

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Professional Social Work Practice (Trainee in Employment Route), Work based learning
Date submission received	01 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13414-Z9T7C0

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:

Patricia Higham	Social worker
David Childs	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Professional Social Work Practice (Trainee in Employment Route)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03845

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, which will be based closely on their currently approved work based learning route. The introduction of the Degree Apprenticeship will present some differences to the currently approved social work 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.

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

Reason: On reviewing the evidence provided the visitors noted that the BSc (Hons) Professional Social Work Practice Course and Unit Information form refers to Social Work England as the regulator for the programme. Currently the HCPC remains the regulator for this programme. Whilst this document was still in draft form with track changes included on it, the visitors were concerned that this would be misleading for applicants, especially if such changes had been added to applicant materials too. The visitors agreed that this information does not provide potential applicants with the correct information they may require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors require further evidence that clearly demonstrates that all information for applicants provides correct and up to date information.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates that all application material for the programme contains correct and up to date information, in regards to the regulator for the profession.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Reason: On reviewing, the evidence provided the visitors noted that the BSc (Hons) Professional Social Work Practice Course and Unit Information form refers to Social Work England as the regulator for the programme. Currently the HCPC remains the regulator for this programme. Whilst this document was still in draft form with track changes included on it, the visitors were concerned that this information would be misleading to learners on the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the learning resources were appropriate, due to the incorrect information.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates that the learning resources for the programme contain correct and up to date information, in regards to the regulator for the profession.

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.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: On reviewing the evidence provided the visitors noted that the BSc (Hons) Professional Social Work Practice Course and Unit Information form refers to Social Work England as the regulator for the programme. Currently the HCPC remains the regulator for this programme. Whilst this document was still in draft form with track changes included on it, the visitors were concerned that this information was misleading for learners and educators on the programme. The visitors noted that the SOPs refer to the “Register” in many standards. If the documentation for learners refers to Social Work England, learners may not be clear what “Register” they are meeting standards for. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that the documentation contains correct and up to date information in regards to the regulator for the profession, to determine that learners have the information they need to meet the standards of proficiency.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates that documentation contains correct and up to date information in regards to the regulator for the profession.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: On reviewing the evidence provided the visitors noted that the BSc (Hons) Professional Social Work Practice Course and Unit Information forms refers to Social Work England as the regulator for the programme. Currently the HCPC remains the regulator for this programme. Whilst this document was still in draft form with track changes included on it, the visitors were concerned that this information was misleading for learners on the programme. The visitors considered that this standard could not be met if the documentation referred to Social Work England, as the learner needs to

understand the implications of the HCPC standards of conduct performance and ethics. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that documentation contains correct and up to date information in regards to the regulator for the profession.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates that documentation contains correct and up to date information in regards to the regulator for the profession.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The visitors considered the evidence provided. The visitors understood that learners on the programme who are apprentices will be both learners and employees at the practice-based learning setting. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear as to how the education provider will support learners on practice-based learning where the learners will be both employees and learners. The visitors could not determine how the education provider might manage any potential conflict and support the learners in both roles. The visitors require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how learners will be supported in the practice-based learning setting when they are both learners and employees, in order to determine that the practice-based learning setting is a safe and supportive environment.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will provide support to learners in the practice-based learning setting when they are both learners and employees.

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 30 January 2019 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 Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	15 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13698-W7V7Z6

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:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
John Archibald	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 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04049

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 restructured modules and, due to the creation of new modules, established additional learning outcomes. They will be looking to not use IPL research modules. The education provider is also revising the structure of the placement modules and has increased the number of placement hours.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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 30 January 2019 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) Paramedic Practitioner, Full time
Date submission received	24 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-13456-R5W6S8

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:

Anthony Hoswell	Paramedic
Timothy Hayes	Paramedic
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practitioner
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03884

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 programme to ensure it remains fit for purpose considering the wider context in the profession. This includes a change to the name of the programme. The education provider informed the HCPC of the likely changes in May 2018, but did not have a detailed outline of the changes until the programme had completed the education provider’s own internal quality mechanisms over the summer. Therefore, it was agreed that the changes would be sent to us now so they could be reviewed and assessed against the revised standards of education and training. The change includes an increase in the number of learners for 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.

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

Reason: The visitors could not see from their review of the evidence how the education provider ensured that there will be an adequate number of staff in place to support the additional learners for the programme. Taking into consideration additional staff appointed on initial fixed-term 12 month contracts, the visitors could not see how the education provider will ensure that there are an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme with increased learner numbers.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider have sufficient qualified and experienced staff in place to support the increase in learners to the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors on reviewing the evidence for this standard could not see how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient resources in place to support the increased learner numbers for the programme. The visitors were unclear from the evidence provided whether there will be additional equipment and other resources in place to ensure that the increase in learner numbers will be supported in all areas of the supported learning for the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence that details the resources available to the programme to ensure resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that clearly demonstrates that there are the resources in place to support the increase in learner numbers across the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence that there will be a transitional period for the learners who are taking the current programme. Learners will be taking a “hybrid” module structure where the modules Facilitating Education in practice replaces the module Health and Social Care, and a Clinical Skills and Medical conditions Pathophysiology modules to replace Assessments on minor injuries and minor illnesses. The visitors could not see how these transitional modules map to the standards of proficiency. Therefore, the visitor require evidence that demonstrates how learners taking the transitional modules will meet the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how the learners taking the transitional modules meet the relevant standards of proficiency for paramedics.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the evidence provided in Faculty of Health & Human Sciences- School of Health Professions Placement Capacity and allocation processes (appendix 17) and the programme handbook (appendix 18) referred to differing placement hours to be completed by learners on the programme. The visitors were unclear about the number of hours that need to be completed. In addition, the visitors were unclear if this change had been made to placement hours to accommodate the increase in learners for the programme. Therefore, the visitors were not clear as to how many hours were to be completed and how this could impact on the completion of the

standards of proficiency for paramedics. The visitors require to see clarification of the placement hours for the programme to be assured that these standards are met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that clarifies the actual placement hours learners will complete to meet these standards.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence for this standard and could not see how the education provider ensured that there would be an adequate number of staff in practice based learning areas. As the placement timetables indicate that there is an overlap of placements across the three years of the programme, this would indicate that there must be a large number of qualified and experienced staff required in practice-based learning areas. Unfortunately, the visitors were not able to access the on-line database the education provider holds which shows how many staff are in place to deliver placements. The visitors were therefore unable to gauge if there were sufficient staff in place to deliver the placements to the increased learner numbers for the programme. The visitors require evidence that demonstrates that there are an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for the increased learners on the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that clearly shows that there are an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for 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 30 January 2019 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 Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	Cert HE Paramedic Practice, Work based learning
Date submission received	26 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13686-T3C6X4

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anthony Hoswell	Paramedic
Gordon Pollard	Paramedic
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Cert HE Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 March 2016
Last intake	31 August 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 34
Intakes per year	5
Assessment reference	MC04041

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 the HCPC that they intend to increase learner numbers by an additional 60 learners per year, as well introducing an additional partnership with a new ambulance provider to deliver the programme. The programme is closing, with a last intake date in August 2021. The education provider intends to take on an additional 60 learners per year up until the last intake date.

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.

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

Reason: To evidence how they will continue to meet this standard, the education provider has noted that there will be an addition of two more teaching staff on the programme. The visitors read that the two additional members of staff will be on a fixed term basis for 12 months. As the education provider intends to recruit 60 more learners for each year until the programme closes in 2021, the visitors could not determine how they would continue to ensure this standard is met with the additional staff members on a 12 month fixed term basis. Therefore, the visitors require further information about

what plans the education provider has in place to ensure this standard is met with the increase in learner numbers for the duration of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place for the duration of the programme, until the last cohort has completed the programme.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: To evidence how they will continue to meet this standard, the education provider has provided a mentor register for the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWASFT), showing overall current mentor numbers, and SWASFT total learner numbers projected to 2021 – 2022. The education provider has also provided comments from Deputy Director of Education SWASFT acknowledging capacity for 60 additional learners per year. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine whether the practice educator capacity is sufficient for this programme, in the context of several other programmes in the region with increased learner numbers that will be supported by SWASFT. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine whether there would be an adequate number of staff in the practice-based learning setting. In order to determine whether this standard is met, the visitors require further information about how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of staff at the practice-based learning setting to support learners on the programme, when considering that SWAST also supports other programmes in the region.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of staff at the practice-based learning setting to support learners on the programme, when considering that SWAST also supports other programmes in the region.

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 30 January 2019 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	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	05 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-14347-S3H1D3

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:

Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04104

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist

First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04112

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 they intend to increase the number of learners on the programme with an additional cohort.

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 30 January 2019 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)	Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	05 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13430-W9C9K9

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
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	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 for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

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:

Christine Hirsch	Independent prescriber
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03861

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03853

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 main change is a reduction in the number of days of face-to-face delivery, from 26 to 10 days. The 16 remaining days will be replaced by an equivalent amount of e-learning. The education provider has stated that there are no planned changes to assessment strategy and design, or curriculum.

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.

B.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Reason: The visitors noted the change in the number of contact hours on the programme. The visitors were however unclear on how the academic and pastoral support for the profession specific learners would be addressed. Learners will have less face to face contact and may require additional support. The visitors therefore, need evidence that clearly demonstrates how academic and pastoral support will be provided to learners with the change in contact hours for profession specific learners on the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how academic and pastoral support will be provided to learners with the change of contact hours on the programme.

B.14 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Reason: The visitors noted a difference in the evidence provided. The mapping document seems to indicate that the self –directed time can be used to make up the 90 hours of placement activity. In the mapping document it states “(this time can be used to help achieve the 90 hours supervised practice)” where as in other documents indicates that that there are ten mandatory days. The visitors were unclear if the self-directed time is considered mandatory in terms of attendance for the programme. The visitors want further evidence that clearly indicates the mandatory attendance that applies to this programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates the parts of the programme that are mandatory so that it is clear to learners with the change of contact hours for the programme.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Reason: With the change to contact hours on the programme, the visitors were unclear how the profession specific skills of the learners will be addressed through the e-learning content of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the profession specific skills of the learners will be addressed through the e-learning content for the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the profession specific skills will be identified and addressed for the learners on 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 30 January 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future.

The visitors considered that the standards had been met, but noted that the calculation of staff / learner ratios appeared to use a method which was not always straightforward to understand. They noted that visitors undertaking future assessments may wish to ensure that they understand the education provider's understanding of how to explain their staff / learner ratios, to ensure that any relevant standards can be met appropriately.