

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Academy for Healthcare Science
Name of programme(s)	Certificate of Attainment, Full time Certificate of Equivalence, Full time
Date submission received	02 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-15124-Y8L0R1

### 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:

Matthew Craddock	Clinical scientist
Lydia Taiwo	Clinical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate of Attainment
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 260
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04466

Programme name	Certificate of Equivalence
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 500
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04467

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

HCPC-registered clinical science programmes are expected to define which modalities they offer. This is because some of the SOPs refer to modalities, and since the HCPC's regulatory framework requires that visitors make a judgment about whether a programme will deliver learners who can meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs), visitors considered individual modalities.

This particular case considered the new Decontamination Science modality, and the evidence submitted by the education provider was focused on that modality. The visitors made a determination based on the way in which the new modality delivered the SOPs.

### 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 20 August 2020 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	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	24 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-16061-R1N5S8

### 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:

David Comber	Paramedic
Gordon Pollard	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 100
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04617

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes identified 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 making changes to module content, practice-based learning, and to teaching and learning activities on the programme.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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.

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

**Reason:** The education provider submitted some evidence about some of the events and activities that service users and carers were involved with on the programme. However, it was not clear to the visitors from this evidence how service users and carers were systematically used on the programme. It is important for this standard to be met that service users and carers are used in a structured way and that their input into the programme can be assessed and reviewed. In particular, in the context of this major change, the visitors were not clear how service users and carers contributed to the curriculum design and development, and how the education provider recorded this.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing how service users and carers have specifically fed into the programme changes, how their input and discussions are recorded, and how the education provider will ensure systematic involvement in the new curriculum.

### **3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** The education provider submitted some evidence around this standard, showing some learner involvement in some aspects of the programme. However, it was not clear to the visitors how this was incorporated into the programme in a structured way. The visitors did not see evidence clarifying whether the only mechanism for learners having input into the programme was via the National Student Survey. Specifically, the visitors could not see how learners were able to formally contribute to the design, delivery and review of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing how learners are enabled to contribute to design, delivery and review, in the context of this amended programme.

### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** The education provider indicated in their evidence that changes had been made to inter-professional education (IPE) in the amended programme. This took the form of a series of events and opportunities for learners. However, it was not clear to the visitors how the kind of IPE required by the standard was formally integrated into the programme, i.e. they could not see how all learners would be enabled to learn with, and from, learners and professionals in other relevant professions. They were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to clarify how the education provider will ensure that all learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions, and how this is formally integrated into the programme.

### **6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.**

**Reason:** From the evidence submitted the visitors were aware that there was a 30% pass mark for many of the modules. While the HCPC does not set specific requirements in such areas, the visitors did consider that these seemed to be a low figure, and it raised a question for them about whether the assessment strategy would ensure that the standards of proficiency were appropriately met. They therefore were unable to determine whether this standard was met, as they were not clear how the education provider uses assessment to ensure that learners are fully prepared to become safe and effective practitioners.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence relating to how the education provider will use assessment strategy, in particular the determination of pass marks, to ensure that learners meet the SOPs.

## **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

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



This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 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 Birmingham
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Flexible
Date submission received	25 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-16029-W7B9T5

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04601

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2005

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 52
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04602

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04605

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

The education provider informed us of a change in learner numbers for the 2019-20 cohort, from a maximum learner cohort of 50 to 80 across both BSc (Hons) programmes, and from a maximum learner cohort of 50 to 67 for the MSc programme. The education provider has let us know they have additional practice-based learning opportunities, extra teaching-focussed staff, created an additional teaching space and have bought more equipment in order to support the increased number 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: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the visitors were informed the education provider has a total of 106 new placement opportunities available. However, the visitors could not find information about when placements are needed by learners on each programme throughout the year. The visitors were also unclear that the availability of placement opportunities matches the demand for them in the academic year. Therefore the visitors could not be sure there is the capacity of practice-based learning so all learners on the programmes have access to practice-based learning to meet their learning needs. The visitors need to see information of the processes to ensure there is the capacity of practice-based learning so learners on the programmes have access to practice-based learning to meet their learning needs.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the processes to ensure there is the capacity of practice-based learning so all learners on the programmes have access to practice-based learning to meet their learning needs. For example, a placement schedule showing when practice-based learning is needed by learners on each programme throughout the year, or any other evidence to show that the total number of practice-based learning which is available matches the demand for them throughout the academic year.

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

**Reason:** To meet this standard, the visitors were informed the education provider has supported the recruitment of specialist teaching physiotherapy staff and increased the practice education team. The visitors were made aware of the approval to appoint three teaching staff, with another when the change of increased learner numbers was approved. However, the visitors were aware the total number of staff the programmes applied for was more than what has been agreed. The visitors were therefore unsure whether the resources provided for the programme allows for an appropriate number of staff. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate there are an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must provide further information to ensure there is an adequate number of staffing in relation to the practical requirements of the programme, the number of learners, their needs and the learning outcomes to be achieved.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware that the education provider has created a new practical room to support the increased number of learners, as well as a purchasing additional equipment. The visitors saw that the new practical room had been identified

to be refurbished with an additional 20 plinths, allowing for the recruitment of eight additional learners to the BSc provision and ten on the MSc programme. The visitors were unsure whether the creation of a new practical room was enough, given the change in learner numbers from a maximum learner cohort of 50 to 80 across both BSc (Hons) programmes, and from a maximum learner cohort of 50 to 67 for the MSc programme. The visitors need further information that programme resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide further information that programme resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

**Reason:** For this standard the education provider said no changes had been made to the way the programmes meet the SETs. The visitors were informed the education provider has established new contemporary practice-based learning to meet the increased demand for placements. The visitors were also made aware of education provider staff working on the programme. However, the visitors could not find information relating to the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, including practice educators and others working in the practice-based learning environment or setting. The visitors therefore were unclear whether there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to submit further information to ensure there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 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 Bradford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Blood Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Cellular Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Genetics Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Infection Science, Full time
Date submission received	19 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-16118-P2X9T0

### 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.....	4
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:

Sara C Smith	Biomedical scientist
Kathleen Simon	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Blood Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04638



Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Cellular Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04639

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Genetics Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04640

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Infection Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04641

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes identified 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 amending the structure of practice-based learning on the programme.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors understood that information about the changed placement structure would be provided to applicants coming on to the programme in future years, after the changes had been made and approved. However, they were not clear how the change would be communicated to those who are applying for, or have already accepted, or been offered, a place for September 2020. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that those starting the programme in September 2020 will have full information about the placement structure, so that they can make an informed decision.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider has communicated to those starting the programme in September 2020 the new structure of practice-based learning.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Work based learning
Date submission received	04 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16142-W0X7K1

### 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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 125
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04656

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2018

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04657

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04658

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 above programmes in line with a new programme structure and assessment process introduced by the education provider as a whole.

### 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 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	10 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15928-W5S0K0

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach .....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	9

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Susan Boardman	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04572

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

Following a successful tender process, the education provider will receive funding for the BSc Paramedic Science programme from September 2020. As per the requirement of this, the education provider intends to make changes around the resourcing of the programme, programme and practice-based learning structure, modules and module descriptors, assessment methods, learning outcomes and the development of a practice assessment document which will work across Scotland. As part of this, the education provider has taken note of feedback from a range of stakeholders, including service users and carers and 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.

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
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.**

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

**Reason:** The visitors were informed via the major change process the learner numbers are proposed to be 210 over three years. However, the visitors were unclear whether this number was in regards to this programme only, or included other paramedic provision at Glasgow Caledonian University. The visitors require clarity on the proposed number of learners on the new BSc Paramedic Science and any impact on other paramedic programmes at Glasgow Caledonian University.



The visitors noted there is a 'top-up' route onto the programme, of two cohorts of ten learners per year. The visitors were also informed there is a route onto the programme for Associated Ambulance Practitioners. If the increment in learner numbers is to take place across these mentioned programmes as well along with BSc Paramedic Science programme, then the visitors would require more information regarding how the increased numbers will be split across all programmes. Based on this, they will be able to make a judgement on the viability and sustainability of BSc Paramedic Science programme.

As the visitors were unclear regarding the learner numbers on this programme, the visitors could not make a judgement to determine whether the programme will be sustainable and fit for purpose.

**Suggested evidence:** Clarity regarding the proposed increment in learner numbers for the proposed Bsc Paramedic Science programme, and whether these numbers are for this programme only or combined with any other existing programmes.

### **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 reviewing the mapping document and evidence provided, the visitors noted that as part of the tender agreement a 'Practice Education Lead' from Scottish Ambulance Service will be allocated to this programme, to liaise and collaborate between the education provider and Scottish Ambulance Service. The visitors also noted that all non-ambulance placements will be undertaken in the Greater Glasgow & Clyde Region. However, as noted above under SETs 3.1 and 3.2, the visitors were not clear regarding if the proposals to increase learner numbers to 210 across the three years applies only to the existing BSc Paramedic Science programme only, or includes any other paramedic programmes at Glasgow Caledonian University. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether all learners on the programme will have access to practice-based learning. Additionally, the visitors were not clear regarding what process will be in place to ensure there will be sufficient availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners, considering the proposed increment in learner numbers. The visitors were also not clear if there are processes in place to manage availability and capacity of practice-based learning capacity for learners across other existing paramedic provision programmes, considering the increment to increase learner numbers under the new agreement.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must clarify the process in place to determine availability and capacity for learners on the BSc Paramedic Science programme, considering proposals to increase learners on this programme. Additionally, the education provider must demonstrate how it will manage and ensure all learners have access to practice-based learning across all paramedic programmes.

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

**Reason:** To support the change of increase in learner numbers, the education provider stated in the mapping document a further 1.4 full time equivalent (FTE) member of staff has been recruited as part of the programme team, whilst a further 1.4 FTE is in the process to be recruited. The education provider also stated in the mapping document that a total of 4.4 FTE staff will be managing the new total of 120 learners across the

three year BSc Paramedic Science programme. From reviewing the evidence provided for this standard which included staff curriculum vitae and timetable of the programme, the visitors could not see information on plans of managing the increment in learner numbers on this programme. The visitors determined that a 4.4 FTE staff is likely to increase the student-staff ratio on this programme, and could not see any information demonstrating whether the new addition of staff will only contribute to teaching on the BSc Paramedic Science programme or will they also contribute to any other existing paramedic programmes. Due to this the visitors could not determine if there will be an adequate number of staff to support learners on this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate:

- Whether existing staff and new staff will contribute to teaching on only the BSc Paramedic Science programme, or other paramedic programmes as well;
- How will 4.4 FTE staff on this programme manage 120 learners across the three years on the BSc Paramedic Science programme.

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

**Reason:** The education provider stated in the mapping document that the existing practical classrooms and Interprofessional Simulation Centre has capacity to accommodate the increase in learner numbers from 150 to 210. It also stated that other resources such as handbooks, module guides, textbooks and journals will not be affected by the increment in learner numbers. From reviewing the evidence submitted for this standard, the visitors noted it contained information regarding student support, simulation centre, programme accessibility and inclusiveness for learners. However, the visitors could not see any information regarding what arrangements or systems are in place to manage resources for the increment in learner numbers. The visitors noted in the evidence regarding the education provider's approach to have a blended learning approach where many teaching materials will be paperless, but it was not clear how the physical resources such as teaching rooms and handbooks will be accessible to all learners.

Additionally, as noted above under SETs 3.1 and 3.2, the visitors were not clear if the proposals to increase learner numbers to 210 across the three years applies only to the existing BSc Paramedic Science programme only, or includes any other paramedic programmes at Glasgow Caledonian University. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether there will be sufficient resources, and how effective and accessible will they will be for learners on this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must:

- provide evidence of the systems in place to ensure all learners on this programme will have access to the necessary resources and support required for their learning; and
- clarify regarding the proposed increment in learner numbers for the proposed Bsc Paramedic Science programme, and whether these numbers are for this programme only or combined with any other existing programmes

### **3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Reason:** As per the mapping document and evidence provided for this standard, the education provider mentioned the different exit awards, including clarity whether they will confer eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register or not. The visitors noted one of the exit awards 'Diploma HE Paramedic Studies' will not lead to confer eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors noted having the title 'Paramedic' in an exit award might be misleading for learners as it is a protected title. As per the requirement of this standard, learners who are not eligible to apply for registration should not be given an award that refers to a protected title. Due to this, the visitors felt that it might give the learners the impression that they might be able to apply for registration, upon achieving this exit award with a protected title. Based on this, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must clarify whether learners who achieve the exit award 'Diploma HE Paramedic Studies' will allow learners to confer eligibility to apply for admission to the HCPC Register. If learners will not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register, then the education provider must clarify if it might consider changing the title of this exit award.

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

**Reason:** For this standard, the education provider provided the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document, module descriptor and relevant pages of the Definite Programme document. From reviewing the Definite Programme document, the visitors noted that as part of the agreement of this new tender, learners on the current pre-registration, post-registration and Associate Ambulance Practitioner programmes will be entering into the new programme. However, the visitors could not find any information demonstrating at what stage / level of the programme learners from these different programmes will be able to enter onto the programme. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether learners from other existing programme provisions joining the BSc Paramedic Science programme would have met any existing SOPs for the relevant part of the Register. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether every learner completing the programme can meet all of the SOPs for this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must clarify:

- at what stage of the programme will learners from other existing programme provisions will be joining the BSc Paramedic Science programme; and
- how will it be ensured that all learners joining the BSc Paramedic Science programme will not miss out on achieving the SOPs for paramedics.

#### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** The education provider stated in the mapping document that there are no changes to this standard, however the visitors noted in the Definite Programme document that inter-professional learning (IPL) will take place in the Inter professional Simulation Centre. However, the visitors could not find information demonstrating what will be taught ensuring IPL will be delivered. Based on this, the visitors could not determine how learners will learn with and from learners from other relevant professions to help develop learners' ability to communicate and work with those outside their profession.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about how the education provider makes sure that learners will learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professionals.

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

**5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**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:** From reviewing the relevant pages of Definite Programme document as evidenced in the mapping document, the visitors noted as part of the agreement for the proposed tender a Practice Education Lead (PEL) will be appointed for effective and regular collaboration on practice-based learning for all education providers in Scotland delivering Paramedic Science studies. The evidence also mentioned regarding the role of 'Practice Placement Co-ordinator', who will be working closely with practice educators and are responsible for identifying practice educators. However from the information provided, the visitors were unclear of how the education provider will ensure that there is an adequate number of staff involved in practice-based learning to support the increment in learner numbers from 150 to 210 over the three years of the programme. Additionally, as noted under SETs 3.1 and 3.2, the visitors require clarity regarding the proposed increment in learner numbers for the proposed Bsc Paramedic Science programme and whether this affects other paramedic provisions or not. Based on this, the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure any new practice educators joining in to support the increase in learner numbers are appropriately qualified and experienced.

As there are proposals to make changes in the practice-based learning structure including module descriptors and assessment methods, the visitors could not find any information demonstrating what training will practice educators undertake appropriate to their role to support learners achieve the learning outcomes on this programme. Due to this, the visitors could not determine how prepared practice educators will be to support learning and assess learners effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate:

- how they will ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff at the practice-based setting to support the increment in learner numbers;
- whether the increment in learner numbers is only for BSc Paramedic Science programme or is it combined with other paramedic provisions as well. The education provider must clarify how it will ensure there will be adequate practice educators to support learners;
- how it will ensure practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support the increment in learner numbers; and
- what training will be undertaken by practice educators to provide support to learners, to help them achieve the learning outcomes of the programme.

Additionally, the education provider must clarify how regular this training will be undertaken by practice educators.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed SOPs mapping document and relevant pages of the Definite Programme document provided as evidence for this standard, which had information regarding the assessment strategy for this programme. The visitors also reviewed the 'Paramedic Science Master MD Booklet' document which contained module descriptors. The visitors noted that this document had information relating to the type of assessment for each module, but module M3B726434 on page 26 has an annotated bibliography as one of the assessment methods. Without seeing any further information regarding annotated bibliography, the visitors could not determine how this assessment is carried out, how this assessment will be carried out and which relevant SOP is being met. As the visitors were not clear regarding the assessment strategy for module M3B726434, they could not determine how this will ensure learners who complete the programme will be able to meet the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must clarify what is annotated bibliography and how will learners be assessed. The education provider must also demonstrate how annotated bibliography assessment will ensure learning outcomes have been met and which relevant SOP will this relate to.

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

**6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed 'PAD- BSc Paramedic Science' document and noted on page 21 under the heading of Quality Assurance, that 40% of learners will be randomly selected for marking the Practice Assessment Document (PAD) portfolio. The visitors noted that PAD is a complete record of practice from practice-based learning that demonstrates competency. Additionally, in the Paramedic Science Master MD Booklet document on page 11, the visitors noted that the Clinical Scenario OSCE component has a pass mark of 40%.

As the visitors could not see any further information regarding PAD marking, they were not clear how only selecting 40% random learners for marking constitutes as a fair and reliable measure of learner's progression and achievement. The visitors were unclear about how learners who do not get selected for marking, are assessed. With regards to the pass mark of 40% for Clinical Scenario OSCE, the visitors were not clear how this mark is sufficient to ensure whether a learner is fit to practice by the end of the programme. Additionally, the visitors could not see any information demonstrating what can and cannot prevent learners from progressing onto the programme if they are part of the 40% random selection or not. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if these standards have been met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must:

- clarify the fairness and reliability of PAD marking;
- demonstrate how achieving 40% pass mark for clinical scenario OSCE is realistic for a learner to be fit for practice by the end of the programme; and
- clarify progression and achievement requirements within the programme, specifically around PAD marking.

#### **6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** From reviewing the PAD – Bsc Paramedic Science document, the visitors noted page 143 contains a list of clinical skills learners need to be complete in the practice-based learning setting by achieving a minimum 80% pass. The list of skills also reflected which particular SOP will be met upon successful completing the relevant clinical skill. The visitors noted that learners who complete the clinical skills of ‘Needle thoracocentesis’ and ‘Needle Cricothyroidotomy’, will have successfully met SOP 14.3 respectively. However, the visitors could not find any information relating to what assessment methods will be used to assess this skill. From reviewing the module descriptors as well, the visitors could not see any information regarding this. Based on this the visitors could not make a judgement on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the assessment method to measure the learning outcomes on the programme. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether will ensure that SOP 14.3 is met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must demonstrate the assessment methods that will be used to assess the Needle thoracocentesis and Needle Cricothyroidotomy skills.

#### **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 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Hull
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	16 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-16100-F8B8C6

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Gemma Howlett	Paramedic
David Comber	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04634

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes identified 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 an increase in learner numbers.



### 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:** The education provider submitted evidence relating to their communication with placement partners in relation to the planned change in learner numbers. This seemed to be a good basis for the increase, but the visitors considered that it did not provide sufficient clarity and certainty concerning how this particular issue would be handled. The visitors also noted that placement hours could include assisting activities within placement sites, being part of interviews, and it was not clear to the visitors how these kind of activities would enable learners to meet placement learning outcomes, which meant that they were not clearly linked to the creation of extra capacity. The visitors did not have information about whether the practice assessment documentation (PAD) would be used to capture this issue. They were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met, and the education provider must demonstrate how they will create extra capacity in practice-based learning which delivers the programme goals appropriately.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate specifically how the education provider will ensure that all new capacity is appropriate capacity, especially in relation to the flexibility about how learners would achieve their hours.

- 3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**
- 3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.**
- 3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.**

**Reason:** From their review of the evidence, the visitors were aware that significant extra staffing and resource burden would be placed on the existing staff and resources. However, it was not clear to the visitors what the specific longer term planning was around these issues. They noted that the planned learner increase would eventually raise the staff to student ratio well beyond its current level, and also that the resourcing plan did not appear to address the implications of the increase in numbers beyond the first year. They noted too that they were not clear about whether there was sufficient specialist knowledge and expertise available. They were therefore unable to be certain that the standard was met, and the education provider must show what their planning is around this area.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider would ensure sufficient numbers of suitable staff, and sufficient availability of all necessary resources to staff and learners, in the long term when the scaled-up programme has admitted three new cohorts.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were aware that there were a large number of practice educators without a formal qualification, but they could not see in the information provided what additional support was given to those individuals. They were not clear whether practice educators were expected to undertake yearly updates, as the evidence seemed to be contradictory. They could also not see how the regular updating was managed on an operational level, for example with an online system. Without clarity on this the visitors could not understand how the education provider ensured that enough of their staff had appropriate qualifications and experience.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that they have an adequate number of staff whose qualifications and experience can be suitably updated as necessary.

- 6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear whether the education provider anticipated increases in the workload or the capacity of the teaching team as a result of this change, specifically in relation to the facilitation of additional OSCEs or marking of assignments. They considered that this was relevant under the circumstance, because the assessment methods may no longer be suitable if the staffing resource was insufficient.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate that the assessment methods used remain appropriate given the staffing availability following the changes being made to the programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 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	King's College London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	19 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15971-K7V3V0

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1991
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 78
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04579

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20

Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04580

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

The education provider has informed us they have updated both programmes following a curriculum development process. The programme delivery will incorporate further blended-learning approaches with a greater proportion of online and self-directed learning, as well as lectures. Modules have been developed along themes that run spirally through the curriculum.

The undergraduate programme has moved from six periods of practice-based learning comprising of one 6-week and five 5-week placements, to seven periods comprising one 6-week, four 5-week, one 4-week elective and one 1-week observational placement. Practice-based learning will now be non-credit bearing.

The Masters programme has moved from comprising 90 level 4 credits and 180 level 7 credits, and a minimum of 1038 hours of practice education, to comprising 180 level 7 credits and a minimum of 1000 hours of practice education. There will now be seven periods of practice-based learning.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### **Further evidence required**

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

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

### **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 mapping document provided, the education provider indicated no change had been made to the way the programme meets this standard. However, the visitor was made aware the programmes have moved from six to seven periods of practice-based learning, with different durations, and that there was a new elective placement. The visitor considered the design, content and duration of academic modules has changed. Therefore the visitor was unclear if there has been a change as to when practice-based learning is delivered. The visitor considered there was a large number of learners in practice-based learning during summer months and therefore was unsure if there was sufficient capacity and availability of practice-based learning to accommodate these learners. The visitor was unsure whether other programmes in the same geographical area had also been considered. The visitor therefore needs to see additional information about the processes in place to make sure all learners on the programmes have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must submit further information, such as communications with practice partners and LSEAPP, about the processes in place to make sure all learners on the programmes have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

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

**Reason:** To meet this Standard, the education provider said they had moved from six to seven periods of practice-based learning, with differing duration, and that there is a new elective placement. The visitor considered the design, content and duration of academic modules has also changed with the programme providing innovative changes to be more reflective of modern practice. The visitor was unclear if there has been a change as to the delivery of practice-based learning. The visitor was made aware the programme refers to innovations with other partners, LSEAPP and HEE-funded placements. The visitor, however, considered the evidence related to this to be limited. The visitor was also unclear whether the new practice-based learning supports the achievement of learning outcomes and also the standards of proficiency. The visitor therefore needs to see further information, such as communications with partners including LSEAPP, to demonstrate that practice-based learning support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs for physiotherapists.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must submit further information, such as communications with partners, to demonstrate that the new practice-based learning opportunities support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the visitor was aware practice-based learning on the programmes has changed to non-credit bearing modules and that practice education learning outcomes are still to be achieved. The visitor was made aware learners will be assessed and receive a pass or fail mark on practice placements. The visitor was consequently unclear how learners will progress if a fail mark has been achieved in these practice placement modules. However, the visitor was also informed that a minimum of 1000 clinical hours will be required to graduate from each programme. The visitor was also made aware of a placement assessment form but this was not submitted and therefore was unsure if there have been modifications made to it to accommodate the change to non-credit bearing modules.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must provide further information, such as the revised placement assessment form, and how students will progress if they achieve a fail on practice placements.

## 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 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	London Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition, Full time Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration), Full time MSc Dietetics and Nutrition, Full time
Date submission received	29 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16164-Y7Y8W7

### 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:

Susan Lennie	Dietitian
Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04677

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2012

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04678

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04679

Programme name	MSc Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04680

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 changes to learning and teaching activities, to the structure and organisation of some of the modules on the programmes, and to the organisation of the practice-based learning.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: 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 20 August 2020 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	Middlesex University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	21 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-16123-W8F2H1

### 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:

Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
Stephen McDonald	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 8
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04644

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

The education provider has informed us they have changed the structure of practice-based learning on the programme, from three two-three month placement blocks, one in each of the three years on the degree programme, to one x 12 month placement block. They have added this into the three-year academic study, making the programme four years in duration. To reflect the new 12 month placement arrangement, the programme has also changed the placement modules. The two x 30 credit modules carried out by students in the second and third years (BMS2555 and BMS3566, respectively) have been replaced by one x 120 credit module (BMS3576) carried out in the fourth year.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 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	Edinburgh Napier University
Name of programme(s)	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals, Part time
Date submission received	08 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16185-B0R1D6

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Nicholas Haddington	Independent Prescribing
Alaster Rutherford	Independent Prescribing
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC04731

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’s two existing programmes will be combined into one programme. This will have a new title, as noted in the programme details under section 2 of this report. The new combined programme will now be offered as a 40 credit module at Level 11, with three intakes per year with up to 65 learners per cohort, out of which up to 10 learners per cohort will be HCPC registrants. Proposals also include changes to the admissions process, updating module descriptors, revising learning outcomes, more involvement of service users and carers and increasing practice-based learning to 90 hours.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 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 Nottingham
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (D.App.Ed.Psy), Full time
Date submission received	22 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16165-R1G5R2

### 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:

Lisa Marks Woolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Sarah Hulme	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (D.App.Ed.Psy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04681

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 changed the taught component of the programme from 14 modules of 10 credits each, to seven modules of 20 credits each. The education provider has also informed us they will be adapting practice-based learning activities linked to each module.

### 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 20 August 2020 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 Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time
Date submission received	30 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16226-N0M8V3

### 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:

Jo Jackson	Physiotherapist
Wendy Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04674

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04675

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 reported changes to the design, delivery and assessment of modules shared by both programmes.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 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	Robert Gordon University
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9), Part time Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11), Part time Prescribing for Healthcare Practitioners (SCQF Level 9), Part time Prescribing for Healthcare Practitioners (SCQF Level 11), Part time
Date submission received	14 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16171-P4F0B7

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist Independent Prescribing, POM – Administration POM - Sale / Supply (CH) Podiatric Surgery
Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04686

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04687

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04688

Programme name	Prescribing for Healthcare Practitioners (SCQF Level 9)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 115: three cohorts of 35 learners each and one of 10 learners
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	MC04744

Programme name	Prescribing for Healthcare Practitioners (SCQF Level 11)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 115: three cohorts of 35 learners each and one of 10 learners
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	MC04745

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

The education provider has informed us they are replacing their current supplementary prescribing and independent prescribing provision, with two new programmes. Applicants must now have been registered for a minimum of one year prior to application for entry onto the programme. Assessments will now include a 3000 word case-based discussion which focusses on a prescribing decision from the student's practice. The education provider has informed us learners will now need to be supported by a Practice Educator, rather than a Designated Medical Practitioner, and that the programmes meet the new HCPC standards for prescribing.

### 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 20 August 2020 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	Swansea University
Name of programme(s)	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Part time
Date submission received	07 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16183-Z1G0S4

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
James Pickard	Independent prescriber
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04693

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 increase the overall learner number to 100 learners. This will be split across two intakes per year, with 50 learners in each.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of East Anglia
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	17 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15030-W7L2G2

### 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:

Anthony Hoswell	Paramedic
Gemma Howlett	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	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04426

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 changed the module structure for the first and second years of the programme. The assessment strategy has also been changed for all three years of the programme.

The education provider also indicated changes to learner numbers at the initial notification stage. However, this change was withdrawn during the process.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Outcome from first review**

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

**Further evidence required**

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

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

**5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Reason:** In response to standard 3.1 the education provider they indicated that when multiple cohorts are in practice-based learning, first year learners will be facilitated by newly qualified paramedics and other ambulance staff. They stated that these ambulance staff will have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and also undertake regular training to meet the needs of the programme. The education provider did not disclose who these ambulance staff were or show how they possessed the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support first year learners other than by stating it. As such, the visitors were unclear that they met the relevant criteria to support effective and safe learning. The education provider must

clarify how they determined these additional staff possess the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that newly qualified paramedics and other ambulance staff have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Applied Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	26 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-16128-K1L1B7

### 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:

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04647

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 August 2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04661

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 start a degree apprenticeship programme from September 2020, titled 'BSc (Hons) Applied Occupational Therapy'. Partner practice education providers will be responsible for selecting learners who work as employees in their organisation. There will also be changes made to existing modules by removing few or moving them to a different level.

### 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 20 August 2020 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 Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	03 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16154-G3N3R0

### 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:

Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 100 (Walsall campus) Up to 25 (Telford campus)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04670

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.



From September 2020, the education provider intends to now have an annual cohort intake of 100 learners at their Walsall campus, moving on from the existing agreement of 50 learners per cohort with two intakes per year. Additionally, the education provider also wishes to have an additional separate cohort of up to 25 learners at their Telford campus, starting from September 2021. At the admissions stage, learners will have the option to choose which campus they like to study at.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 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)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre registration), Full time MSc Physiotherapy (Pre registration), Part time
Date submission received	10 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15926-R4N5W8

### 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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04570

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre registration)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2021

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 2
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04598

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 programme curriculum to enable learners adapt to the changing needs of service users and local communities and to adapt to the constantly evolving models of service delivery and innovative practice within the health service. In addition to the curriculum redesign, they are also making changes to assessments, which involves the use of formative and summative assessments to achieve the programmes' learning outcomes and HCPC standards. The education provider is also introducing a part time route through the existing, approved full time programme.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).