

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Education provider | University of Brighton |
| Name of programme(s) | Independent Prescribing, Part time |
| Date submission received | 11 August 2021 |
| Case reference | CAS-17110-F0Q2B8 |

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Janet Lawrence | Independent prescriber |
| James Pickard | Independent prescriber |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Independent Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04941 |

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 about their proposal to have two cohorts from September 2021, with up to 30 HCPC learners per cohort going forward where the two intakes will take place in September and January respectively. This will mean a combined intake of 60 learners combined per cohort which equates to 120 per year, consisting of HCPC and Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) registrants. To accommodate this change, the education provider has recruited an additional 0.5 work time equivalent (WTE) staff, as part of the programme team.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider stated in the mapping document that the programme team now comprises of three new independent prescribing staff members as part of the programme team, whilst a new 0.5 work time equivalent (WTE) staff has been recently appointed. Additionally, there was also mention that existing staff members will also contribute towards this programme. From reviewing the CVs submitted as evidence for this standard, visitors could not gather what the WTE of those staff were, which meant they could not make a reasonable assessment of adequate teaching personnel for this programme. Additionally, without knowing details regarding

the teaching hours for each of the team members for this programme and any other programmes they teach on, it was not clear how exactly some of these staff members are integrated or will contribute towards this prescribing programme. Additionally, there was mention of HEI funding for guest lecturers contributing in delivery of the programme but it was not clear how many were going to contribute towards this programme, except for two staff who were mentioned in the timetable submitted. Therefore, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on how the programme will remain sufficiently staffed to accommodate the increase in learner numbers.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate and clarify the WTE of all staff, including the independent prescribing staff and how will they all contribute towards the teaching on this programme, to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme for all learners.

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

Reason: There was no evidence submitted for this standard, as per the mapping document. As such, visitors could not gather what considerations or arrangements with regards to physical resources have been made, to ensure there will be adequate support to accommodate increment in learner numbers. The visitors could not determine what strategy has been considered to accommodate all learners, to support their learning and teaching activities on site and during practice-based learning on the programme. Therefore, the visitors could not make a judgement on how it will be ensured that resources to support learning in all settings will be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme once learner numbers increase on this programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate what arrangements in terms of staff support and physical resources have been made to accommodate the increment in learners' numbers on site and during practice-based learning, to ensure all learners will have access to the necessary resources for effective delivery 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 **02 November 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 | Canterbury Christ Church University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time |
| Date submission received | 29 June 2021 |
| Case reference | CAS-16915-Q9L0J5 |

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 | 9 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Martin Benwell | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Shaaron Pratt | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Rabie Sultan | 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 July 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04847 |

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 via the major change form regarding their intention to introduce a degree apprenticeship route from September 2021, through the existing full time BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme. The intention is to have up to 20 learners per cohort. The proposed programme will have a blended approach to teaching with the same module learning outcomes as the existing approved BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme. However, the proposed programme will have a slightly different teaching pattern with 20 percent off the job learning along with work-based learning.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

2.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: Within the mapping document, it was stated that there will be two different pathways for applicants to apply on the proposed degree apprenticeship route. One of the routes will be for those applicants who are already in employment, whilst the second one will be for those who are not employed but will be recruited as apprentices and will

be allocated to an employer. From reviewing the '2021 Prog document', the visitors noted that the recruitment process for applicants on the proposed degree apprenticeship route will involve a collaboration between the education provider and the employer. However, there was no information provided to suggest how potential applicants who apply for either of the two pathways, will be made aware of the information regarding the programme. Additionally, visitors also could not see any information to suggest how exactly the education provider and employer will be involved as part of the recruitment process. For example: will the employers be involved in assessing the minimum criteria or interviews, or will that be done in a joint collaboration, and how will decisions be made based on this. Considering that this is a different programme from the existing BSc provision, the visitors could not determine what the admission process is for the proposed degree apprenticeship programme and how applicants will have access to the necessary information required.

Additionally, visitors noted the specific entry requirements for applicants was a bit unclear. From example within the same document on page 24 it was stated applicants must have A Levels in a related area, but there was no indication what grading of A Levels or subjects were a minimum entry requirement. As such, visitors could not determine if and how specific details regarding A Level requirements will be made clear to applicants during the admissions stage.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating:

- how potential applicants on both the pathways for the degree apprenticeship programme, will be aware of the programme and its admission process;
- collaboration between the education provider and employer as part of the admissions process; and
- clarity on A Levels requirement, as part of the entry and selection criteria and how that will be made clear to applicants during the admissions process.

2.5 The admissions process must ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.

Reason: From their review of the mapping document and '2021 Prog document', visitors noted that all apprentices are required to have health checks done prior to admissions. The education provider will ensure employers have carried out these checks. However, there was no information regarding what the health specific requirement checks will be and how those requirements will be clear to applicants. Additionally, visitors could not determine the process by which the education provider will ensure these checks have been undertaken and what happens when an apprentice does not meet these requirements. Therefore, visitors could not be sure that the admissions process for the proposed degree apprenticeship route ensures that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate what aspects of health requirement checks the apprentices are meant to undertake and how this information will be made clear to them during the admissions process. Additionally, the education provider must also explain the process of how it will check with the employers and deal with apprentices who do not meet the health check requirements.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document that there are no changes to this standard. However, visitors noted that learners on the degree apprenticeship route will be recruited differently to those on the current BSc programme. Without seeing any narrative around this within the overall submission provided, visitors could not determine what equality and diversity policies will apply in relation to applicants on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, they were also unclear on how these policies will be implemented and monitored to ensure the admissions process will be fair and impartial.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence and demonstrate the equality and diversity policies with regards to the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, the education provider must also demonstrate how they will ensure these policies are implemented and monitored fairly and impartially.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: It was noted in the mapping document that discussions held with employers suggest that existing practice placement providers will be able to send apprentices on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. It was also noted in the mapping document that there has been interest shown from practice placement providers currently not in partnership with the education provider. However, visitors could not see any evidence of the consultations that have taken place with stakeholders. Additionally without any evidence submitted regarding the consultations, visitors could not determine what steps have been undertaken to ensure the ongoing sustainability of the proposed programme and how it will fit in within the business plan. For example: what support and commitment has been offered by the senior management team and practice placement providers, including any funding arrangements to ensure support for up to 20 learners per cohort on the proposed programmes. As such, visitors could not determine whether there will be a future for the proposed programme and whether it will be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating the following areas:

- consultation with practice placement providers and other relevant stakeholders; and
- commitment from senior management team and practice placement providers to ensure there will be adequate support for up to 20 learners per cohort.

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

Reason: It was stated in the mapping document that there will be no changes to this standard for the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. Within other submission documents for this major change, visitors did note that the education provider will have meetings with apprentices to obtain feedback regularly. However, it was not clear how this feedback will be used to form part of programme monitoring and evaluation. Additionally, there was no information to suggest what processes will be used to determine the quality and effectiveness of theoretical and practice-based learning aspects of this programme. As this proposed programme pathway will differ somewhat from the existing BSc provision in terms of delivery pattern, it was not clear what system will be used to audit the quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. This arises

because some of placements on the proposed programme will involve practice placement providers that are not currently in partnership with the education provider. As such, visitors could not gather how arrangements such as quality audit checks of new practice-based learning partners, monitoring of learners in new placement settings and feedback evaluation will take place. Therefore, visitors could not make a judgement on how effective the monitoring and evaluation of systems of the proposed degree apprenticeship programme will be.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate what monitoring and evaluation systems will be in place for the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, how will these systems ensure the overall quality and effectiveness of the proposed programme on an ongoing basis.

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

Reason: It was noted in the mapping document that the education provider said there are no changes to this standard. Though the proposed programme is based on the existing BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme, the proposed programme will be delivered via a slightly different pattern where apprentices will spend more time on placements. As such, visitors were unable to identify any involvement of service users and carers in the proposed programme and how will they be supported to do so. As such, the visitors require further information regarding what aspects of the proposed degree apprenticeship programme service users and carers will be involved in. From this, they will be able to determine how appropriate service user and carer involvement is and how their contribution adds to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in the proposed degree apprenticeship programme.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: Though it was stated in the mapping document that there are no changes in this standard, visitors did note within other submission documents that learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme will be involved in giving feedback to the education provider. Visitors recognise that feedback will probably be currently collected and evaluated from the existing BSc provision, however the evidence submitted did not clarify how the feedback collected from apprentices will be evaluated. Based on this, it was not clear how that feedback will be used and will contribute to the degree apprenticeship programme in a meaningful way. Additionally, it was not clear whether apprentices will in some way be involved in the design or review of the proposed programme. As such, visitors could not determine how learners will be involved in the programme and how their contribution will add to the quality and effectiveness of the degree apprenticeship programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme will be involved in the programme and how their contribution will add to overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

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

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

Reason: It was noted in the mapping document that financial planning has been undertaken to ensure adequate staffing will be in place to support learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. Visitors also reviewed the curricula vitae (CVs) supplied as evidence for this standard. From their review of the evidence submitted, visitors could not see any information regarding details of any financial planning that has been undertaken to ensure that there will be adequate staff in place to support learners on the degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally, from reviewing the CVs it was not clear whether these are existing staff teaching on the BSc provision who will now be teaching only on the degree apprenticeship programme, or are these staff who will provide support to learners across both the BSc and degree apprenticeship programme. For example, some of the CVs stated these staff are already employed and have taught on the existing BSc provision for the last few years. However, the visitors were not clear what are the work time equivalents (WTE) of these staff and in what capacity they will be contributing to the teaching on the programme. As such, it was also not clear how many, if any, additional staff have been recruited to support up to 20 learners per cohort on the degree apprenticeship programme. Therefore, visitors could not make a judgement on whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating:

- whether the staff who have submitted CVs will be teaching on both the BSc provision and degree apprenticeship programme;
- confirm whether additional staff have been recruited or whether there are intentions to recruit further staff;
- WTE of existing staff and those yet to be recruited, including clarity on how they will contribute to teaching on the proposed programme; and
- How all the above mentioned aspects will ensure there will be adequate staff providing support to up to 20 learners per cohort.

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: Visitors were directed to review page 13 of the 'Programme Document' for this standard, however they were unable to locate any information regarding resources within this document. Additionally, it was stated in the mapping document that financial planning has been undertaken to ensure there will be adequate resources within the education provider and practice education provider sites, to support learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. As there were no details provided regarding the financial planning for the proposed degree apprenticeship programme, it was not clear what considerations or audit of the physical resources has been carried out to determine that the resources to support learning for learners joining the degree apprenticeship programme will be effective and appropriate. As such visitors were unclear whether existing resources within the academic site and practice education provider sites are sufficient, to provide an appropriate level of support for the new degree apprenticeship pathway.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how programme resources will be readily available for learners and educators to support learning and teaching activities appropriate to the degree apprenticeship programme.

4.5 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the programme.

Reason: It was stated in the mapping document that there are no changes to this standard. From reviewing pages 4 to 12 of 'Programme document', visitors noted the programme structure and delivery for the proposed degree apprenticeship programme will be slightly different from the existing BSc provision. Though visitors were able to see when theoretical and practical aspects of the programme will be delivered, they could not see any information about how theory and practice will be linked and support each other. Therefore, visitors could not determine how linking of the different parts of the programme will be relevant and meaningful to learners.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how it will ensure that integration of theory and practice will be central to the degree apprenticeship programme.

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

Reason: It was stated in the mapping document that where an employer is a pre-existing practice placement provider, there will be no change in the current practice-based learning quality assurance arrangements. However, new employers seeking to provide apprentices will undergo relevant practice-based learning checks via a placement audit. From reviewing the relevant pages of the 'Programme document' referenced as per the mapping document for this standard, visitors could not see any information regarding details of the steps that are involved as part of the placement audit checks. This meant that visitors could not see information regarding the process to approve and audit new practice education providers. As such, visitors could not make a judgement on this standard as they could not determine the process for approving and regularly monitoring the quality of practice-based learning for new practice education providers, willing to provide apprentices on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate the process for approving and regularly monitoring the quality of practice-based learning for new practice education providers, willing to provide apprentices on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme.

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: It was noted that the mapping document referred to the same referenced pages of 'Programme document', as noted for SET 5.3. However, visitors could not see any information suggesting how the education provider will ensure there will be an

adequate number of practice educators to support additional learners of up to 20 per cohort on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme.

Additionally, as noted under SET 5.3 it was not clear how the approval and auditing of new practice education providers for the degree apprenticeship will take place. Based on this and from reviewing the evidence submitted, visitors were not clear what process the education will have in place to ensure practice educators in new practice setting partnerships will have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support and develop learners on the degree apprenticeship in a safe and effective way.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how it will ensure there are adequate numbers of practice educators to support up to 20 learners, on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. Additionally what process will the education provider have in place to ensure practice educators within new partnerships with practice placement providers, will have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Cumbria |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (top-up), Full time BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (top-up, degree apprenticeship), Work based learning |
| Date submission received | 12 August 2021 |
| Case reference | CAS-17100-K8V6Z7 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Rachel Picton | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Shaaron Pratt | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Niall Gooch | 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 January 1992 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 70 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04934 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (top-up) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 February 2022 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04935 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (top-up, degree apprenticeship) |
| Mode of study | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 February 2022 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04936 |

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 notified us that they intend to start two new one year top-up programmes, one a degree apprenticeship and the other a standard taught programme. These programmes will be closely based on the third year of the existing BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography. In the case of the apprenticeship, an End Point Assessment (EPA) will be added to adapt to the format.

The programmes are intended to provide a shortened route to registration for individuals working as assistant practitioners.

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.

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

Reason: There was a reference in the mapping document submitted with the documentation to an audit document. However, this audit was not supplied with the submission and so the visitors could not make a decision about its appropriateness, or whether it evidenced the regular and effective monitoring of the programme. They therefore could not determine whether this standard was met.

Suggested evidence: The audit document mentioned in the mapping document under SETs 3 and 5.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted from their review of the submission that the education provider was expecting to increase overall learner numbers in their provision by up to 100%. They considered that this might require an increase in programme resources, teaching spaces and staffing. The visitors could not see where in the evidence submitted the possible additional staffing and resourcing requirements were considered and reflected upon, and they were therefore unable to determine whether these standards were met.

Suggested evidence: Recruitment planning or planning for additional resourcing and teaching space.

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 02 November 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 Hull |
| Name of programme(s) | Allied Health Professional Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, Part time Allied Health Professional Independent and Supplementary Prescribing Level 7, Part time |
| Date submission received | 14 September 2021 |
| Case reference | CAS-17122-V1K0L4 |

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 |
| Fiona McCullough | Dietitian |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Allied Health Professional Independent and Supplementary Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04950 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Allied Health Professional Independent and Supplementary Prescribing Level 7 |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 August 2018 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04951 |

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 moving to a blended approach of delivering the programme, following adaptations to its delivery and assessment during Covid -19, which saw elements of the programme delivered and assessed online. This means some sessions and assessments will continue to be undertaken online.

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Portsmouth |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Medical Imaging, Full time |
| Date submission received | 27 September 2021 |
| Case reference | CAS-17145-Y8C7W9 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Martin Benwell | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Stephen Boynes | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Medical Imaging |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04957 |

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 introducing a new module, Core Radiographic Anatomy, Physiology and Pathology to replace the Science Information Practice module on their BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Medical Imaging programme. They also informed us that the number of learners on the programme would be 65 for the 2021/22 cohort. This follows a one-off increase from 60 to 70 learners that was approved for the 2020/21 cohort via a major change process. The education provider is also reverting from 30 to 37.5 hours per week for placement and are removing complementary activities that were previously introduced. The initial reduction from 37.5 to 30 hours was also a one-off change that we assessed and approved via the major change process.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 November 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 (Apprenticeship), Work based learning |
| Date submission received | 22 July 2021 |
| Case reference | CAS-17062-C2R4N5 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Gail Fairey | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Shaaron Pratt | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (Apprenticeship) |
| Mode of study | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04926 |

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 the programme:

- content of the modules, including their delivery and assessment along with realigning them to incorporate more shared learning with the physiotherapy and occupational therapy degree apprenticeship programmes;
- make changes to the modules and their delivery, but the content and learning outcomes will remain the same except for one module;
- changing the programme delivery pattern by introducing a flexible weekly delivery pattern which will be two days on campus and two days on online teaching per month;
- introducing flexible placements, that will allow learners to undertake their 15 week placements anytime during the year; and
- updates made to entry and selection criteria as part of the admission process

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

2.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: Visitors were directed to review 'Doc A – Course Specification' as evidence for these two standards. From their review, visitors noted the specific entry requirements for applicants were unclear. For example, within the same document, on page 16 it was stated that applicants must have A Levels in a biology, chemistry, or physics, or equivalent subject. However, there was no indication what grade of A Levels, or what subjects were a minimum entry requirement. As such, visitors could not determine whether and how specific details regarding A Level requirements will be made clear to applicants during the admissions stage.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide clarity on A Levels requirement, as part of the entry and selection criteria and how that will be made clear to applicants during the admissions process.

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

Reason: It was stated in the mapping document, against various standards, that in the new proposed timetable, there will be flexible timetabling for the practice-based learning provision. This flexibility will allow the employer, apprentice and education provider to negotiate the best times for the apprentice to be at practice-based learning. In the proposed flexible approach, Wednesday evenings were identified as possible days for learners to attend practice-based learning. Visitors could not find any information to suggest what support services will be available to learners during these late evenings, to ensure the specific needs of learners will be responded to should they require support. For example, they were not clear what services will be available to learners if there is a need for academic, pastoral, counselling or occupational health support during evening or late hours during practice-based learning. As such, visitors could not gather whether there is a commitment to support and help learners during late evenings to achieve and successfully complete the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate what support services will be on offer for learners who will undertake practice-based learning during late evenings, and how learners will be able to access these services.

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

Reason: There was no information provided regarding this standard in the mapping document. Visitors noted from the major change submission that the proposed timetable pattern for this programme will be similar to that of the physiotherapy and occupational therapy degree apprenticeship programmes. Within the overall submission, visitors noted an example timetable submitted within 'Doc K – Example timetable' document but it was a generic one week timetable rather than for the entire semester or overall programme. As such, visitors could not gather what the new proposed timetable will look like. The education provider had also submitted a

standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document within the overall submission, but without an understanding of the timetable and new flexible delivery pattern the visitors could not establish how learners on this programme will be able to meet all of the SOPs. Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine whether and how it was feasible for all of the SOPs to be covered and learning outcomes achieved, within the new proposed timetable and flexible delivery pattern of the programme. As such, they could not make a judgement on whether learners completing the degree apprenticeship and accelerated programme will be able to meet all the SOPs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating the strategy for learners to achieve the learning outcomes of the degree apprenticeship programme, with consideration to the revised flexible programme timetabling and delivery pattern. Additionally, evidence showing how the learning outcomes will ensure learners will be able to meet the SOPs adequately.

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

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

Reason: It was stated in the mapping document that the programme's new flexible delivery model will allow the apprentices to undertake their practice-based learning, when there is sufficient placement capacity during the calendar year. From reviewing 'Doc H' submitted as evidence for these standards, visitors noted the relevant topic areas to be covered including the range of practice-based learning. As noted above under SET 4.1 without seeing the proposed timetable on how the new flexible delivery pattern will look like, visitors were not clear how the design of practice-based learning will allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes and SOPs. Additionally, there was no information provided regarding the rationale and reasoning of having a flexible practice-based learning structure.

As such, it was not clear how this decision is appropriate to the design and content of the proposed programmes and how the balance of ensuring all learners access the range of practice-based learning during their placement blocks will be managed, to support the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Suggested evidence: The education provider must articulate the rationale for the structure of flexible practice-based learning and how the timetable will ensure that learners will have access to a range of practice-based learning and be able meet the learning outcomes and SOPs.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 November 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 College Birmingham |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Apprenticeship), Work based learning |
| Date submission received | 23 September 2021 |
| Case reference | CAS-17114-T3Y6N0 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Karen Harrison | Physiotherapist |
| Carol Rowe | Physiotherapist |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04944 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Apprenticeship) |
| Mode of study | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2020 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | MC04959 |

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

The education provider is increasing the number of learners on their BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme from 30 to 60 from September 2021. They are also making changes to some practice-based learning modules taught in year one, to include a range of clinical simulation activities.

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Education provider | University of East Anglia |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 03 September 2021 |
| Case reference | CAS-17129-B3L2X5 |

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Carol Rowe | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| John Archibald | 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 60 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04954 |

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 an increase in the learner numbers on the programme, from 60 to 92 per cohort. The education provider has also told us they plan to recruit additional staff to provide the academic and pastoral support for the learners.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: 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 02 November 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](#).