

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Academy for Healthcare Science
Name of programme(s)	Certificate of Attainment, Full time Certificate of Equivalence, Full time
Date submission received	02 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13051-B1L3H5

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach .....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
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:

David Stirling	Clinical scientist – Cellular Science
Lydia Taiwo	Clinical scientist – Clinical Biochemistry
Susan Davey	Clinical scientist – Histocompatibility & Immunogenetics
Tim Cross	Clinical scientist – Clinical Bio-informatics
Stephen MacDonald	Clinical scientist – Haematology
Jennie Bell	Clinical scientist – Genomic Sciences
Ross Sadler	Clinical scientist – Clinical Immunology
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

We regulate clinical scientists as a single profession. However, there are a number of different disciplines with the profession. To the HCPC these are known as modalities. When we register a clinical scientists they tell us of their modality. AHCS operates two route to clinical scientist registration, a Certificate of Attainment and a Certificate of Equivalence. The curriculum changes that we reviewed through this process were relevant to one or both of the pathways.

HCPC-registered clinical science programmes are expected to define which modalities they offer. This is because some of the SOPs refer to modalities, and since the HCPC's regulatory framework requires that visitors make a judgment about whether a

programme will deliver learners who can meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs), visitors considered individual modalities.

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate of Attainment
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 260
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03603

Programme name	Certificate of Equivalence
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 500
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03604

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

The education provider informed us that they intended to make certain amendments to their curriculum and introduce new specialisms.

## 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 22 August 2019 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 Brighton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	27 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14172-F5Q1D4

### 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:

Gemma Howlett	Paramedic
Glyn Harding	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04086

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 the curriculum, assessment and practice-based learning for the programme. The programme has also increased the size of the cohort, from 50 to 60 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: 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.

#### 5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware of the equality and diversity policy for South East Coast Ambulance Service. However, the visitors were not able to see the equality and diversity policies from other placement providers. The visitors were therefore not able to see that equality and diversity policies are in place for all non-ambulance placement providers and that the policies cover all of the placement providers' activities.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the equality and diversity policies for all non-ambulance placement providers.

#### 5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware of the policy from South East Coast Ambulance Service which showed the capacity of practice-based learning. However, the visitors were not able to see information on the capacity of other placement providers and so were not sure whether there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning. The visitors require further information about placement capacity and details of staff at practice placement settings to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about placement capacity and details of staff who will be supporting learners.

## 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 remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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 Brighton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time MSc Podiatry (pre-registration), Full time accelerated BSc (Hons) Podiatry (apprenticeship), Full time
Date submission received	02 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14396-S8P0T5

### 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:

Catherine Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40 across this programme and the BSc (Hons) Podiatry (apprenticeship) programme
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04131

Programme name	MSc Podiatry (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04146

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry (apprenticeship)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40 across this programme and the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04174

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 will be changing the structure of the BSc (Hons) Podiatry and MSc (Hons) Podiatry programmes from September 2019. Additionally, the education provider has informed us that they propose to deliver an integrated Degree Apprenticeship route through the currently approved BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme. The learner numbers across both the apprenticeship route and the currently approved route will be a maximum of 40.

### 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.

### **5.2 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 documentation, the visitors understood that the learners would experience one day placements “in a specialist podiatric or other medical clinics”. From this, the visitors were not clear whether this practice-based learning opportunity formed part of the placement hours that learners are expected to complete on the programme, or whether these were further placements. As such, the visitors were not able to determine the structure of PBL and whether this standard continues to be met. Therefore, the education provider must show how the structure of practice-based learning supports the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Suggested evidence:** Information outlining the structure of the practice-based learning element of 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:** From reviewing the documentation, the visitors understood that learners on the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme spend 21.5 hours per week in practice and learners on the BSc (Hons) Degree Apprenticeship podiatry programme will spend 22.5 hours per week in practice. However, it also states in the documentation that there will be a “total of 1450 hours of scheduled teaching or practice placement within the 5 Clinical Practice modules”. This does not reflect the table provided on page 20 of the programme handbook where the total number of hours noted is 976.5. In this table, the number of hours also does not equate to the number of weeks at 21.5 hours for the standard undergraduate programme. For example, for placement 1, four weeks are noted as equalling 90 hours, which would work out at 22.5 hours per week. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors were not able to determine how much time learners would spend in the practice based learning environment. Therefore, the education provider must outline the requirements of learners for practice-based learning on both programmes, and ensure the information provided in their handbooks is accurate.

**Suggested evidence:** Documentation outlining the duration of 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 22 August 2019 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 Brighton
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational therapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	17 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14831-R2S5D7

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:

Rebecca Khanna	Occupational therapist
Natalie Matchett	Occupational therapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04308

Programme name	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04309

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 requested for their MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) programme (in addition to the existing approved Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) programme) to be approved for eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. The education provider informed the HCPC that introduction of the MSc will not change how the Pg Dip continues to run.

### 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 22 August 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	18 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14898-Y7W3Z2

### 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
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 147
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04354

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

The education provider has informed us that they have changed the delivery of interprofessional education through the programme. Additionally, practice-based learning has now been introduced into the programme for learners in the first year 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.

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	11 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14452-H2G4Y3

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 Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04149

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2000

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04150

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 offer an apprenticeship route for the existing BA (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme and BA (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. The education provider has highlighted that learners on the apprenticeship route will undertake the same modules as the currently approved programme, and will undertake learning alongside learners on the current programme. There will be variation in attendance pattern for learners on the apprenticeship route due to the nature of work-based learning. While the education provider intends to use the same programme design, there will be changes to the currently approved programme to incorporate aspects required for a degree apprenticeship.

### 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 22 August 2019 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	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) in Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) in Social Work, Work based learning MA Social Work, Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	12 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14812-F9D3W9

### 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:

Patricia Cartney	Social worker
Gary Dicken	Social worker (Approved mental health professional)
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01/06/2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04294

Programme name	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)

Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01/06/2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04295

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01/09/2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04296

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01/09/2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04298

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 programme design and delivery are being substantially amended, including changes to staffing, and a degree apprenticeship route is being introduced.

### 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 22 August 2019 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	Edge Hill University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	02 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14925-H1P8F5

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Paul Jeffrey	Operating department practitioner
Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04367

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

The education provider stated that they intend to make changes to the design and delivery of the programme, the practice-based learning, the assessment strategy and may affect aspects of the programme’s governance, management and leadership.

### 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 remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programmes	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time Doctorate in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	28 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14849-Q0P5M3

### 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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 78
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04320

Programme name	Doctorate in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04321

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 44
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04323

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 highlighted changes to their programmes as part of the periodic curriculum review. This process involves a review of the curricula and learning and teaching approaches across several programmes delivered by Glasgow Caledonian University. The education provider mentioned changes around programme design and delivery, practice-based learning and 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 programmes remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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 Greenwich
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Part time MA Social Work, Full time MA Social Work, Part time PG Dip Social Work, Full time PG Dip Social Work, Part time
Date submission received	15 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14981-C8C3K0

### Contents

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

David Childs	Social worker
Susan Bell	Social worker
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 August 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04390

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 August 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04391

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 31
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04392

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 31
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04393

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 31
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04394

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 31
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04395

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

The education provider informed us that they relocating their entire social work provision to a new campus.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Visitors' recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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
Date submission received	25 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14692-B3M2V6

### 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:

Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Lawrence Martin	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 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04258

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 stated they would like to increase their learner numbers from 35 (which is the figure our records currently show) to 80. They have stated they have adjusted their business plan, specifically around growth. They plan to facilitate this new change by investing in more staff and ensuring there is sufficient capacity on practice placements.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Outcome from first review**

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

**Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider provided documented minutes from different stakeholder meetings, a partnership agreement and a link to the online Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA) log in screen. The documents demonstrated the partnerships the education provider has in place across a different range of health professions. The majority of these documents discuss matters on the programmes but do not state the processes. In addition, the visitors were unable to access the login screen. The rationale around learner numbers increase on the programme does not allow the visitors to determine whether there is an effective process in place to accommodate the increase and ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners on the programme.

Therefore, the visitors require information on how the education provider will ensure the availability and capacity in practice-based learning for the increased learner numbers.

**Suggested evidence:** Supporting information demonstrating how the education provider ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider provided a document called Staffing for physiotherapy, which states they have 7.4 full time equivalent staff committed to physiotherapy. The document also states they are currently in the process of recruiting a full time lecturer. However, the visitors noted that the proposed staff numbers will need to accommodate an increased cohort of learners.

The visitors considered the education provider plans but are unable to identify how the number of staff remains adequate across the programme to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors require information around how the current level of staff levels are adequate for the increase in learner numbers.

**Suggested evidence:** Documentation demonstrating how the proposed level of staff supports the proposed increase of learner numbers and how the education provider ensures appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

### **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:** From the documentation, the visitors could not identify evidence relating to resourcing (including rooms, especially availability of dedicated practical rooms), staffing, placement availability, resources and budgets to support visiting placements. In the mapping document, the education provider stated there had been no changes to this standard. However, the visitors could not understand how the education provider is planning to resource the programme to accommodate the increased learner numbers. The visitors were unable to determine how the resources to support learning in all settings will be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme and accessible to all learners and educators. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on the education provider's plans around resource allocation to support the increase in learner numbers for staffing, rooms and practice-based learning.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence on resource allocation to support the increase in learner numbers for staffing, rooms, practice-based learning

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

**Reason:** In the mapping document, the education provider stated there are no changes to this standard. The visitors noted that the number of staff involved in practice-based learning need to be in line with the increased learner numbers. However, they were unable to determine the education provider's plan to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-

based learning. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence relating to staff involved in practice-based learning being adequate and appropriately qualified and experienced.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information on the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning to facilitate the increased learner numbers.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Apprenticeship, Full time
Date submission received	28 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14891-K7Z5W4

### 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:

Vicki Lawson-Brown	Social worker
Gary Dicken	Social worker (Approved mental health professional)
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 82
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04346

Programme name	BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Apprenticeship
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to
Intakes per year	
Assessment reference	MC04366

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

The education provider has informed us they intend to offer an apprenticeship route through their existing BA (Hons) Social Work programme. The changes constitute of the development of new modules to facilitate the delivery of the integrated degree apprenticeship route.

### 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 22 August 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Lincoln
Name of programme(s)	MSc Social Work, Full time PgDip Social Work (exit route), Full time
Date submission received	13 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14879-H5J7J9

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 Childs	Social worker
Lynda Kelly	Social worker
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	1/9/2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 (across both programmes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04338

Programme name	PgDip Social Work (exit route)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	1/1/2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 (across both programmes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04372

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 a new start date and the introduction of a PgDip exit route, through the existing MSc Social Work 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 22 August 2019 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 Liverpool
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	28 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-14833-K3N5B2

### 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:

Carly Elliott	Therapeutic radiographer
Angela Duxbury	Therapeutic radiographer
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04311

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

The education provider has proposed to reduce their practice-based learning from 46 to 38 weeks as part of their 5 year review.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Certificate Mental Health Practice, Part time
Date submission received	10 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14454-F6F8M4

### 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Paul Blakeman	Chiroprapist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Lynda Kelly	Social worker (Approved mental health professional)
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate Mental Health Practice
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Approved mental health professional
First intake	01 January 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04151

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 assessment which may impact the way the programme meets the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMPH) requirements.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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 South Bank University
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	05 August 2019
Case reference	CAS-14983-Y4R0R2

### 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:

James Pickard	Independent Prescribing, POM – Administration, POM - Sale / Supply (CH), Podiatric Surgery
Alaster Rutherford	Independent Prescribing
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04396

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

The education provider has proposed to make changes to this programme by redesigning the curriculum structure and 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.

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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	New College Durham
Validating body	The Open University
Name of programme(s)	BA Hons Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	30 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14915-B9D5V5

### 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:

Michael Branicki	Social worker in England
Gary Dicken	Social worker in England
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA Hons Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04362

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 have a Level 5-practice based learning for 70 days in Malta, in partnership with Malta’s Children and Families and Adult Service Sectors. The practice educator and on-site supervisor will be responsible for monitoring the practice based learning, and will be assigned by the education provider.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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 Reading
Name of programme(s)	MSc Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	27 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14926-M9Z6W8

### 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:

Clare Attrill	Speech and language therapist
Catherine Mackenzie	Speech and language therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 January 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04368

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 plans to merge and reorganise some of the modules on 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.

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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 Salford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Part time
Date submission received	05 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14935-K1J8Y8

### 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
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1999
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 53
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04371

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1999

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 34
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04377

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 wants to increase learner numbers for the full time programme only from 53 to up to a maximum of 75 per cohort.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: 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 remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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	St George's, University of London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography, Full time
Date submission received	05 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14777-R7F5Q0

### 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:

Carly Elliott	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Ismini Tsikaderi	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	1/1/1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 61
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04266

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer

Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	1/1/1999
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04267

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 highlighted changes in the modules across the programmes while introducing an integrated curriculum

### 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 22 August 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), Full time accelerated MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	17 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14840-B0D9S4

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:

Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04315

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist

First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04316

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 wants to make changes by increasing inter profession learning, via making amendments to the curriculum for both the programmes. Additionally, the education provider also wants to appoint an external examiner who will be responsible for the inter-professional and shared learning aspects of both the 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: 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 programmes remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 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 Southampton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	26 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14896-Y6S7L5

### 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:

Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Jane Grant	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 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04351

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.

Following an internal revalidation, changes were made to the structure, position and learning outcomes of some modules. There were also amendments to the timing and structure of practice-based learning, and to the programme’s 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 22 August 2019 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	Solent University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	07 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14869-H0Q2C4

### 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:

Vicki Lawson-Brown	Social worker
Sheila Skelton	Social worker
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 76
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04334

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 proposes to make amendments to the assessment methods of two modules, by changing the way it is graded. Additionally, the education provider also will be changing the way by which the final grade is decided, based on joint agreement between the practice educator and academic staff. The practice educator and academic staff will review the portfolio independently, but should a joint recommendation not materialise, a third independent academic staff will look at it.

**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 22 August 2019 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	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Degree Apprenticeship, Full time
Date submission received	26 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14474-M7G7H8

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04157

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04229

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 on adding a degree apprenticeship route through their currently approved programme. Learners who have completed a Foundation Degree in Peri-Operative Care programme will be able to come onto the degree apprenticeship programme at level 5 (year 2). These changes are likely to affect the information provided throughout the admissions process. As learners who have completed a Foundation Degree in Peri-Operative Care programme will be entering the programme at year 2, they may have different demands in terms of resources to support their learning and the teaching activities of the programme. This could also affect how learners meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for operating department practitioners, as they will be exempted from undertaking year 1 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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware the programme specification gave details of the admissions process for applicants and education provider. However, the visitors had not seen information on the education provider's website in regards to the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear how the education provider would intend to provide the information on the course website in a way that is clear, thorough and allows for informed decision making by the applicant and education provider.

**Suggested evidence:** Information for applicants contained on the education provider's website.

#### **2.4 The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.**

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware the selection process will also include a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. Although the mapping document said the check will be completed by an applicant's employer, this information was not represented in the information given to applicants. The visitors are therefore unclear about the information given to applicants to ensure an applicant is of appropriate character.

**Suggested evidence:** Information for applicants about who will be responsible to undertaking the assessment of the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated there are no changes to the way the programme will meet this standard. However, the visitors were made aware the selection process will include screening by Occupational Health. The visitors are unclear whether it will be the employer or the education provider who will be responsible for undertaking these checks.

**Suggested evidence:** Clarification about the information given to applicants about who will be responsible for undertaking any health requirements.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware there is a policy for the recognition of prior learning. The policy states in some cases there will be a charge where there is extensive scrutiny of non-standard certificated evidence. The visitors were unclear who will be responsible to pay this charge.

The visitors were also made aware learners who have completed a Foundation Degree in Perioperative Care programme will be able to come onto the degree apprenticeship programme at level 5 (year 2) and that the Recognition of Prior Learning procedure will be used to determine the applicants suitability of accessing the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Degree Apprenticeship programme at this level. The visitors noted the document mapping the modules and outcome from the Foundation Degree programme to level 4 of the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Degree Apprenticeship programme, and the practice portfolio. The visitors however were not sure how applicants are able to meet the anaesthetic components through supervision and assessment in the workplace. The visitors need more information to show how applicants can adequately meet these anaesthetic components on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Degree Apprenticeship programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about who will be responsible to pay where there is extensive scrutiny of non-standard certificated evidence, and information to show how applicants can adequately meet these anaesthetic components on the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Degree Apprenticeship programme.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware that in the placement provider meeting minutes on 21 November 2018 a number of concerns were raised by students in regards to the availability and capacity of practice-based learning, which the programme team took away as an action. The visitors were also made aware there was a further meeting planned. However, the visitors did not receive minutes from this further meeting. Therefore the visitors were unclear what the programme team have done to address the issues raised. The visitors need information to ensure all learners have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

**Suggested evidence:** The visitors need information to ensure all learners have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware the education provider had supplied details of the programme structure and assessments. The visitors were aware of the differing types of assessment throughout the three years of the programme. The visitors saw there was the assessment element of drug calculations has a zero percentage pass mark and no apparent credit weighting as part of the Fundamentals of Perioperative Practice module at level four and Intermediate Perioperative Care module at level five. However, the visitors also saw the assessment element of drug calculations had a ten credit weighting in the Specialised Perioperative Practice module at level six. The visitors were therefore unclear how this assessment element works overall in the assessment of the modules. The visitors need further evidence about the rationale for the weighting of the assessment element of drug calculations throughout the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the rationale for the weighting of the assessment element of drug calculations throughout 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 22 August 2019 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)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	25 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14893-R9B6C0

### 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:

Patricia Cartney	Social worker in England
Gary Dicken	Social worker in England
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 August 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04347

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 proposed to make amendments to two module assessments in year one and amend credit weighting from 40 to 60 in year three for the practice placements two module. Additionally, the education provider wants to remove one module from year three and have the content of that module spread across all other 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.

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	PG Dip Social Work, FTA (Full time accelerated)
Date submission received	18 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14868-W9Q8W7

### 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:

Kate Johnson	Social worker
Lynda Kelly	Social worker (Approved mental health professional)
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01/01/2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 26
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04333

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

The education provider stated that they were planning to change the location of the second delivery site 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: 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 22 August 2019 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 West London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Work based learning
Date submission received	12 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14618-Q9Q9T6

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	1 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04256

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	1 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04293

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 to their programme curriculum for their currently approved BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, full time programme. They are also considering adding a degree apprenticeship as a new route through the existing programme. The education provider is making changes to their current curriculum, learning outcomes, programme management and resources and assessments in order to incorporate the new route through their existing programme. The education provider intend for the new and existing route to be delivered in a similar way.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider referred to the Supporting evidence document. The document outlines how employers will identify and screen staff they wish to put forward. The document goes on to mention a handbook which the University will provide to the employer and prospective apprentices and contains basic information about the programme prior to the selection event. Following this, apprentices will go through the same selection process as learners for the full time programme. The information provides a brief outline of the admissions process however, the visitors noted that it does not demonstrate the information provided to potential applicants to ensure it is clear and thorough, and allows informed decision-making. Therefore the visitors require further information which demonstrates how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Information provided to applicants for the degree apprenticeship programme, so they are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

### **2.4 The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.**

**Reason:** To evidence the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider referred to the Supporting evidence document. The relevant section states that employers are required to confirm that candidates have enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) clearance and that this is confirmed in the tripartite Commitment Statement signed by the education provider, employer and apprentice. While the visitors were clear about who undertakes the DBS check, they were unclear about what happens, and who is involved, should something be declared during this process. They were also unclear about who is responsible for covering the cost of the check. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information about the process for assessing applicants suitability for the degree apprenticeship programme, including what happens if an issue is declared and who pays for the DBS check.

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

**Reason:** For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider stated on the mapping document that there were no applicable changes to this standard. The education provider therefore did not provide information on the management structure or lines of responsibility for the programme, both within the education provider nor its link to the employer. As information was not provided, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures effective management and clear responsibility for the degree apprenticeship programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of how the degree apprenticeship programme is effectively managed, including clear lines of responsibility.

### **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:** In the mapping document, the education provider noted there would be additional support for the degree apprenticeship programme and the visitors were referred to the Supporting evidence document. The relevant section of this document, focusses on the amount of practice-based learning which will be available for the full time and degree apprenticeship programmes. The visitors noted that in the context of this standard, 'resources' may include information technology or rooms and facilities and were therefore unclear about the references to practice-based learning.

In addition, the education provider did not discuss the cohort numbers for both programmes though outlined that should cohort numbers increase, they have plans in place for meeting additional resource requirements. The visitors were unclear whether these references were in the context of this standard and therefore whether, there would be any changes to the resources available to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programmes. As further information was not provided about the cohort numbers, resources to support learning in all settings or the plans if learner numbers should increase, the visitors were unable to determine whether the resources were effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and accessible to all learners and educators. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information about:

- the cohort numbers for both programmes,
- the resources that will be available to the programmes; and
- the plans should additional resources be needed.

### **3.16 There must be thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.**

**Reason:** Within the mapping document, the education provider stated there is an additional role for the employer for the degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors were referred to the Supporting evidence document which states that employers have a key role in ensuring candidates, put forward for selection, are of good character, health and conduct. No further evidence was provided to illustrate how the employer undertakes this or how this responsibility links to the process run by the education provider, both during admission and throughout the programme. From the information provided, the visitors were unclear of the processes in place to ensure the ongoing suitability of learners conduct, character and health throughout the programme. In addition, they were unsure who would be responsible for undertaking these at the various stages of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which demonstrates the thorough and effective process in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners conduct, character and health, including details of who holds responsibility throughout 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:** The education provider stated there were no changes to this standard due to the introduction of the degree apprenticeship programme. The Supporting evidence document, states that both the education provider and employer will have responsibility for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. However, the education provider has not provided any further evidence on this standard. The visitors recognise the changes to the assessment process, through the introduction of the End Point Assessment (EPA), however, they were unclear about how practice educators would be made aware of the expectations and requirements surrounding this. To ensure practice-based learning is safe and effective, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which demonstrates how information about the degree apprenticeship programme, will be provided to practice educators so they are prepared for 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 22 August 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Worcester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	20 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14927-L5Q6N9

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Paul Bates	Paramedic
Anthony Hoswell	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 120
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04369

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

The education provider has informed us they are reducing the number of hours in practice-based learning from 600 a year to 400 a year. The education provider is also updating some of the intended learning outcomes and changing the assessment strategy for module BSPS3005 and updating or removing some of the intended learning outcomes and changing the assessment strategy to module BSPS3003. The education provider has also let us know that learners will undertake an additional 50 hours of stimulated learning a year and has informed us of a change to the BSPS3005 module title.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Worcester
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	08 July 2019

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:

Vicki Lawson-Brown	Social worker in England
Beverley Blythe	Social worker in England
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04373

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 amendments to the learning outcomes and assessment strategy for Module SOWK2001 Law and Policy following feedback from learners and their External Examiner. The amendments include removing two learning outcomes and replacing the seen examination with an individual presentation.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 August 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).