

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Liverpool John Moores University, Full time BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Liverpool John Moores University, Part time
Date submission received	11 October 2017
Case reference	CAS-12156-V8L0W1

### 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

### 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:

Ian Davies	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 student cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03383

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007

Maximum student cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03384

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 was restructuring the curriculum for both programmes, particularly in regard to assessment, module weighting and closer integration of the foundation year with the rest of the 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: 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.

#### **3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.**

**Reason:** The visitors were able to review documentation relating to attendance requirements, and monitoring of those requirements. They were satisfied that the standard was met for on-campus attendance, but it was not clear to them how the

education provider ensured that learners on placement, and those supervising learners on placement, had appropriate information about attendance requirements on placement.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence relating to information given to learners and practice educators about attendance expectations during practice-based learning.

**4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Reason:** The visitors were able to review documentation relating to assessment strategy and methodology. They considered that these were appropriate, but with regard to the statement about the possibility of a year abroad for learners at the institution, they were not able to determine whether a year abroad with additional credits at Level 5 was an option for this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence clarifying whether learners on this programme will be able to take a year abroad, and if so, showing what the academic credit arrangements will be.

## 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 **18 January 2018** meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).