

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Aston University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	18 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-15082-X7M1K5

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:

Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Stephen McDonald	Biomedical scientist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 October 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04449

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

The education provider informed us of their intention to redesign the programme curriculum in line with the new programme design guidance developed by Aston University.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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	British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences
Name of programme(s)	Sport and Exercise Psychology Accreditation Route, Part time
Date submission received	12 August 2019
Case reference	CAS-15023-P0Q1H7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Gary Robinson	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
Rhonda Cohen	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Sport and Exercise Psychology Accreditation Route
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 August 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04421

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

The education provider was making changes to its admission routes, seeking to admit a wider range of learners.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors considered that the standards were met at threshold overall. However, they did wish to note a few issues which may in future affect the way in which the standards are met. The education provider might wish to consider their approach in these areas, and visitors in future HCPC processes may wish to review how they are addressed to make sure that the standards continue to be met.

The education provider may wish to consider:

- Creating a list of alternative pathways into the programme other than the “traditional route”;

- Linking to online resources which would be useful for applicants from non-traditional routes;
- Describing in detail for applicants how the review process will work;
- Incorporating an annual review of learners' conduct, character and health in order to ensure that any changes from the start of the programme are captured appropriately;
- Ensuring that there is a means of reviewing the criminal convictions of overseas applicants;
- Incorporating an "other" category in the gender and sexual orientation information sections.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Brighton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	11 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14837-S6Z5W8

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:

Anne Mackay	Social worker in England
Anne Gribbens	Social worker in England
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 April 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04314

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

The education provider is introducing a degree apprenticeship route to their existing BSc (Hons) Social Work programme. There will be no changes to admissions standards nor the course structure other than the final year assessment for the end point 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: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: Within the mapping document, the education provider stated that this was not applicable and did not submit further evidence in relation to this standard. Elsewhere within the documentation, the visitors noted that partner agencies have commissioned the programme and are happy to continue with the same entry processes and requirements as the ‘standard’ route. However, the visitors were unclear who the partner agencies were and their overall level of engagement in the development, and ongoing commitment to the sustainability, of the programme. Therefore the visitors were unable to identify information that demonstrated evidence of sustainability or how the programme was supported by all the stakeholders involved. Therefore, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the sustainability of the degree apprenticeship programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider stated that the same arrangements which are currently in place for the traditional route, will be applicable to the apprenticeship route. These will be supplemented by additional agency led apprenticeship review and monitoring meetings but the primary route will remain the same as the “relevant employers” were already active within the traditional route. The education provider also referred the visitors to their rationale for change document, where they further explained how the relationship between the programme management group and the employers will be managed. Whilst the visitors understood that the education provider had plans to ensure the programme is effectively managed by both the programme team and the employers, they were unclear of the programme management structure in place or the roles and responsibilities of both parties to ensure all have a clear understanding of their responsibilities. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the degree apprenticeship programme is effectively managed.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence that demonstrates the programme management structure in place to ensure the programme is effectively managed between the relevant parties.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider stated that they are currently recruiting one additional full time equivalent (FTE) staff member as well as 2 x 0.5 FTE ‘teaching assistants’ to support the range of learners, assist with break out group learning and 1-1 support. The visitors could see from this information that the education provider had plans in place to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme effectively. However, taking into account that the education provider wishes to start the degree apprenticeship programme in September 2019, the visitors considered it necessary to know more about the contingency plan if the education provider was not able to secure a suitable post holder within time. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, if they are unable to successfully recruit during the current campaign.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the contingency plan in place to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from reviewing the documentation, including the rationale for change document, that the education provider intended to record a lecture for the Social Policy module and provide this as a web based podcast for apprentices. The education provider had decided upon this format so that apprentices did not need to come into the university on another day, for a short period of time. The visitors could not identify whether this was the only time lectures were recorded and made available as podcasts.

The visitors understand the rationale for devising new and different ways of delivering the content of the apprenticeship programme. However, they were unclear about whether this learning and teaching method was appropriate in achieving the learning outcomes of the particular lecture / module or, if used elsewhere, the wider programme. The visitors therefore require additional documentation to demonstrate how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the learning and teaching methods used are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from reviewing the documentation, including the rationale for change document, that the education provider intends to record a lecture for the Social Policy module and provide this as a web based podcast for apprentices. The education provider had decided upon this format so that apprentices did not need to come into the university on another day, for a short period of time. The visitors could not identify whether this was the only time lectures were recorded and made available as podcasts. In addition, they were also unclear about whether attendance for any lectures delivered online will be mandatory and the processes in place to monitor such attendance, if it is. The visitors were therefore unclear about the education provider's intention regarding attendance for these modules and if, learners needed to 'attend' the lectures, how this would be monitored. The visitors therefore require further clarification on how the education provider meets this SET.

Suggested evidence: Further information which clarifies the attendance policy for online modules and, if necessary, how this attendance is monitored.

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

Reason: Within the mapping document, the education provider stated that there had been no change to this standard. From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice-based learning settings will have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. The visitors considered that the addition of the degree apprenticeship route to the existing traditional route would likely require additional practice educators. However, the education provider has not provided information that clearly outlines how they will make provision for this to ensure there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning. The visitors were therefore unclear if there will be an adequate number of practice educators available for the total number of learners, or how the education provider will ensure the practice educators are appropriately qualified and experienced. As such the visitors require further information to determine whether this SET is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which outlines how the education provider ensures there is adequate number of qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

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

Reason: Within the mapping document, the education provider stated that there had been no change to this standard. From the documentation review, the visitors were unable to find information that articulated how practice educators for the apprenticeship programme will be trained and supported appropriately for their role. The visitors recognised that there may be differences in the training provided to the practice educators on the traditional programme and those on the apprenticeship programme. They were therefore unclear about how practice educators for the apprenticeship programme were prepared so they can support and assess learners effectively. As such, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures regular training for practice educators on the apprenticeship programme is undertaken and that it is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice educators undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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) Social Work, Full time BSc (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning
Date submission received	11 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14837-S6Z5W8

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:

Anne Mackay	Social worker in England
Anne Gribbens	Social worker in England
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 April 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04314

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04503

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

The education provider is introducing a degree apprenticeship route to their existing BSc (Hons) Social Work programme. There will be no changes to admissions standards nor the course structure other than the final year assessment for the end point 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: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: Within the mapping document, the education provider stated that this was not applicable and did not submit further evidence in relation to this standard. Elsewhere within the documentation, the visitors noted that partner agencies have commissioned the programme and are happy to continue with the same entry processes and

requirements as the 'standard' route. However, the visitors were unclear who the partner agencies were and their overall level of engagement in the development, and ongoing commitment to the sustainability, of the programme. Therefore the visitors were unable to identify information that demonstrated evidence of sustainability or how the programme was supported by all the stakeholders involved. Therefore, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the sustainability of the degree apprenticeship programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider stated that the same arrangements which are currently in place for the traditional route, will be applicable to the apprenticeship route. These will be supplemented by additional agency led apprenticeship review and monitoring meetings but the primary route will remain the same as the "relevant employers" were already active within the traditional route. The education provider also referred the visitors to their rationale for change document, where they further explained how the relationship between the programme management group and the employers will be managed. Whilst the visitors understood that the education provider had plans to ensure the programme is effectively managed by both the programme team and the employers, they were unclear of the programme management structure in place or the roles and responsibilities of both parties to ensure all have a clear understanding of their responsibilities. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the degree apprenticeship programme is effectively managed.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence that demonstrates the programme management structure in place to ensure the programme is effectively managed between the relevant parties.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider stated that they are currently recruiting one additional full time equivalent (FTE) staff member as well as 2 x 0.5 FTE 'teaching assistants' to support the range of learners, assist with break out group learning and 1-1 support. The visitors could see from this information that the education provider had plans in place to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme effectively. However, taking into account that the education provider wishes to start the degree apprenticeship programme in September 2019, the visitors considered it necessary to know more about the contingency plan if the education provider was not able to secure a suitable post holder within time. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, if they are unable to successfully recruit during the current campaign.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the contingency plan in place to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from reviewing the documentation, including the rationale for change document, that the education provider intended to record a lecture for the Social Policy module and provide this as a web based podcast for apprentices. The education provider had decided upon this format so that apprentices did not need to come into the university on another day, for a short period of time. The visitors could not identify whether this was the only time lectures were recorded and made available as podcasts.

The visitors understand the rationale for devising new and different ways of delivering the content of the apprenticeship programme. However, they were unclear about whether this learning and teaching method was appropriate in achieving the learning outcomes of the particular lecture / module or, if used elsewhere, the wider programme. The visitors therefore require additional documentation to demonstrate how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the learning and teaching methods used are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from reviewing the documentation, including the rationale for change document, that the education provider intends to record a lecture for the Social Policy module and provide this as a web based podcast for apprentices. The education provider had decided upon this format so that apprentices did not need to come into the university on another day, for a short period of time. The visitors could not identify whether this was the only time lectures were recorded and made available as podcasts. In addition, they were also unclear about whether attendance for any lectures delivered online will be mandatory and the processes in place to monitor such attendance, if it is. The visitors were therefore unclear about the education provider's intention regarding attendance for these modules and if, learners needed to 'attend' the lectures, how this would be monitored. The visitors therefore require further clarification on how the education provider meets this SET.

Suggested evidence: Further information which clarifies the attendance policy for online modules and, if necessary, how this attendance is monitored.

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

Reason: Within the mapping document, the education provider stated that there had been no change to this standard. From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice-based learning settings will have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. The visitors considered that the addition of the degree apprenticeship route to the existing traditional route would likely require additional practice educators. However, the education provider has not provided information that clearly outlines how they will make provision for this to ensure there is enough support for learners to take

part in safe and effective practice-based learning. The visitors were therefore unclear if there will be an adequate number of practice educators available for the total number of learners, or how the education provider will ensure the practice educators are appropriately qualified and experienced. As such the visitors require further information to determine whether this SET is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which outlines how the education provider ensures there is adequate number of qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

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

Reason: Within the mapping document, the education provider stated that there had been no change to this standard. From the documentation review, the visitors were unable to find information that articulated how practice educators for the apprenticeship programme will be trained and supported appropriately for their role. The visitors recognised that there may be differences in the training provided to the practice educators on the traditional programme and those on the apprenticeship programme. They were therefore unclear about how practice educators for the apprenticeship programme were prepared so they can support and assess learners effectively. As such, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures regular training for practice educators on the apprenticeship programme is undertaken and that it is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice educators undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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 Chester
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning
Date submission received	09 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-15009-Y3V0K4

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
David Childs	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 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04410

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 October 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to
Intakes per year	
Assessment reference	MC04415

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

The education provider informed us that they were going to start 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 06 November 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 Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	15 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-14830-G0M2F2

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Andrew Jones	Paramedic
Anthony Hoswell	Paramedic
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	9/1/2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04307

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 the HCPC that they intend to increase learner numbers from 50 to 70 on the programme per year from September 2019. The education provider highlights that the increase is required to deliver on the workforce needs for the North West Ambulance Service (NWAS) NHS Trust.

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: From the documentation the visitors were made aware of a statement of intent on behalf of the programme’s main placement partner, NWAS. The visitors were unclear how the process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners was sufficient to support an increase in learner numbers on the programme. . Furthermore the visitors could not see evidence to demonstrate how non-ambulance placement capacity had been investigated.

Suggested evidence: Evidence as to how placement capacity is calculated and allocated to the proposed increase in student numbers across both ambulance and non-ambulance placement areas.

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

Reason: In the documentation the visitors were told the education provider will increase staffing by 1.5 whole time equivalents (WTE) to account for 158 learners across 3 stages of the programme. The education provider also indicated the team will be augmented by staff from the critical/acute care team. The visitors observed how the education provider plans to increase staff for a potential increase of 20 learners in September. However, with the proposed increase of learners up to 70, there is potential for 210 learners across the three years of the programme at once. Therefore the visitors could not see how the education provider would ensure there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an appropriate programme at this new maximum capacity of 70 learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence as to how staffing levels would relate to proposed student numbers initially and across the lifetime of the programme.

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

Reason: In the documentation the education provider has indicated that there is no change from how they have previously met this standard. The visitors were unclear how the proposed increase in student numbers would be managed with the current physical resource levels (e.g. teaching space, clinical skills equipment, etc.), with an initial student number increase of 40%. Furthermore, with the proposed increase of learners up to 70, there is potential for 210 learners across the three years of the programme at once. The visitors were not clear how resources will be managed when the programme is operating at maximum capacity across three cohorts of 70 learners. Therefore the visitors could not judge that the resources to support learning are effective and appropriate for the increase in numbers.

Suggested evidence: Evidence as to how the programmes physical resources would relate to proposed student numbers initially and across the lifetime of the programme.

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

Reason: The education provider indicated in the documentary submission that staffing would increase by 1.5 WTE's to account for 158 learners across three stages of the programme. The visitors observed how the education provider plans to increase staff for a potential increase of 20 learners in September. However, with the proposed increase of learners up to 70, there is potential for 210 learners across the three years of the programme at once. Therefore from the documentation the visitors were unclear how the proposed increase in staffing would allow effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in all settings. Particularly the availability and accessibility of pastoral and academic support for all learners when the programme is operating at maximum intake across all three years.

Suggested evidence: Evidence as to how the learner's wellbeing and learning needs are supported in all settings, both initially and across the lifetime of the programme.

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

Reason: From the documentation the visitors were made aware of a statement of intent on behalf of the programme's main placement partner, NWAS. The visitors were unclear how the process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners was sufficient to support an increase in learner numbers on the programme. Furthermore the visitors could not see evidence to demonstrate how non-ambulance placement capacity had been investigated.

Suggested evidence: Evidence as to how placement capacity is calculated and allocated to the proposed increase in student numbers across both ambulance and non-ambulance placement

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors considered the standards to be met at a threshold level and considered there was no threat that learners would be practising unsafely or ineffectively. However, the visitors noted that process for ensuring the capacity and availability of non-ambulance practice-based learning was informal and reactionary compared with the ambulance-based practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the process of ensuring the capacity and availability of non-ambulance placements is considered by visitors in future assessments to ensure all learners have access to non-ambulance placements.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science, Full time
Date submission received	04 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14894-G3C3G1

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:

Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Ian Davies	Biomedical scientist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04348

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

The education provider informed us of their intention to offer Clinical Genetics, as a new specialist route in their BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science 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 education provider stated that there will be changes around the admissions information for applicants to include the new specialism, and referenced a student handbook and web link as evidence for this standard. From reviewing the Level 5 modules on page 12 of the student handbook, the visitors noted there is a ten-week practice-based learning on year two for this programme. However, the information on the website state that this is part of year one. In the same section, the student handbook refers to routes of specialisation excluding Genetic Sciences. The visitors reviewed the evidence provided, but they were unable to determine whether the applicants will receive the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence, which demonstrates the education provider has included information relevant to the proposed Genetic Sciences route.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence on the updated student handbook, the Open Day and Applicant day talks, including the information on the website to demonstrate information regarding the new specialism of Genetic Sciences.

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: In the student handbook, the education provider refers to the HCPC as being a professional body, on page 21 under the section '3.6.1 The role of the professional bodies.' The visitors considered this information being incorrect, as the role of HCPC is of a regulatory body. In the same section, the education provider refers to the eligibility to apply to the HCPC register as "for state registration" (page 21). However, the visitors consider the above evidence as incorrect references. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has the correct information they require, to make an offer of a place to learners on this programme. The visitors require further evidence, which reflects the correct role of HCPC and accuracy with reference to the registration process in the student handbook.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence on the updated student handbook including accurate reference to the HCPC role and registration process.

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 noted the education provider's intention to sign a Service Level Agreement as part of the process, to secure practice-based learning for learners on the proposed Genetic Sciences route. The visitors considered the information on the work based learning (WBL) booklet as a reassurance from the education provider. However, this standard is relevant for both the education provider and the practice education, provider to reach an agreement. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place to ensure the capacity of practice based learning for all learners. The visitors require further evidence around the process to ensure the capacity for all learners on the Genetic Sciences route.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence around the process to ensure capacity for all learners on the Genetic Sciences route.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning
Date submission received	02 August 2019
Case reference	CAS-14957-L4K1Z1

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:

Patricia Higham	Social worker in England
David Childs	Social worker in England
Lawrence Martin	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 30 (across both programmes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04380

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 (across both programmes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04381

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 modifying their existing social work provision to deliver a degree apprenticeship programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: In their mapping document, the education provider has highlighted information about the roles and responsibilities of the work-based mentor and the academic tutor who are involved in the tripartite meeting. The visitors noted the work-based mentor role which will be key in delivering the programme and assessing apprentices' performance in their practice-based learning experience. The visitors considered the information on the programme handbook where the education provider mentions the practice supervisor as another role to address the same purpose. However, the visitors were unclear about who, in what ways and at what stage will be assessing apprentice's practice-based learning. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether the programme will be effectively managed in delivering the degree apprenticeship route.

Suggested evidence: Further information which clarifies who is supporting the apprentices, in what ways and at what stage will this happen.

3.15 There must be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.

Reason: The education provider mentioned that the commitment statement, which is the evidence in support of this standard, was under development at the time of the submission for this major change. The visitors were unclear how and to whom an apprentice will submit a complaint relating to work-based learning. In particular, the visitors were unable to identify how the education provider ensures that submission of complaints runs smoothly alongside the employers' mechanisms for raising complaints. The visitors were unable to determine the process the education provider has for receiving and responding to learner complaints.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which outlines the process for receiving apprentice complaints relating to their work-based learning.

6.6 There must be an effective process in place for learners to make academic appeals.

Reason: The education provider has mentioned in their mapping document that there will be no changes in this area. The visitors understood that while apprentices will be employed in practice-based learning they would need to use the employers' mechanisms for raising complaints if needed. However, the visitors were unclear how academic assessment and appeals process, including complaints submission, sits alongside the employers' appeals mechanisms. The visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place for apprentices to make academic appeals including submission complaints in practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process in place for apprentices to make academic appeals alongside the employers' appeals mechanisms.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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	The Open University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Honours) Social Work (England), Distance learning
Date submission received	17 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-15071-Y4D6N8

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:

Cathrine Clarke	Social worker
Lynda Kelly	Social worker (Approved mental health professional)
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Honours) Social Work (England)
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 260
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04446

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

The education provider has informed us of changes on the admissions process.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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	Queen's University of Belfast
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DECAP), Full time
Date submission received	08 August 2019
Case reference	CAS-15006-W4R7H0

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.

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Lisa Marks Woolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Andrew Richards	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DECAP)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04409

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 timing of certain parts of practice-based learning as well as the types of assessments used on the programme. They are also making changes to the programme design and delivery by reorganising some of the material on the course, as well as reweighting modules so they are compatible with the university's standard module weighting.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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) Social Work, Full time BSc (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning
Date submission received	28 August 2019
Case reference	CAS-15026-X7C7P6

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
Gary Dicken	Social worker
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to
Intakes per year	
Assessment reference	MC04424

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

The education provider informed us of their intention to introduce a new 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 06 November 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)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	04 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14897-Z7Y3S4

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04352

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist

First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04353

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 the programme design, delivery, practice-based learning and assessment for both the programmes. For the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme only, the education provider has increased learner numbers on the programme from 30 to 36 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.

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

Reason: As per the standards mapping document, the education provider stated there are no changes made in this area for both the programmes. From reviewing the submission for this major change, the visitors noted during the previous annual

monitoring 2018-2019, there was additional evidence submitted by the education provider upon request of the visitors. This evidence was accepted at that time. Since then, the education provider has changed the schedule for the practice placements to facilitate more cross-professional learning with other allied health programmes also being delivered. These all coincide with holiday timings and specifically, are heavily weighted for both programmes throughout the summer vacation time. The education provider stated that they have a yearly meeting to allocate placements, but there has been no information or evidence provided regarding this. As such, the visitors are unclear if the schedule changes impacts the ability to provide a broad range of placements and the capacity allocation. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate if there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating if the change in schedule and timings of the practice placements to facilitate more cross-professional learning with other allied health programmes, has any impact on the process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners across both the programmes. Additionally, it will be useful to have evidence demonstrating a detailed list of current placement providers, including available numbers of when these placements are available.

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

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

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

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

Reason: As per the mapping document, the education provider had provided web links within two documents 'healthcare placements' and 'Wessexdeanery' under various standards relating to placements. The links to these documents are not valid, as they display an error message upon accessing it. As the visitors could not see any information relating to the mentioned web links, they could not determine or make a judgement if these standards relating to placements and practice placement partner agreements have been met. Therefore, the education provider must provide information demonstrating the content of the mentioned web links.

Suggested evidence: Evidence or information demonstrating the content of the web links related to 'healthcare placements' and 'wessexdeanery'.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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	York St John University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	30 August 2019
Case reference	CAS-14998-N5D1Z3

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:

Dawn Blenkin	Occupational therapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 130
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04440

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 changing how they assess 3OT500 module 'Advancing Occupation Focussed Practice' from two assignments comprising a 2500 word synopsis and a poster to one assignment. The new assignment will be a 4000 word written proposal or a 25 minute presented proposal.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 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](#).