

Commentary on the proposed revised standards of education and training

The extent of the changes we are proposing to the structure and content of the existing standards may make tracked changes difficult to understand. We produced this document to provide more information and outline the differences between the draft standards for consultation and the existing standards. We identify where the content of the existing standards can be found in the consultation draft. We also provide a short commentary of the main changes we have made.

Existing standard	Draft proposed standard	Commentary
Institution level standards		
1. Level of qualification for entry to the Register		
1.1 The Council normally expects that the threshold entry routes to the Register will be the following. Bachelor degree with honours for: • biomedical scientists (with the Certificate of Competence awarded by the Institute of Biomedical Science, or equivalent); • chiropodists / podiatrists; • dietitians; • occupational therapists; • operating department practitioners; • orthoptists; • paramedics; • physiotherapists; • prosthetists / orthotists; • radiographers; and • speech and language therapists.	<i>Programme – Programme establishment</i> 7.1 The academic level of the programme is appropriate to support learners in achieving the standards of proficiency and delivering safe and effective practice.	SET 1 defines the minimum qualification levels normally expected for entry to the HCPC Register across the 15 regulated professions. Considering increasingly varied delivery models in health and care education, it is important that this standard enables flexibility to accommodate innovation and difference while ensuring public protection. To achieve this, the standard has been significantly reworded. The draft new standard (7.1) emphasises that the academic level must support learners in achieving the standards of proficiency and practising safely. This also reflects stakeholder feedback calling for greater clarity and flexibility, especially for apprenticeship and non-traditional routes. The draft standard would apply to the education programme rather than the

Foundation degree for hearing aid dispensers. Masters degree for: • arts therapists; • clinical scientists (with the Certificate of Attainment awarded by the Association of Clinical Scientists, or equivalent); • forensic psychologists (with the award of the British Psychological Society qualification in forensic psychology, or equivalent); • health psychologists (with the award of the British Psychological Society qualification in health psychology, or equivalent); • occupational psychologists (with the award of the British Psychological Society qualification in occupational psychology, or equivalent); and • sport and exercise psychologists (with the award of the British Psychological Society qualification in sport and exercise psychology, or equivalent). Professional doctorate for clinical psychologists. Professional doctorate, or equivalent for: • counselling psychologists; and • educational psychologists		institution. It therefore is a programme level standard. This reflects recent changes in the approach to assessing this standard. The current qualifications list will be retained as part of the guidance, to provide clarity for education providers and support programme assessment/approval.
--	--	--

2. Programme admissions		
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.	<i>Institution – Admissions</i> 4.1 The admissions process is fair, transparent and accessible, and enables both the applicant and the education provider to make an informed choice about admissions to programmes.	The draft standard (4.1) retains the core intent of enabling informed choice and strengthens expectations of fairness, transparency and accessibility. This responds to stakeholder feedback about potential barriers faced by applicants from marginalised groups and different entry routes and aligns with the HCPC's commitment to fairness in admissions. The revised wording also reflects a more outcome-focused approach, consistent with our regulatory approach.
2.3 The admissions process must ensure that applicants have a good command of English. 2.4 The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks. 2.5 The admissions process must ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.	<i>Institution – Admissions</i> 4.4 The education provider sets and implements fair, appropriate and effective admissions requirements, covering health, conduct, character and English language proficiency, to ensure learners can safely participate in programmes and meet professional standards.	These standards have been consolidated into draft standard 4.4 to improve clarity and reduce duplication. The new wording sets expectations for fair and effective admissions requirements covering health, conduct, character and English language proficiency. This change reflects stakeholder concerns about inappropriate barriers for disabled applicants or those with different linguistic backgrounds. It also aligns with the HCPC's fitness to practise principles and ensures providers are fair in their assessment of applicants' ability to safely participate in programmes.
2.6 There must be an appropriate and effective process for assessing applicants' prior learning and experience.	<i>Institution – Admissions</i> 4.3 The education provider assesses applicants' prior learning and experience to support fair admissions decisions across diverse entry routes.	Draft standard 4.3 strengthens expectations for recognition of prior learning, especially for non-traditional entry routes such as apprenticeships and employer-led models. This responds to feedback from stakeholders which highlighted inconsistencies in how education providers assess prior learning.

		The revised wording promotes transparency and fairness.
2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored. 3.14 The programme must implement and monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to learners.	<i>Institution – Management</i> 2.2 Equality, diversity and inclusion are embedded in strategies and policies in all settings, and these are meaningfully implemented, monitored and reviewed to support good quality experiences and outcomes for all learners and others involved in programmes. <i>Programme – Programme establishment</i> 7.2 Strategies and policies to embed equality, diversity and inclusion are effectively implemented and monitored across the programme.	Draft standards 2.2 and 7.2 combine the existing equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) standards at an institution level (2.7 and 3.14). They also expand the scope of the original standards to set out EDI expectations across all settings. They strengthen the expectation that EDI is embedded at both a strategic and operational level, and not just in standalone policies. This reflects the HCPC's broader commitment to embedding EDI across education and training, as seen in recent updates to the standards of proficiency and standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The change also responds to stakeholder requests for more active and reflective EDI strategies at all levels of the institution, including addressing structural barriers, monitoring of differential attainment and supporting diverse learner needs.
3. Programme governance, management and leadership		
3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.	<i>Institution – Resourcing</i> 1.1 Programmes are financially sustainable within the education provider and are fit for purpose with the support of all stakeholders involved.	Draft standard 1.1 clarifies the concept of sustainability to financial viability and stakeholder support. This reflects reports of increased financial pressure on institutions. We have seen this in education reports and throughout our stakeholder feedback during the review.

		Stakeholder feedback emphasised the importance of a programme maintaining strategic support and planning resources effectively. The change also aligns with broader sector expectations of institutional resilience and programme viability, especially in the context of workforce planning and evolving delivery models.
3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.	<i>Institution – Management</i> 2.1 The programme is clearly and effectively managed, with defined responsibilities for all aspects of programmes including with strategic and operational partners.	The revised standard (2.1) introduces clearer expectations regarding programme management and defined responsibilities, including with strategic and operational partners. This responds to challenges identified in employer-led and multi-site delivery models, where governance and accountability can be fragmented. The proposed change supports clearer oversight of partnerships. It also aligns with proposals to strengthen the way education providers make joint decisions with partners.
3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.	<i>Institution – Management</i> 2.4 There is a fair and effective process in place for appointing individuals with overall professional responsibility for programmes, ensuring they are suitably qualified and able to support the safe and effective delivery of education and training.	Draft standard 2.4 sets out the requirements for those who hold professional responsibility for the programme. The reference to individuals being on the relevant part of the Register has been removed to align with the current application of the standard as set out in existing guidance. The current standard allows for exceptions to the requirement that the responsible person be part of the Register. However, it is worded in a complex and negative way. Removing this part of the wording maintains the current application of the standard whilst

		simplifying the wording, and moves away from the negative framing. The draft standard focuses on the responsible person being appropriately qualified and experienced for the role. The updated guidance would provide further detail on how we expect the education provider to demonstrate suitable qualification including where appropriate, the person being a part of the HCPC Register. The change aligns with broader EDI principles and stakeholder feedback on flexibility in staffing. The draft change also emphasises the importance of a fair and effective appointment process. This addresses concerns about bias and unnecessary barriers, while maintaining the expectation that individuals are suitably qualified to support safe and effective delivery of education and training.
3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place. 5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.	<i>Institution – Management</i> 2.3 The education provider regularly monitors, evaluates and enhances the quality, safety and fairness of education and training provision across all settings.	Draft standard 2.3 combines existing standards on monitoring and evaluation systems, including in practice-based learning, and strengthens expectations by explicitly referencing quality, safety and fairness. This supports consistency in quality across all learning environments, particularly in employer-led and remote settings, reflecting stakeholder concerns about poor quality practice-based learning and negative placement experiences. The change supports a more reflective and data-informed approach to programme improvement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.	<i>Institution – People and partnership: Learners and service users</i> 6.3 Service users and carers are actively and meaningfully involved in the design, delivery and evaluation of programmes, contributing to their quality, effectiveness and relevance to health and care practice.	Draft standard 6.4 places service user and carer experiences at the heart of programmes. The change supports public accountability and ensures learners are prepared to meet professional standards in real-world contexts. It clarifies the nature of service user involvement, specifying their role in design, delivery and evaluation. The existing standard was set at a high level to enable providers to build the systems needed meet this standard. Now that this standard is long-established, these revisions strengthen the existing standard and set higher expectations that are reflective of what is required now and in the future. This responds to stakeholder feedback calling for more meaningful engagement and clearer expectations.
3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.	<i>Institution – People and partnership: Learners and service users</i> 6.6 Learners are actively and meaningfully involved in the design and evaluation of programmes, contributing to their quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement.	Draft standard 6.6 mirrors the changes to service user involvement, emphasising meaningful learner participation in programme design and review. This reflects stakeholder feedback which highlighted the value of learner voice in improving programme quality and fairness.
3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.	<i>Institution – People and partnership: Programme staff</i> 6.1 All educators undertake regular and effective learning and development which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of learning outcomes.	Draft standard 6.1 consolidates expectations regarding educator development in standard 3.11 and 5.7. This is to reduce duplication and supports consistency in quality across all learning environments. The draft standard responds to concerns about potential inconsistencies in the quality

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.		of training and support, particularly in delivery methods such as apprenticeships. It supports high-quality supervision across education settings. We heard requests from some stakeholders to introduce minimum standards such as minimum qualifications and minimum experience of educators. However, this would change the nature of the standards of education and training to be input-focused. The draft standard addresses these requests whilst maintaining the output-focused nature of the standards.
3.13 There must be effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in all settings.	<i>Institution – Safety and wellbeing</i> 3.2 The wellbeing and learning needs of all learners are effectively supported across all settings.	Draft standard 3.2 retains the expectations of the original standard and updates the wording to align with the rest of the revised SETs. Improving the clarity of this standard helps address stakeholder concerns about inconsistent support, especially in remote or third-party settings. It aligns with proposals to strengthen reasonable adjustments and inclusive support systems.
3.14 The programme must implement and monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to learners.	See 2.7	See 2.7
3.15 There must be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.	<i>Institution – People and partnership: Learners and service users</i> 6.7 Education providers receive and respond effectively to all complaints, feedback and learner requests for academic appeals.	Draft standard 6.6 consolidates existing standards 3.15 and 6.6 regarding complaints and academic appeals into a single standard. It expands the scope to include other forms of feedback, and feedback and complaints from service users.

6.6 There must be an effective process in place for learners to make academic appeals.		The changes also make the standard concise and outcome-focused by emphasising effective responses and learner voice, rather than processes. These changes align with stakeholder feedback regarding the length of the standards and the effectiveness of education providers responsiveness to feedback and complaints.
3.16 There must be thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.	<i>Institution – Safety and wellbeing</i> 3.4 The ongoing conduct, character and health of learners is considered, to maintain the safety of service users and carers.	This standard has been reframed in draft 3.4 to emphasise the relation between service user safety and assessment of a learner's conduct, character and health. The change clarifies that education providers are expected to assess learners' conduct, character and health in relation to ensuring the safety of service users. This change aligns with our equality impact assessment. It also aligns with the 2022 updates to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics, which emphasised the relationship between registrants' health and character and safe practice.
3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.	<i>Institution – Safety and wellbeing</i> 3.5 Learners are supported to identify and raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.	Draft standard 3.5 simplifies the existing standard 3.17 and highlights the expected outcome from application of the standard. The change also attends to stakeholder feedback emphasising the importance of psychological safety and understanding of internal processes to deal with complaints and safety.
3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware	<i>Institution – Communication and information</i> 5.2 The education provider effectively communicates the role of the HCPC to	Draft standard 5.2 improves the clarity and of standard 3.18. It ensures that learners, educators and other users of the standards of education and training understand that

that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.	learners and that only successful completion of an approved programme may lead to eligibility for admission to the Register for learners, educators and others.	only successful completion of a HCPC approved programme leads to eligibility to join the HCPC register. This supports transparency and aligns with our public protection remit. We have also added a new expectation for education providers to communicate the role of the HCPC to learners.
4. Programme design and delivery		
4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.	<i>Programme – Programme delivery: Learning approaches</i> 9.4 Learners learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions, in keeping with the principles of multi-disciplinary team working.	Draft standard 9.4 strengthens standard 4.9 and highlights the importance of interprofessional learning rather than the learners' ability. This change aligns the standard with the interpretation set out in the guidance and adds clarity. By highlighting the provision of interprofessional learning, it reflects stakeholder feedback regarding the importance of preparing learners for team-based care environments. The change also aligns with the standards of proficiency relating to communication and teamwork. The standard is complemented by guidance that sets out that we expect programmes to also ensure that learners are sufficiently engaged in interprofessional learning.
4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.	<i>See new standards at the end of the document</i>	<i>See new standards at the end of the document</i>
4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the	<i>Institution – Communication and information</i> 5.3 There are clear expectations for attendance, including identifying and	Draft standard 5.3 improves clarity around mandatory attendance and monitoring. It ensures learners are fully engaged in essential learning activities and supports

programme where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring processes in place.	communicating which parts of programmes require mandatory attendance, and attendance is monitored to ensure learners are fully engaged in essential learning activities.	programme transparency. This responds to feedback about inconsistent attendance policies and the need for clearer expectations.
5. Practice-based learning		
5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.	See 3.4	See 3.4
5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.	<i>Institution – Safety and wellbeing</i> 3.1 All learning environments are safe and supportive for learners, service users and others involved in programmes.	Draft standard 3.1 expands the scope to include all learning environments and stakeholders. This aligns with feedback on safeguarding and psychological safety.
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.	See 3.11	See 3.11
5.8 Learners and practice educators must have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning.	<i>Institution – Communication and information</i> 5.1 Learners and practice educators have the practical and academic information they need to be appropriately prepared for practice-based learning.	Draft standard 5.1 retains the expectations of the original standard and updates the wording to align with the rest of the revised SETs. The revised wording emphasises the importance of enabling preparedness, which helps address concerns about gaps in communication and the need for better orientation to placement settings. The standard is complemented by guidance that sets out that preparation includes practical and academic preparation.

6. Assessment		
6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Learning outcomes and assessments</i> 8.6 Assessments provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.	Draft standard 8.6 retains the original intent, ensuring assessments are objective, fair and reliable. This standard supports consistency and transparency in evaluating learner progression and achievement and aligns with stakeholder calls for more inclusive and competency-based assessment methods.
6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.	<i>Institution – Communication and information</i> 5.4 Assessment requirements for progression and achievement across programmes are clearly set, communicated and monitored.	Draft standard 5.4 clarifies assessment requirements and progression criteria. The change ensures that the focus of the standard is the outcome of application rather than setting out what assessment policies must say. This highlights the importance that learners understand expectations and supports programme transparency. This change reflects feedback on the need for clearer communication of academic standards for learners.
6.6 There must be an effective process in place for learners to make academic appeals.	See 3.15	See 3.15
6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.	<i>Institution – People and partnerships: Programme staff</i> 6.2 There is effective external scrutiny of programmes including at least one appointed person who has the appropriate professional experience and qualifications relevant to the programme.	Draft standard 6.2 strengthens expectations for effective external scrutiny but removes the Register clause and shifts away from HEI-focused language. This supports flexibility while maintaining quality assurance. Similarly to draft standard 2.4, it responds to concerns about unnecessary barriers and promotes inclusive recruitment of external examiners.

Programme level standards		
2. Programme admissions		
2.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.	<i>Institution – Admissions</i> 4.2 The selection and entry criteria are appropriate to the level and content of a programme and are fairly applied in admission decisions.	Draft standard 4.2 improves clarity around selection and entry criteria by focusing on their appropriateness to the level and content of the programme. This replaces the more technical language of ‘academic and professional entry standards’ and supports fairer, more transparent admissions decisions. It also aligns with the broader aim of making the SETs more accessible and focused on outcomes rather than setting processes.
3. Programme governance, management and leadership		
3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.	<i>Programme – Programme delivery: Partnerships</i> 9.5 There are formal partnerships between the education provider and their delivery partners, which involve regular and effective collaboration and joint evaluation, and which ensure the provider’s responsibility for the programme.	Draft standard 9.5 strengthens expectations regarding formal partnerships between education providers and delivery partners. It introduces requirements for joint evaluation, addressing concerns about inconsistent collaboration in employer-led and multi-site models. This change supports accountability and quality assurance in practice-based learning. The change also highlights the need for partnership to ensure the providers’ overall responsibility for the programme.
3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.	<i>Programme – Programme establishment</i> 7.4 There is sufficient availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners throughout the programme.	Draft standard 7.4 maintains the expectation that education providers ensure that there is sufficient availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The change to this standard emphasises the outcome-

		based nature of the SETs rather than highlighting specific processes. Stakeholders were supportive of maintaining the current approach for providers to consider placement availability to enable consideration of inequitable access, particularly in non-traditional routes.
3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. 5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.	<i>Programme – Programme delivery: Staffing</i> 9.1 There are sufficient qualified and experienced staff in all settings to deliver and support the programme in a way that enables learners to achieve the standards of proficiency and prepare for safe and effective practice.	Draft standard 9.1 consolidates staffing expectations for theory and practice-based learning into a single, more concise standard, to reduce duplication and support consistency in quality across all learning environments. The revised standard ensures that there are sufficient qualified and experienced staff in all settings, to deliver the programme and support learners effectively. This supports safe and effective practice and aligns with feedback on the need for consistent expectations for staffing across all delivery models and the importance of supervision quality.
3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. 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.	<i>Programme – Programme delivery: Staffing</i> 9.2 Learning is supported by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise, whose competence and training enable learners to develop the knowledge, skills and behaviours required for safe and effective practice.	Draft standard 9.2 combines and clarifies expectations for educator expertise, qualifications and training, including in practice-based learning. This makes the standard more concise, reduces duplication and supports consistency in quality across all learning environments. This change responds to concerns about variability in educator preparation and supervision quality. Similarly to draft standard 2.4, the current standard allows for exceptions to the requirement that the responsible person be

		part of the Register. However, it is worded in a complex and negative way. Removing this part of the wording maintains the current application of the standard whilst simplifying the wording, and moves away from the negative framing. The draft standard focuses on practice educators being appropriately qualified and experienced for the role. The updated guidance would provide further detail on our expectations.
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.	<i>Programme – Programme establishment</i> 7.3 The resources to support learning in all settings are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme and are accessible to all learners and educators.	Draft standard 7.3 retains the expectations of the original standard and updates the wording to align with the rest of the revised SETs. To ensure clarity and aid application of this standard, we have also strengthened the guidance to provide examples of the resources that may be helpful to support learning and accessibility.
4. Programme design and delivery		
4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register. 4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Learning outcomes and assessment</i> 8.1 The learning outcomes effectively integrate the requirements for professional practice as defined in our standards of conduct, performance and ethics and standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.	Draft standard 8.1 consolidates the expectations about learning outcomes into a single standard. This makes the standards more concise and reduces duplication. This standard supports readiness for registration and professional behaviour and reflects the outcome-focused direction of the revised SETs.

4.3 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Curriculum content</i> 8.7 The programme reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of current members of the profession and relevant external reference points.	Draft standard 8.7 updates expectations for curriculum content to ensure it reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of the profession, rather than only those articulated in curriculum guidance. This acknowledges the different reference points that may be reflected in programme content as well as the differences across professional bodies and whether reference points are termed 'curriculum guidance' or otherwise. It also focuses the standard on the expected outcome – the need to show how external guidance is reflected in the programme. This aligns the standard more clearly with guidance and supports relevance and responsiveness to current practice.
4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Curriculum content</i> 8.8 The curriculum is regularly reviewed and updated to ensure it remains responsive to developments in professional practice and continues to prepare learners for safe and effective practice.	Draft standard 8.8 clarifies that we expect providers to have appropriate mechanisms to regularly review and update the curriculum, beyond the point of programme approval. This ensures that programmes remain responsive to developments in professional practice and continue to prepare learners for safe and effective practice. It reflects stakeholder feedback on the need for future-readiness and adaptability.
4.5 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the programme. 5.1 Practice-based learning must be integral to the programme.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Curriculum content</i> 8.9 Practice-based learning and the integration of theory and current practice are central to the programme.	Draft standard 8.9 combines the purposes of existing standards to make the standards more concise. This standard supports holistic programme design and reflects the importance of experiential learning in preparing learners for real-world practice.

4.6 The learning and teaching methods used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Learning outcomes and assessment</i> 8.3 Learning and teaching methods are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.	Draft standard 8.3 retains the expectations of the original standard and updates the wording to align with the rest of the revised SETs. It ensures that delivery methods are aligned with learning outcomes and supports effective pedagogy across diverse delivery models.
4.7 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking. 4.8 The delivery of the programme must support and develop evidence-based practice.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Curriculum content</i> 8.10 The programme design is informed by evidence and reflective practice and supports integration of appropriate methods and technologies.	The original standards (4.7 and 4.8) were about the learner being autonomous, reflective and evidence-informed. These requirements can be removed from the SETs as expectations of autonomy, reflective thinking and evidence-based practice have now been included in the updated standards of proficiency. The principles of the original standards have been combined and replaced by draft standard 8.10, which sets expectations for providers to embody these same principles when undertaking programme design. This is a significant change in the focus of the standard, but rests on the same principles. It aligns with stakeholder feedback on purposeful programme design.
5. Practice-based learning		
5.1 Practice-based learning must be integral to the programme.	See 4.5	See 4.5
5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Learning outcomes and assessment</i> 8.4 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning enables learners to develop the knowledge, skills and experience	Draft standard 8.4 clarifies expectations about learner outcomes from practice-based learning. This change clarifies the intention of the standard, and more explicitly links the standard to the expected outcome.

achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.	required to achieve the learning outcomes and to meet our standards for admission to the Register.	
5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.	See 3.9	See 3.9
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.	See 3.10	See 3.10
6. Assessment		
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. 6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Learning outcomes and assessment</i> 8.2 Assessments ensure that those who successfully complete the programme understand our standards of conduct, performance and ethics and are able to meet our standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.	Draft standard 8.2 consolidates expectations of assessments into a single, more concise standard that ensures that learners who complete the programme understand the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and are able to meet the standards of proficiency. It supports readiness for registration and reflects the importance of aligning assessment with professional standards.
6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.	<i>Programme – Programme design and curriculum: Learning outcomes and assessment</i> 8.5 Assessment methods are appropriate and effective for measuring the learning outcomes.	Draft standard 8.5 retains the expectations of the original standard and updates the wording to align with the rest of the revised SETs. It supports fair and inclusive evaluation of learning outcomes and reflects stakeholder interest in authentic and competency-based assessment.

New standards		
No existing standard for comparison.	<i>Institution – Safety and wellbeing</i> 3.3 The wellbeing of staff and others involved in programmes are supported to enable effective contribution to the programme and the quality of learning.	This new standard introduces expectations for appropriately supporting staff. It ensures that staff and others involved in the programme have access to appropriate support from their institutions to enable them to effectively deliver quality education, training and support to learners. This responds to concerns about increasing demands on educators and the impact of that on learning environments.
No existing standard for comparison.	<i>Institution – Communication and information</i> 5.5 Education providers determine, set and clearly communicate expectations for the appropriate use of technology in learning and teaching, ensuring these are understood by learners and educators.	This standard introduces expectations regarding the appropriate use of technology in learning and teaching. It ensures that learners and educators understand how to use digital tools effectively and ethically, supporting academic integrity and digital readiness.
No existing standard for comparison.	<i>Institution – Communication and information</i> 5.6 Learners receive timely and meaningful feedback to empower and enable them to have an active role in their own development.	This standard introduces expectations for timely and meaningful feedback to learners. It ensures that learners receive good quality feedback, to support learner development and promote engagement, responding to stakeholder feedback about the value of co-production and feedback loops. It also helps address differential attainment (which research links to inequalities in the provision and quality of feedback) by ensuring feedback is actionable and equitable. Similar expectations have been included in the guidance for draft standard 3.3 (above), in relation to effective feedback for staff and others involved in the programme.

No existing standard for comparison.	<i>Programme – Programme delivery: Staffing</i> 9.3 Educators are up to date in the use of contemporary technologies and digital tools that are relevant to their profession and that are used in teaching, supervision and assessment.	This standard introduces expectations for educator competence in contemporary technologies and digital tools. It ensures that educators are prepared to support learners in using emerging technologies in teaching, supervision and assessment.
4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.	<i>Institution – People and partnership: Learners and service users</i> 6.4 Appropriate consent is obtained from service users and carers, in ways that uphold their rights and reflect ethical practice. 6.5 Appropriate consent is obtained from learners, in ways that uphold their rights and maintain their safety in all settings.	Draft standards 6.4 and 6.5 focus on the outcome-focused nature of the standards rather than focusing on the existence of processes. It also separates service users and carer consent from that of learners. The reference to rights and ethical practice in the standard provides a clear definition of consent and reflects ethical practice principles. This supports service user, carer and learner rights, aligning with the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and standards of proficiency relating to dignity and autonomy.