

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	MA Social Work (Chelmsford)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 April 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Cathrine Clarke (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has highlighted an increase to student numbers from 30 students per year to 45 students per year.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Document outlining the teaching allocation for the programme
- Information regarding resources
- Information regarding placement capacity
- Job description

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitor	James Pickard (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 April 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module definition forms

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) (SP only)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 April 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module definition forms

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 April 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module definition forms

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) (SP only)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 April 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module definition forms

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Bradford College
Validating body	University of Bolton (formerly validated by Teesside University)
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work - Part time BA (Hons) Social Work - Full time
Date submission received	04 May 2017
Case reference	CAS-11841-D3V0L2

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 Choose an item. (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Patricia Cartney	Social worker
Anne Mackay	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum student cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03149

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.

We were informed as part of the major change notification that the education provider had changed validator for the programme, from Teesside University to the University of Bolton.

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum student cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03257

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.

We were informed as part of the major change notification that the education provider had changed validator for the programme, from Teesside University to the University of Bolton.

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.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Derby
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy – Full time
Date submission received	02 May 2017
Case reference	CAS-12059-Z2S2Z5

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Angela Ariu	Occupational therapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 October 1995
Maximum student cohort	Up to 105
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03313

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.

A change to the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme, from Fiona Page.

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.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Sciences (Integrated)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	26 April 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist) Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC of changes to the programme spanning several areas of the programme. The changes include an increase in student numbers, a new placement provider, the introduction of an industrial placement year and a new external examiner.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- HCPC supporting evidence document
- Staff summary and curriculum vitae

- NHS Staff summary
- Research facilities

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

During their reading of the documentation the visitors noted a discrepancy between the information on the education provider's website, and the documentation relating to the HCPC approved programme. The visitors advise the education provider that all documentation and electronic media are revised to ensure the programme title matches the HCPC approved programme title to ensure that the correct information is available for students on the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	22 May 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Michael Branicki (Social worker in England) Gary Dicken (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
 SET 3: Programme management and resources
 SET 4: Curriculum

The education provider has proposed a change to their accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) process to allow experienced candidates to enter their BA (Hons) Social programme at level 5.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- "Nottingham First" presentation
- Off-site delivery resources report
- Additional Explanatory Information to support major change

- Social Work Programme handbook
- Example APEL timetable for a 2017 intake

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	21 March 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has indicated that the programme is being realigned against the 'Programme Framework for Northumbria Awards' (PFNA). As a result, there are proposed changes to the learning outcomes and assessment weightings.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- HCPC SOPs mapping
- PFNA supplementary information
- Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors reviewed the SOPs mapping document. However, the visitors noted that the learning outcomes mapped to the SOPs were at programme level only. As such the visitors could not see where the learning outcomes and SOPs are being delivered within the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to where within the modules these SOPs are being delivered in order to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence, such as a revised SOPs mapping document, which demonstrates where the learning outcomes are being delivered within the modules to demonstrate that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors reviewed the SOPs mapping document. However, the visitors noted that the learning outcomes mapped to the SOPs were at programme level only. As such the visitors could not see where the learning outcomes and SOPs are being assessed within the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to where within the modules these SOPs are being assessed in order to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence, such as a revised SOPs mapping document, which demonstrates where within the modules the learning outcomes are being assessed in the programme to demonstrate that those who successfully complete the programme have met the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 February 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources
 SET 4: Curriculum
 SET 5: Practice placements
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider will be making changes to their curriculum and assessment. These changes to the curriculum are university wide and all the programmes will be realigned against the 'Programme Framework for Northumbria Awards' (PFNA). The education provider will also be increasing their student numbers from 25 to 37.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack

- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Programme handbook
- Standards of proficiency mapping
- Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

3.5 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 did not submit documentation to support the changes highlighted in the major change notification form. The education provider has not addressed the potential increase of student numbers and its impact on staff resources. As such the visitors could not determine whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme, with the increase in student numbers. Therefore, the visitors need to see further evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of staff for the amount of students they are proposing for the programme, how they will support students in all settings and that these members of staff are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider did not submit documentation to support the changes highlighted in the major change notification form. The education provider has not addressed the potential increase of student numbers and its impact on staff resources. The education provider stated that they will be making various changes to modules, in response to the PFNA. With the proposed increase in student numbers and the module changes the education provider will need to demonstrate that this programme has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place, with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors need to see further evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of staff for the amount of students they are proposing for the programme and that these members of staff have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme, particularly with the relevant expertise and knowledge to deliver the new curriculum.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider did not submit documentation to support the changes highlighted in the major change notification form. The education provider has not addressed the increase of student numbers and its impact on placements. Through the major change notification form and telephone correspondence the education provider told the HCPC that they will be reorganising how students are allocated to placements, by streaming them, in order to deal with the potential increase in student numbers. The education provider however, did not provide any evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure that the duration and the range of placements, following the streaming, will be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. Therefore, as the education provider will be streaming students to accommodate the potential increase, the visitors need to see further evidence to demonstrate that the range and duration of placements will be appropriate to effectively the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the duration and range of placement will be appropriate to deliver the achievement of the learning outcomes.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Reason: For this standard, the education provider did not submit documentation to support the changes highlighted in the major change notification form. The education provider has not addressed the increase of student numbers and its impact on placements. Through the major change notification form and telephone correspondence the education provider told the HCPC that they will be reorganising how students are allocated to placements, by streaming them, in order to deal with the potential increase in student numbers. The education provider however, did not provide any evidence to demonstrate, how they will ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators will be fully prepared for placement, following the reorganisation. Therefore, the visitors need to see further evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators will be fully prepared for placement, following the reorganisation.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators will be fully prepared for placement, following the reorganisation.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	21 March 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has indicated that the programme is being realigned against the 'Programme Framework for Northumbria Awards' (PFNA). As a result, there are proposed changes to the learning outcomes.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- PFNA supplementary information
- SOPS mapping
- Programme structure information
- Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors reviewed the SOPs mapping document. However, the visitors noted that the learning outcomes mapped to the SOPs were at programme level only. As such the visitors could not see where the learning outcomes and SOPs are being delivered within the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to where within the modules these SOPs are being delivered in order to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence, such as a revised SOPs mapping document, which demonstrates where the learning outcomes are being delivered within the modules to demonstrate that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors reviewed the SOPs mapping document. However, the visitors noted that the learning outcomes mapped to the SOPs were at programme level only. As such the visitors could not see where the learning outcomes and SOPs are being assessed within the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to where within the modules these SOPs are being assessed in order to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence, such as a revised SOPs mapping document, which demonstrates where the learning outcomes are being assessed within the modules to demonstrate that those who successfully complete the programme have met the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme title	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicholas Haddington (Independent prescriber) Michael Minns (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 April 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources

Standard C: Curriculum

Standard E: Assessment

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend their independent prescribing programme to therapeutic radiographers.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification

- Clinical assessment decision making in NMP
- Module descriptors
- Example timetables

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted potential challenges regarding the number of student admissions to the modules. The education provider has specified the number of students per module; however, this may hamstring the education provider's capacity for additional recruitment. The programme team may wish to give this some further thought, whilst ensuring that allocated module resources are commensurate with the recruitment strategy in order to ensure HCPC standards continue to be met.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme title	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicholas Haddington (Independent prescriber) Michael Minns (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 April 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources
Standard C: Curriculum
Standard E: Assessment

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend their supplementary prescribing programme to include dietitians and diagnostic radiographers.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Clinical assessment decision making in NMP
- Module descriptors

- Example timetables

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted potential challenges regarding the number of student admissions to the modules. The education provider has specified the number of students per module; however, this may hamstring the education provider's capacity for additional recruitment. The programme team may wish to give this some further thought, whilst ensuring that allocated module resources are commensurate with the recruitment strategy in order to ensure HCPC standards continue to be met.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of East Anglia
Name of programme(s)	MA in Social Work - Full time
Date submission received	02 May 2017
Case reference	CAS-12060-L7D0L9

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Patricia Cartney	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum student cohort	Up to 81
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03312

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.

This was a change to the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme, from Jeanette Cossar.

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.