

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Suffolk
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography, Full time
Date submission received	20 January 2020
Case reference	CAS-15749-J2P0H8

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Amy Taylor	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04497

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 42
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04498

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04527

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 wants to make changes to the curriculum by introducing a separate practice-based learning module for each year of the programme. The other proposed changes include inter-professional learning modules to be replaced with personal and professional modules, and having two resit opportunities instead of one.

### 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 learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, which included a description of how assessment was intended to work in the practice-based learning context. The evidence was helpful on the whole but there were areas where the visitors considered that more information was needed.

First, they noted that materials relating to SOP 13.6 were introduced only at Level 6, in the module Living Well & Beyond Cancer (T). SOP 13.6 states that learners must “understand the radiobiological principles on which the practice of radiography is based”. They considered that this was quite late in the programme for learners to start learning about a fundamental part of the professional knowledge of a radiographer, and require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure this SOP can be fully met through the learning outcomes.

Similarly, with regard to SOP 14.8, they considered that one of the Level 6 modules, Research Project (T), mapped as meeting the SOP might not meet it in full, and it was not clear to them where it would be addressed elsewhere in the programme. SOP 14.8 states that learners must “be able use physical, graphical, verbal and electronic methods to collect and analyse information from a range of sources including service user’s clinical history, diagnostic images and reports, pathological tests and results, dose recording and treatment verification systems”. The visitors considered that the module had a specific research focus rather than having a broader focus on skills for interpretation, evaluation and decision making within standard clinical practice as required by the SOP. They therefore require further evidence to show how SOP 14.8 is met by components of the programme outside that module.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how other parts of the programme, separate from the modules mentioned above, ensure that SOPs 13.6 and 14.8 are met.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear from the evidence submitted where in the programme formal inter-professional education (IPE) would take place. They noted that two 20-credit inter-professional learning modules had been removed and considered that this might have affected the opportunities for IPE on the programme. The education provider’s submission indicated that IPE would take place at placements with partner Trusts, but the visitors did not see evidence of how the education provider would ensure this, or have oversight for purposes of quality assurance. In particular they wanted to be clear that there would be equity of access for learners, and that diagnostic and therapeutic radiographers would have equal opportunities. This was a potential issue because IPE opportunities were included in the module Becoming A Radiographer

which was mandatory for therapeutic radiographer learners but optional for diagnostic radiographer learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure access for all learners to appropriate IPE that enables them to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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

**Reason:** Relating to the issues outlined above under SET 4.1, the visitors were not clear how assessment on the programme would enable learners' competencies and knowledge around SOPs 13.6 and 14.8 to be appropriately measured. In particular they wished to see further detail relating to how knowledge related to these SOPs would be assessed in practice-based learning.

**Suggested evidence:** Documentation describing the recording of competencies related to the above SOPs, 13.6 and 14.8.

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