

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	18 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13545-W7P9S9

### 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:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03952

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 reported a reduction in the overall practice hours from 900 to 750 hours. From September 2018 onwards, there will be a 50 / 50 per cent split between practice and theory as well as an increase in placement weeks from 24 to 25 following the removal of 'intersemester break' in learners' timetable.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Outcome from first review**

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

**Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors were provided with a narrative of the change in the duration and number of practice placements. The visitors noted the following statement in the mapping document, "there will be no reduction in exposure to learning opportunities or required skills". However, the visitors were not provided with evidence to support this statement or how the education provider intends to monitor the change from 900 to 750 hours of practice opportunities to ensure that all learners will have access to the appropriate number and duration of practice placement to support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that all learners will have access to practice-based learning opportunities of appropriate

structure, duration and range to support the achievement of the learning outcomes given the reduced practice hours.

## 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 September 2018 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	Bradford College
Validating body	The University of Bolton
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Part time
Date submission received	30 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13278-B6Y1S0

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Cathrine Clarke	Social worker
Gary Dicken	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 October 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03736

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 October 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03737

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 intend to introduce a social work Degree Apprenticeship programme. After email and telephone conversation, the education provider has indicated that the learners will be enrolled on the BA (Hons) Social Work (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 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Brighton
Name of programme(s)	Clinical Pharmacology, Part time BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time MSc Podiatry (pre-registration), Full time accelerated
Date submission received	08 August 2018
Case reference	CAS-13564-T3H7T3

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Alison Wishart	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Catherine Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Clinical Pharmacology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 December 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03862

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03969

Programme name	MSc Podiatry (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03970

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.

As part of a curriculum review for the BSc (Hons) Podiatry and after taking external examiner feedback on board the education provider has made changes to some tasks and assessments for the programme.

There have been changes to the management of the MSc Podiatry (pre-registration) and Clinical pharmacology 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 September 2018 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 Edinburgh
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), Full time Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), Flexible
Date submission received	18 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13636-N4K6X0

### 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:

Stephen Davies	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04000

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04001

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

The education provider has informed us that there has been a change to the individual with overall professional responsibility for the above 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 September 2018 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)	Doctorate in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	18 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13586-F2Q7L4

### 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
Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03978

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



The education provider has informed us of a change to how practice-based learning for the doctorate will be taught and assessment.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Greenwich
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Part time MA Social Work, Full time MA Social Work, Part time PG Dip Social Work, Part time PG Dip Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	11 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13614-H1Z1R4

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 August 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03983

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 August 2003

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03984

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 31
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03985

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 31
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03986

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 31
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03987

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 31
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03988

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

The education provider informed us that there has been a change of person with overall responsibility for the programmes.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<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 September 2018 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)	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time Masters Award in Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	12 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13524-Q2V3J9

### 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:

Anne Mackay	Social worker
Susan Bell	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 37
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03934

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 82
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03936

Programme name	Masters Award in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03937

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continue 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 began a review of the social work curricula across the provision and other aspects of programme delivery. The main change for this programme concerns the delivery of practice placements and the addition of step off awards that do not lead to an HCPC registrable qualification.

### 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 September 2018 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	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences), Work based learning BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences), Work based learning
Date submission received	13 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13562-W7S7Y1

### 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:

Stephen McDonald	Biomedical scientist
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences)
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6 (Up to 24, across the work based learning programmes noted on this form)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC4037

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences)
----------------	--

Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6 (Up to 24, across the work based learning programmes noted on this form)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04038

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences)
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6 (Up to 24, across the work based learning programmes noted on this form)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04039

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences)
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6 (Up to 24, across the work based learning programmes noted on this form)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04040

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 introduce a Degree Apprenticeship route to their already existing BSc (Hons) Health Sciences programmes. Particularly, the education provider will introduce degree apprenticeship routes, which will be based on their currently approved full time programmes. The introduction of the degree apprenticeship routes will present some differences to the currently approved programmes, and are noted through this process as new work based learning 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: 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.

### 5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that the practice educators are appropriately trained at the practice setting, considering the different requirements of the Degree Apprenticeship route. In particular, the visitors noted in the SETs mapping document (SET 5.8), that the evidence mapped provides information about what learners will undertake, and how practice educators will assess learners, rather than how practice educators will be trained to support learners. Given the change in the Degree Apprenticeship route of the programme, the visitors require further evidence of how the practice educators are undertaking appropriate training to deliver effective learning for Degree Apprenticeship learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence to demonstrate that there will be practice placement educator training available for the practice placement educators, which is appropriate to the Degree Apprenticeship programme.

## Section 5: 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 September 2018 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) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), Full time
Date submission received	04 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13630-N0J6L0

### 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 Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03994

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03995

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03996

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

The education provider has informed us that they have reviewed the small modules for the programme. This has meant that the education provider has reviewed the curriculum across the programme. They are to close unviable modules and move learners onto the biomedical sciences modules from September 2018-2019 academic 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.

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the changes to the curriculum including the removal of small modules linked to the programme. As the small modules are being removed, the visitors were concerned that the viability of the programmes could be undermined. However, the visitors could find no evidence that the education provider in making the changes to the curriculum and removing the smaller modules linked to the programme are ensuring that the programmes have a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors could not see either if learners and external examiners have been consulted on the changes to the programme curriculum. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that clearly demonstrates that the programmes remain secure in the education providers' business plan and evidence that demonstrates whether external examiners and learners have been consulted on the change to the curriculum.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clearly indicates the programmes are secure within the education providers' business plan and evidence on whether external examiners and learners for the programme have been consulted on the changes.

## **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 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	07 August 2018
Case reference	CAS-13658-N9N3S6

### 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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04012

Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 62

Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04019

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 about the replacement of the Diploma of Higher Education programme with the BSc (Hons) programme. The same person is in charge of the management for the BSc (Hons) programme. As there are still learners who attend the Diploma of Higher Education programme we assessed whether it continues to meet our SETs.

### 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 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Southampton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	26 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13464-S3V6N5

### 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:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03890

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist

First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03891

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 about the changes which will ensure that the programme is current. The changes will be effective from September 2019 and onwards. In particular, the changes ensure that the integration of theory and practice are appropriate and practice placements are realigned to better integrate with the curricular content. The assessment is amended to involve more information technology and increase the involvement of service users while reducing learner burden.

### 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 September 2018 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)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD), Full time
Date submission received	25 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13489-Q2R2M8

### 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:

James McManus	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 21
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03899



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

The education provider has informed us that they will be making ‘enhancements’ to the curriculum, as well as changes to the ‘specialist placements’ in the final year of the programme.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: 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.

**5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the education provider has provided information about the changes being made to allow the learners to take on specialist placements. These changes could be outside the NHS. The visitors could not see from the evidence provided how the specialist placements are approved and monitored to ensure that the specialist placements are effective. This change could also impact on other standards in SET 5. Therefore the visitors would like to see how the specialist placements are approved and continue to be monitored to ensure that learners receive the appropriate training for the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clearly demonstrates that the specialist placements are approved and monitored effectively to ensure that the relevant standards in SET 5 continue to be met

## 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 September 2018 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)	Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Science, Distance learning
Date submission received	20 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13644-P3B7V7

### 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 Boardman	Paramedic
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Science
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 March 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04005

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

The education provider informed us that the Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Science programme will have a programme leader change. Because of the nature of

the change we had to scrutinize evidence and decide whether our standards of education continue to be met.

### 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 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Worcester
Name of programme(s)	FdSc Paramedic Science, Full time FdSc Paramedic Science (Tech to Para), Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	09 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13511-T6W0R9

### 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:

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03918

Programme name	FdSc Paramedic Science (Tech to Para)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic

First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 135
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	MC03919

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 120
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03920

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 that they will be making changes to curriculum, practice placements and assessments.

### 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 September 2018 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)	BHSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	19 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13532-W7B6R8

### 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:

Natalie Matchett	Occupational therapist
Rebecca Khanna	Occupational therapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BHSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 130
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03938

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.

As part of the five year review for this programme with the Royal College of Occupational Therapists, the education provider made changes to the learning outcomes for the programme and also to change the degree prefix from BHSc (Hons) to BSc (Hons).

**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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided which showed that the education provider is moving to adopting programme learning outcomes, as well as modular learning outcomes. The visitors noted that the modules had the learning outcomes identified alongside the programme learning outcomes. However, the visitors were unclear how the standards of proficiency are covered by the learning outcomes for the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence demonstrating how the standards of proficiency are met by all of the learning outcomes. This evidence will ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the occupational therapist part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the standards of proficiency are mapped against the learning outcomes for the programme to ensure that

learners on the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for the occupational therapist part of the Register.

**6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.**

**6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** The visitors in their reading of the evidence provided noted the programme specification stated that there had been a reduction in the summative assessments for this programme; and there will now be a greater emphasis on formative assessment. In addition, the programme specification and the student handbook noted that throughout all levels of the programme learners will engage with a range of formative assessment activities through the modules for the programme to prepare learners for subsequent summative assessments in the programme. The visitors could not see in the evidence provided what the nature of the formative assessments would take and when the formative assessments would take place throughout the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that will show how and when the formative assessments would happen throughout the programme, including any consultation with external examiners and learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that provides a rationale for the change in the assessment strategy for the programme, including what consultation has taken place with external examiners and learners on the programme. This evidence could include any guidance given to all learners to ensure they have a full understanding of how the change to assessment will allow them to progress throughout the programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).