to learners.

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: From reviewing the mapping document and evidence submitted for this standard, visitors noted that the revisions made to the qualifications meant that the assessment schedule will allow learners to work at set points, whether they are enrolled on a two, three or four year programme route. Visitors considered this is a significant change in the structure of practice-based learning, as this would mean there is a lot of variance in the experience learners will get in terms of their placement experience. For example: learners on a two year pathway will possibly progress differently compared to those on a four year programme pathway. Visitors could not see the rationale for having this flexibility and as such were unclear how all learners on different pathways will be able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) and learning outcomes with consistency. It was also not clear how this decision is appropriate to the design and content of the programme and how learners for each pathway spending different lengths of time during practice-based learning, will be supported to achieve the learning outcomes and SOPs

Suggested evidence: The education provider must articulate the rationale for the variance in structure of practice-based learning for learners on each programme pathway, and how will this ensure learners will be able meet the learning outcomes and SOPs

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

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

Reason: Considering the education provider's proposals to changes in assessment regarding the portfolios, visitors could not see any information in the mapping document or overall submission regarding how practice educators will be made aware of these changes. The visitors could see information within the submission documents with regards to supervisors and their role, but there was no information to suggest how and what training will be provided to ensure they are prepared to support and assess learners effectively. As such, it was also not clear how these changes will be communicated to practice educators, in order to be prepared for practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how and what training will be provided to supervisors regarding the new portfolio assessments. Additionally,

how will this information be provided to the practice educators in a timely manner to ensure they are prepared for practice-based learning.

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

6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From their review of the documentation submitted, visitors noted that the word limits have been reduced for this programme as part of this major change. For example: Core Role 1 (Client work) is 3500 words maximum, whilst Core Role 3 (Report writing and communication) is now 2000 words maximum. Additionally, visitors also noted there were discrepancies regarding the contents and word limit requirements for the portfolios within tables one, two and three on pages 41, 42 and 44. For example on page 41, it was stated that the requirement for the research paper is 10,000 words maximum, but page 44 stated it was 9,000 words maximum. As such, visitors could not consider the rationale for reducing the word limits and how it ensured it will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. Additionally, visitors also considered there is clarity needed on what exactly are the expectation required for learners to be able to pass the portfolio. Based on that, they will be able to determine whether assessment policies clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education must demonstrate how it ensures the changes in word limits will ensure assessments will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. Additionally, the education provider must provide clarity with consistency regarding the word limit requirements for the portfolios, within the documentation.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Exeter
Name of programme(s)	MSc Diagnostic Radiography & Imaging Degree Apprenticeship (pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	02 June 2021
Case reference	CAS-16865-R9Q0N0

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:

Jane Day	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Diagnostic Radiography & Imaging Degree Apprenticeship (Pre-Registration)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 November 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04824

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

The education provider is proposing to introduce a pre-registration two-year Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging Masters degree apprenticeship programme. The programme will sit alongside and is based upon the existing approved BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography & Imaging Degree Apprenticeship programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 August 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) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	18 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-17005-M8H9Z2

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 80
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04886

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2021

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04887

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

The education provider informed us of their intention to develop a degree apprenticeship out of their existing programme. The learning outcomes remain the same as the current approved undergraduate programme. However, the mode of delivery has been significantly amended, to suit an apprenticeship, with a 60-20-20 split between workplace training, academic activities and clinical practice.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors understood that there was a plan in place for recruitment, to ensure sufficient staff resourcing for the apprenticeship. The plan did not contain clear timescales, however, with the result that they were not clear on when the recruitment

would take place, and therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the standard is met.

Suggested evidence: A staffing recruitment plan which gives an idea of timescales and dates for the process.

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

Reason: The visitors were not clear from the evidence supplied how the various new modules and their learning outcomes were linked to the standards of proficiency (SOPs). They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that all the learners are able to meet the SOPs.

Suggested evidence: A SOPs mapping document.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that two of the documents submitted featured track changes, and so were not clear that they represented the final versions. These two documents were:

- BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Programme Specification (April 2021)
- BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy combined module specification (April 2021)

The visitors considered that if they had not seen the final versions of the documentation, then they were not making an appropriate decision about whether the standards were met, because they were potentially working with incomplete information. To ensure that their decision is appropriate, they took the view that they required clarification that these documents were the final versions, and if not would like to review the final versions.

Suggested evidence: Final versions with no track changes of the documents mentioned above.

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

Reason: The visitors were able to view a detailed timetable of the programme structure for year one, which was in Appendix 7 of the submission. However, they were not able to view a similar document for subsequent years (two and three). They were therefore unable to determine whether the learning and teaching methods used in those years were appropriate and effective.

Suggested evidence: Documentation giving details of the learning and teaching activities for years two and three 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 25 August 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	London Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition, Full time MSc Dietetics and Nutrition, Full time Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	23 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-17022-D1T8K5

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Tracy Clephan	Dietitian
Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04903

Programme name	MSc Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2011

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04904

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04905

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04906

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

The education provider intends to increase learner numbers from 20 to up to 35 learners per cohort, for each of the BSc (Hons) Dietetics and BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition programmes. Additionally, the education provider also intends to increase learner numbers from 10 to 15 per cohort, on the Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Preregistration) programme.

Other changes include changing the existing 30 credit individual modules into two 15 credit modules, across all the programmes with no changes to the learning outcomes. Additionally, there will be revisions to the content of the programmes in line with the British Dietetics Association 2020 Curriculum Framework. Other proposals include removing the three existing practice-based learning modules, to reduce repetition of similar assessments and learning outcomes.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Degree Apprenticeship, Full time
Date submission received	18 March 2021
Case reference	CAS-16951-Y7B4K1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	6

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Rebecca Khanna	Occupational therapist
Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 May 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04835

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2003

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04836

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 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04864

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

The education provider intends to introduce a degree apprenticeship programme alongside their existing approved BSc (Hons) and MSc provision. Additionally, the education provider is planning to restructure all modules and reduce the number of practice-based learning modules within their existing BSc (Hons) and MSc Occupational Therapy programmes.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: The visitors reviewed sections of the programme specification and the commitment statement amongst other documents as evidence for this standard. The visitors saw that employers are committed to providing resources for the degree apprenticeship (DA) programme. However, there was no evidence to demonstrate how the education provider would ensure there is a continued supply of applicants from the employers. In addition, the visitors noted that there was no evidence of the mitigations put in place by the education provider to manage risks or threats in extending the portfolio, to also include the DA programme. As the visitors did not see any evidence of how the number of learners from the employers would be sustained, they were not assured the programme's future is secure and therefore request further information demonstrating the education provider's plan to ensure the DA programme is sustainable.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating the degree apprenticeship programme would remain sustainable. Examples could be a memorandum of understanding from employers or their 5-year workforce plan.

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

Reason: From reviewing the documentation submitted, including the Practice Placement Report – Interim Report for the Programme Committee Meeting January 2021, the visitors noted evidence of meetings with practice education providers to discuss availability and capacity of practice-based learning. The visitors noted from the evidence provided, that there already exists pressure on practice education providers due to the impact on service provision during the Covid-19 pandemic and increased learner numbers enrolled in the BSc (Hons) cohort of 2020. The evidence also showed additional pressure on practice-based learning has resulted from increase in demand for placements in the region due to new education providers of pre-registration Occupational Therapy programmes.

Although the visitors are aware that there is an existing process in place for the existing BSc and MSc programmes, they noted that the education provider had not evidenced how they would use the existing framework to obtain a greater number of placements considering the addition of the DA learners. Given there may be risk to securing an increased number of placements as noted above, the visitors considered that the education provider would need to show evidence of the mitigations or controls they have put in place to ensure all learners have access to practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Further information on how the education provider will ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners, including the DA learners.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the evidence provided identified access to Technology Enhanced Services, Nursing, Midwifery and Health facilities and the Clinical Skills Centre. They also noted that the simulation video detailed the intention to make these facilities accessible during non-timetabled use to external organisations. In addition, the visitors noted that staff within the NHS may have access to the NHS library and information facilities. However, they were unclear about access by non-NHS employed staff. For example, how practice educators in hospices, care homes and third sector mental health charities would have access to resources and how this is explained to them. Given the information provided identified the intention of the education provider to continue to extend the scope of placements beyond the NHS, the visitors require further information on how educators and learners in these settings would access the resources they need to support learning.

In addition, the visitors noted that the degree apprenticeship would be delivered using a flexible blended learning approach including online learning materials. However, they could not determine how the education provider will assure digital equality to learners and educators. They also could not determine how the existing quality assurance mechanisms ensure technology effectiveness to appropriately deliver all the Occupational Therapy programmes as the use of technology becomes significant. The visitors noted that there are no arrangements to ensure all learners have access to the right equipment to use for their learning. The visitors understood from their documentation review that both apprentices and employers would use a document referred to as “workbook”. However, it was unclear what its role is, what module it is part of, what help is given to complete it or how it will be marked.

Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to submit additional evidence to address all these areas before they can determine whether this SET is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing how resources to support learning (as highlighted above) would be used to effectively and appropriately deliver the programme and how they will be accessible to all learners and educators.

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

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

Reason: The visitors saw in their review of the documentation submitted that there has been a reduction in placement occurrences for the existing programmes, from four to three.

Given the reduction in the number of placements, the visitors had concerns how the reduced number of placements would still allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational therapists. The visitors considered that the education provider will need to ensure their process for allocating placement to learners will ensure learners gain a range of experiences to enable them to meet the SOPs. Therefore, the education provider must submit evidence demonstrating that the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning would allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational therapists.

Taking into consideration the increased number of learners requiring placements due to the proposed BSc (Hons) Degree Apprenticeship programme, plus further pressures as identified in SET 3.6, the visitors are unclear how the education provider justifies there is enough support for the total number of learners, including any specific support some learners may need. The visitors therefore require that the education provider justify how they will ensure a suitable number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in practice-based learning to support all learners including those with specific needs.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing how the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning would support the achievement of learning outcomes and the SOPs for occupational therapists. Evidence of adequate staffing in practice-based learning.

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 25 August 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 Nottingham
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	07 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-17049-Y2N0V8

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Jo Jackson	Physiotherapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04923

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 decided to amend the learning outcomes in some of the modules, and to rename the various placements with numbers instead of written descriptions.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Flexible
Date submission received	10 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-16925-P0S5R3

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:

Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 66
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04853

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 66
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04854

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

The education provider informed us of their intention to run their BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme in Gibraltar for one intake of six learners. This is in response to the request by the Gibraltar government to deliver the programme to meet their local workforce demands for paramedics.

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.

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

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the Audit for Gibraltar Health Authority (GHA Audit) among other documents as evidence for these standards. The visitors noted that the

GHA Audit stated that a profile would be provided for all areas where learners will be placed - both ambulance and non-ambulance practice-based learning settings. However, the visitors noted that there were no complete profiles provided in the submission. As the visitors did not see evidence of the audit carried out in these placement areas in the GHA Audit or elsewhere in the documentation, they could not determine that there is a thorough and effective system in place to approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning. Similarly, without seeing the complete audit profiles, it is difficult to determine that practice-based learning would take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users. Therefore, they require that the education provider submit further evidence to demonstrate how these standards are met for the delivery of the programme in Gibraltar.

Suggested evidence: Completed profiles of the audit carried out in all practice-based learning areas where learners will be placed.

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 visitors noted the Operations Manual provided a list of staff who will be involved in the practice-based learning environment at Gibraltar. However, there was no information provided about their registration status, qualifications and or experience. The visitors noted that the documentation suggested that learners would be supported by registered professionals. However, it is unclear how the education provider determines the suitability of these professionals to support learners in practice-based learning. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence of how they would ensure the practice educators who would work directly with learners in practice-based learning have the appropriate qualification and experience and are able to support and develop learners in a safe and effective way.

Suggested evidence: Evidence confirming that the ambulance staff, including the practice educators who will be supporting learners in practice-based learning:

- are appropriately qualified and experienced; and
- that they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning, and unless other arrangements are appropriate, are on the relevant part of the Register.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6), Part time Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7) , Part time
Date submission received	16 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-17064-G9M9S3

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	Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04928

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)
----------------	---

Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04929

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

The education provider has informed us of their intention to increase the number of cohorts they run each year, from two to four from September 2021. The education provider also intends on increasing the number of learners per cohort, from 40 to 50. These changes are to the two programmes as a whole.

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 25 August 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	Queen's University of Belfast
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych), Full time
Date submission received	02 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-17043-D3Q3R2

Contents

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Stephen Davies	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 13
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04916

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

The education provider is proposing a restructure of their Doctorate in Clinical Psychology programme, although without changing its content or the learning outcomes. The restructure involves changes to module credits to ensure at least 50% of the programme was practice-based learning, changes to teaching content to align with module descriptors, amongst other changes. They are also proposing changes to both the formative and summative assessments, including the thesis. The education provider made it clear that the changes would not affect learners currently in their third year; however, learners in their first and second years would be affected by the changes.

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 25 August 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 5: 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 noted that the education provider had consulted on the changes, including the changes to the Year 3 research component, with stakeholders including the university, learners, and external examiners. However, the visitors noted that there was no evidence of the response from the external examiners on the Year 3 research

component. Considering that the external examiners are likely to be marking or co-marking the research element, the visitors considered that it would be useful to highlight this to future visitors to consider in the programme's future engagement with our processes. This would reassure visitors that the processes in place to ensure assessments are objective, fair and reliable continue to be appropriate.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	02 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-17050-T3C9L0

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

David Comber	Paramedic
David Whitmore	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04924

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

The education provider intends to make changes by having a single cohort only for an intake for up to 100 learners, from September 2021, shifting from current arrangement of up to 60 learners per cohort with two intakes. This is in line with the opening of new 'Centre for Health Innovation' at the Stafford campus, that will allow learners to access the new teaching, clinical and simulation facilities within the new centre.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	28 May 2021
Case reference	CAS-17017-S8P3Y3

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04893

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

The education provider is making changes to their MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) programme following consultations with stakeholders. The changes include a re-design of the programme to reduce duplication of topics and the enhancement of learners' experience. They have also changed one of the placements to an elective placement. The number of assessments have been reduced to one for each module and the methods of assessment are now more varied to cover more learning styles and help mimic practice.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: 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.

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

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

Reason: The education provider stated that there are no changes to how the programme meets SET 5.7. However, for SET 5.3, they referred the visitors to sections of the Course Specification, Practice Placement Educator Handbook, and the Course Handbook. From their review of these documents, the visitors saw how the education provider approves and ensures quality of mandatory practice-based learning. They also saw how the education provider ensures adequate number of staff in mandatory

practice-based learning. The visitors noted that as part of this proposed major change, there are plans to change one placement to an elective placement. However, they also noted that there was no evidence to support how this change will be managed. The visitors understood that compulsory practice placements are identified, audited, allocated and managed by the education provider. This also includes the training of practice educators. The education provider provided evidence that these stages in the mandatory practice-based learning had been carefully planned and met the relevant HCPC standards. However, for elective placements the visitors noted that there was no guidance for learners in order for them to be able to negotiate and identify suitable elective practice placements.

The visitors also noted that there was no information around the limits to choice in ensuring that a practice placement in a non-traditional or international setting provides a learning experience that is broadly similar to a mandatory practice-based learning experience. In the event of a learner opting for an international placement, the visitors could not determine how the provider will be audited and practice educators given relevant training. As such, the visitors were unable to determine that SETs 5.3 and 5.7 are met. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that there is an effective process for approving and ensuring the quality of an elective placement. In addition, the education provider must also demonstrate how they will ensure practice educators in elective placements are appropriately trained so they can support learning and assess learners effectively.

Suggested evidence:

- Evidence of the education providers processes to approve and ensure the quality of practice placed learning in elective placements.
- Evidence of the preparation and support for practice educators in elective placements.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	03 June 2021
Case reference	CAS-17030-J5X6Z7

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Rachel Picton	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 54
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04911

Programme name	MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer

Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04912

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.

For both programmes, the education provider has informed us of their intention to change the content of modules and how they are delivered and assessed. They have said there is more shared learning with physiotherapy and occupational therapy initially.

For the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme, the education provider has informed us they have made the following changes to modules:

- Improving the Imaging Service is replaced by Developing Leadership and Service Improvement Skills for the Future Ready Practitioner;
- Preparation for Practice is replaced by Professionalism for Healthcare Professionals;
- Research Audit and Data is now Dissertation Planning and Preparation for Health Professionals;
- Creative Thinking Skills has been replaced by An Introduction to Evidence-based Practice for Health Professionals;
- Introductory Physics and Legislation has been removed and the content of this module has been moved into Radiographic Practice One, which will now last a year; and
- Introduction to Pathophysiology for Health Professionals has been added to the programme.

The clinical modules, which include clinical placement assessment, will now last for a year. The education provider has informed us of the addition of a study day to years one and three to allow for students to engage with modules that take place during semester two.

For the MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) programme, the education provider has informed us they have made the following changes to modules:

- Enhancing Professionalism, Leadership & Service Improvement has been added to year one of the programme;
- Dissertation Preparation for Health Professionals has been moved to year two; and
- Contemporary Radiographic Imaging has been removed.

The clinical modules, which include clinical placement assessment, have been renamed due to them being no longer explicitly shared with the undergraduate cohorts.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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.

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

Reason: For the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme only, the visitors were made aware that there had been changes to assessments. In the module descriptor provided by the education provider, the visitors were told there were two components of module AHP1002N Professionalism for Health Professionals. From the assessment chart submitted by the education provider the visitors were unclear when both components of this module would take place. The visitors were informed component two was a 2000 word written assignment submitted in week 12. However, the visitors were unsure whether this meant week 12 of the module or week 12 of the programme. The visitors therefore not sure whether assessments are carried out at appropriate stages during the course of the programme to match a learner's expected progression. The visitors were unsure that the methods used to assess learners helps the education provider to decide whether the learning outcomes of the programme have been met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further information so the visitors can be sure that assessments are carried out at appropriate stages during the course of the programme to match a learner's expected progression.

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

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	16 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-17051-H7W2Q1

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Angela Ariu	Occupational therapist
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 July 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04925

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 responded to feedback by making certain amendments to the programme, including:

- Admissions;
- Module content and the organisation of practice-based learning;
- Learner involvement;
- The raising concerns process;
- Assessment

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 August 2021 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of the West of Scotland
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	19 July 2021
Case reference	CAS-17065-K8B6T7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04930

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

The education provider has informed us that they intend to change campus, and to make amendments to learning outcomes, assessment, teaching and learning methods, and content in some modules.

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 25 August 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](#).