

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Westminster
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences, Part time BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	11 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15420-P3P2G4

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:

Peter Abel	Biomedical scientist
Ian Davies	Biomedical scientist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04475

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04486

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 developed a new degree apprenticeship route. The education provider confirmed in a telephone call that these changes and first learners were in place from September 2017. The new programme delivers the same curriculum as the part time programme. The education provider has added an end point assessment to the programme to meet the requirements of a degree apprenticeship, and has made other changes to the delivery 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.

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.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The education provider supplied a completed standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document. In the mapping document for this standard the education provider disclosed how the current programme lead is currently HCPC registered and appropriately qualified for the role of programme lead. This standard is intended to ensure that the education provider (not the HCPC) ensures that the individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified on an ongoing basis, and the visitors were not clear how the information for the current programme lead ensures this. We need to see evidence that there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable programme lead and if necessary, a suitable replacement. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified, experienced and from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are appropriate.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider's process ensures the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

2.4 The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Reason: The education provider has provided an overview of the process to assess applicants Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) that will be checked at an enhanced level by the employer. The education provider has also indicated that the process is not different for the apprenticeship programme. However, the education provider has also stated in the standards (SETs) mapping document that two employers will not be carrying out this enhanced check for applicants. The visitors therefore considered that the process has differentiated itself from the process. The education provider must clarify how it ensures that sufficient criminal conviction checks are being carried out on all applicants. Due to the collaborative nature of degree apprenticeships the employer and education provider must work together to ensure these checks happen but if admissions criteria and processes are applied by a separate organisation, the education provider must still have overall responsibility for overseeing them.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the education provider ensures that all applicants undergo appropriate criminal conviction checks during the admissions process.

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 25 March 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](#).