

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	MA Dramatherapy, Full time
Date submission received	07 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13509-B7X3F9

### 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:

Belinda Sherlock	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Catherine Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Dramatherapist
First intake	01 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03908

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 change of person with overall responsibility 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: 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 23 August 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	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	05 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13512-Z1P2J7

### 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:

Sheila Skelton	Social worker
Vicki Lawson-Brown	Social worker
Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 90
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03921

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 highlighted various changes to the programme following an internal review 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: 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 23 August 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	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	04 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13518-B8R9Z6

### 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:

Elspeth McCartney	Speech and language therapist
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 101
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03931

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2001



Maximum learner cohort	Up to 101
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03932

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 change to the 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.

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 23 August 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 Birmingham
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD), Full time Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD), Part time
Date submission received	18 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-13296-K1S8W0

### 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:

Nicola Bowes	Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Forensic psychologist
First intake	01 January 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03748

Programme name	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Forensic psychologist
First intake	01 January 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03749

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 a new programme leader would be appointed 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.

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.

#### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Reason:** The visitor reviewed the evidence provided by the education provider to demonstrate that Caroline Oliver, the new programme leader, was appropriately qualified and experienced. She was satisfied that Caroline Oliver was a suitable person.

However, she did note that Caroline Oliver would be filling the role on a 0.6 FTE basis. It was not clear whether this represented a change (reduction) in the programme leader role and, if it was a change, how the education provider would ensure that there were sufficient resources to support the effectively organisation and delivery of the programme. Therefore the visitor was unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing whether the change of programme leader involved a change in the time commitment requirements of the programme leader role, and if so evidence showing that the education provider will support the programme leader appropriately to fulfil the role.

## 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 23 August 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)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time PgDip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	24 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13158-B6N6G2

### 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:

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 March 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 80
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03660

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

First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03662

Programme name	PgDip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03663

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 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03664

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 the HCPC that they are making changes to the structure, length and positioning of content on the modules for the post-graduate Physiotherapy programmes.

For the undergraduate Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy programmes, the education provider informed the HCPC that they are undergoing a Curriculum Design Framework (CDF) process for all undergraduate programmes, which will result in the changes to the curriculum and assessment on 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.

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 23 August 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	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	28 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-13340-H5Q6H2

### 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 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.

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:

Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Nicola Smith	Physiotherapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 120
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03789

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 noted that it is likely that the learner numbers for the programme will increase to 147 from September 2018 from the HCPC approved numbers of 120.

### 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:** The visitors from their reading of the evidence provided viewed the document on the timetable for teaching clinical skills. From this, the visitors noted that it appeared that two staff members were working for four or five hours consecutively without a break. The visitors were concerned that with the increase in learner numbers there may not be sufficient staff with the relevant experience in place to deliver an effective clinical skills programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that there will be sufficient staff in place who are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver the programme effectively in all settings, including the clinical skills teaching.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates that there are sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme to cope with the increase in learners.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted from their reading of the evidence provided that there had been issues with the availability of space for the learners currently on the programme. From the photographs provided it was not clear if there will be sufficient space to take account of the additional learners coming onto the programme. The visitors were therefore, concerned that the resources to support the additional learners on the programme may not be sufficient. Therefore, the visitors need to see evidence that the teaching spaces for learning are in place to cope with the increase in learner numbers.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates that there is sufficient resources in place to support the increase in learner numbers.

### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that there was no clear indication that with the increase in learner numbers, there would be an increase in practice-based learning areas. In addition, the visitors were unclear if there had been any collaboration with the practice-based educators to determine if there were sufficient placements to cope with the increase of 27 additional learners. Therefore, the visitors were unclear if the programme was being managed effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that details that there are sufficient placements to cope with the increase in learner numbers.

### **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:** The visitors were unclear from their reading of the evidence provided if there will be a sufficient number practice-based learning opportunities to cope with the increase in learners. The visitors were also unclear how the placements will be sustained once the increase in learners is carried over the three years of the programme. Therefore, the visitors need to see evidence that demonstrates that there are sufficient practice placements to cope with the increased number of learners on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates the number of placements available to cope with the increase in learners and what plans are in place to ensure sufficient placements over three years of 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 23 August 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](#).

## 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 noted in the additional documentation sent to respond to the further evidence request that the education provider is looking to have further staff in place in September 2018. The visitors note that this will resolve the long teaching days that are carried out by current staff. To ensure that this is kept under review the visitors would like the education provider to include an update on staffing in the next annual monitoring audit.

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	31 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13398-G2T8Z3

### 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 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.

## 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:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post Graduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03838

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 is increasing the learner numbers 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.

#### **B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**

**Reason:** The visitors considered the evidence provided for this major change. From their reading, the visitors were unclear whether there is sufficient additional staff capacity to cope with the 43% increase in learner numbers notified by the education provider. The documentation provided did not indicate the most up to date roles for the staff teaching and marking the programme. The evidence provided indicates that staff are carrying out other roles on other programmes and therefore the visitors could not see that there is any change in the number of qualified staff or total staff hours to deliver an effective programme. The visitors need further evidence that clearly demonstrates the roles and teaching capacity for this programme to be assured that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clearly demonstrates that there are sufficient staff hours to deliver an effective programme, this could include updated documentation for staff roles.

## 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 23 August 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 Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	29 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-13359-W2M5M9

### 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 .....	9

### 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:

Paula Sobiechowska	Social worker
Graham Noyce	Social worker
Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah	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 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03812

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03813

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03959

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 on 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:** From the visitors' review of the evidence submitted, they noted the education provider's degree apprenticeships webpage. However, on the webpage the visitors were directed to, there was no information regarding the social work degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors were therefore unclear what information would be given to applicants to enable them to make an informed choice about taking up a place of offer on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which demonstrates what information will be made available to potential applicants about the programme, to enable them to make an informed choice about taking up a place of an offer on the programme. This evidence should include information about any costs, arrangements with employers, practice-based learning arrangements and where the programme will be delivered.

### **2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.**

**Reason:** The mapping document states that "evidence of reading, writing and spoken English will be established through the application form and interview". From this statement and the evidence provided the visitors could not determine what criteria and method is used to assess applicants' command of reading, written and spoken English. The evidence did not set out the English-language requirements and therefore the visitors could not make a decision on its appropriateness. The visitors could also not determine how the education provider will support learners who are admitted who do not have the English-language requirements to achieve the standard of proficiency upon successful completion of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of what the English-language requirements are for applicants on their entry to the programme. This evidence must also demonstrate how applicants who are admitted who do not have the English-language requirements will be supported to achieve the standards of proficiency upon successful completion of the programme.

### **2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.**

**Reason:** From the visitors' review of the evidence submitted, they noted the education provider's degree apprenticeships webpage. The visitors also noted in the standards mapping document that "apprentices will be assessed to ensure they are capable of achieving the apprenticeship and level 6 study". However, on the webpage the visitors were directed to, or anywhere else in the submission, there was no information regarding the entry requirements. The visitors were therefore unclear what criteria the education provider will use to offer applicants a place on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of how the admission requirements are appropriate for the level and content of the programme, and how applicants are made aware of the admissions requirements.

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

**Reason:** In the evidence provided there was no information about how the degree apprenticeship route fits into the education provider's business plan. The visitors could therefore not determine if the programme has enough support from the education provider to ensure there will be sufficient resources. The visitors are also unclear how many learners the education provider is planning to recruit to the degree apprenticeship programme, so could not determine whether there will be sufficient resources to support the new learners and learners on the currently approved social work programmes.

**Suggested evidence:**

- Evidence that demonstrates how this programme fits into the education provider's business plan.
- Evidence to demonstrate how the degree apprenticeship programme as well as other social work programmes have sufficient resources to ensure the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose.
- Clarity whether the degree apprenticeship will replace the currently approved work-based learning route or whether it is an additional learning route.
- Clarity of the maximum learner cohort size for the new route and any overall resource impact alongside the delivery of the existing approved programme
- A rationale to support where current arrangements used for the existing approved programme are deemed to be appropriate

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

**Reason:** There was no evidence provided around the number of staff delivering the programme or evidence that the staff are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme. The visitors are unclear how many learners the education provider plans to recruit to the degree apprenticeship programme, so could not determine whether there will be sufficient staff in place to support the delivery of all the social work programmes.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that there will be sufficient staff with the relevant experience, knowledge and expertise to deliver all the social work programmes effectively.

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Reason:** From the evidence provided the education provider has stated that "to effectively manage the learning and teaching resources ...the apprentices will join the full time social work students for lecture style classes, have access to the E-learning resources... Existing resources will be available to the apprentice learners". It also states that "the apprentices will have separate apprentice-only learning and teaching sessions that are tailored to address the uniqueness of the programme and themselves as learners. They will be supported over the whole calendar year both within the

university and whilst in the workplace”. However, in the documentation submitted there was no evidence of what resources would be available to learners beyond these statements, and so the visitors were unable to determine whether they would be sufficient and appropriate to support learning. Additionally the education provider has mentioned that learners will be supported throughout the whole calendar year in all settings. There is no evidence of how the learners will be supported as the education provider recognises that the learners may require a different kind of support. The visitors are unclear how many learners the education provider plans to recruit to the degree apprenticeship programme, so could not determine whether there will be sufficient learning and teaching resources in place to support the delivery of all the social work programmes.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which demonstrates what resources will be available to all learners on the social work programmes and that they are appropriate to deliver the learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

**Reason:** From the evidence provided the education provider has stated that “apprentices will ...have access to the E-learning resources... Existing resources will be available to the apprentice learners”. It also states that “they will be supported over the whole calendar year both within the university and whilst in the workplace”. However, in the documentation submitted there was no evidence of what resources would be available to learners beyond these statements, and so the visitors were unable to determine whether they would be sufficient and appropriate to support learning. The visitors are unclear how many learners the education provider plans to recruit to the degree apprenticeship programme, so could not determine whether there will be sufficient learning resources readily available for all the staff and learners on all the social work programmes.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which demonstrates what resources will be readily available to all learners on the social work programmes. These could include evidence of facilities available to learners and staff.

### **3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.**

**Reason:** The visitors recognise that with the potential increase of learners this may have an impact on the academic and pastoral support offered to learners. From the evidence provided the education provider has stated that learners “will be supported over the whole calendar year both within the university and whilst in the workplace”. However, in the documentation submitted there was no evidence of what resources would be available to learners beyond these statements, and so the visitors were unable to determine whether they would be sufficient and appropriate to support learning. The visitors also note that the learners on the degree apprenticeship programme may require a different type or level of support.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which demonstrates what system of academic and pastoral learner support will be in place and how it will be appropriate to support the learners on the degree apprenticeship route.



#### **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:** From the evidence provided, the visitors reviewed the End Point Assessment module. The visitors noted that the third year modules have been amended to incorporate the end point assessment. However, information about the rest of the modules was not submitted. Therefore, the visitors were unclear what had changed, and could not determine whether the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England will be delivered via the curriculum.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the modules that will be taught in the final year of the apprenticeship programme, how they differ from the currently approved programmes, and that the learning outcomes of the new third year modules enable learners to meet the SOPs for social workers in England.

#### **4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Reason:** The education provider provided a standards of proficiency mapping document, the module descriptor for the End Point Assessment and the programme specification to demonstrate how learners on the degree apprenticeship will undertake the EPA. From the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the degree apprenticeship will be delivered for the following reasons:

- the visitors were unclear when the teaching, assessment and practice-based learning would occur on the programme.
- the handbook states that the apprenticeship programme will be three years and learners will have to complete 120 credits in year one, two and three of the programme, which is the same as the full time learners.
- the documentation also states that apprentices will have to attend taught sessions one day a week.
- the documentation states that learners will learn with peers on the full time route and will also have separate taught sessions to address the uniqueness of the programme.

The visitors were unclear how this programme will be delivered and how it would work in practice and how it will be similar and different to the full time route. The visitors could not determine how the apprenticeship programme is designed to enable learners to meet the standards of proficiency within the timelines highlighted.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how the apprenticeship programme is designed to enable the integration of theory and practice and the achievement of the standards of proficiency within the timeframes highlighted in the documentation. This evidence could include a timetable and / or calendar of how the programme will be delivered to highlight when learners would be required to undertake their theory, assessments and practice-based learning.

#### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Reason:** From the visitors' review of the evidence provided, they could not determine where and when the learners on the apprenticeship programme will undertake their practice-based learning. The mapping document states that "apprentices are required to have learning opportunities within two contrasting settings with at least one focusing on

statutory work...the university will discuss the learning needs of the apprentice with employers and learning agreements will document the arrangements made to ensure appropriate social work activities are provided within the workplace". The visitors however could not determine what the placement structure will be, or the process for securing practice-based learning opportunities for learners that will enable them to achieve the learning outcomes.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the appropriateness of the practice-based learning structure and the process of securing practicing practice-based learning opportunities to enable learners to achieve the learning outcomes.

### **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 the visitors' review of the evidence provided, they could not determine where and when the learners on the apprenticeship programme will undertake their practice-based learning. The mapping document states that "apprentices are required to have learning opportunities within two contrasting settings with at least one focusing on statutory work...the university will discuss the learning needs of the apprentice with employers and learning agreements will document the arrangements made to ensure appropriate social work activities are provided within the workplace". From the documentation it is clear learners will have to undertake 170 practice hours from two contrasting practice-based learning areas. The visitors however could not determine the range of practice-based learning opportunities that would be available to learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of where and when learners will undertake their practice-based learning and how the education provider will guarantee a range of practice-based learning opportunities appropriate to achieve the standards of proficiency.

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

**Reason:** From the information provided the visitors were unclear on what the practice-based learning arrangements are, and what the role of the practice educators will be. The visitors note that the learners will undertake their practice-based learning within their workplace. The visitors note that there could be potential issues such as learners' ability to raise concerns about their practice-based learning within their workplace. Therefore, the visitors could not determine whether the practice-based learning environment will provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating how learners practice setting will provide a safe and supportive environment for learners.

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

**Reason:** From the visitors' review of the evidence provided, they could not determine where and when the learners on the apprenticeship programme will undertake their practice-based learning and therefore could not determine whether these settings will have an adequate number of qualified staff to support learning.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support learning.

**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:** From the evidence provided, the visitors reviewed the End point assessment (EPA) module. The visitors noted that the third year modules have been amended to incorporate the EPA. However, information about the rest of the modules was not submitted. Therefore, the visitors were unclear what had changed and could not determine how the assessment strategy and design will be changed for the third year. The visitors could also not determine how this would impact on learners' ability to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England upon successful completion of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of how the modules the final year of the apprenticeship programme will be assessed, how it differs from the currently approved programmes and that the assessment of the new third year modules ensures that learners who successfully complete the programme has met the SOPs for social workers in England.

**6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Reason:** From the evidence provided the visitors could not determine who will be assessing the learners work whilst they are on practice. The visitors note that there may be issues with the assessment of learners within the practice-based learning environment as learners undertake their practice within their workplace. This could be an issue for learners who wish to raise concerns about the practice or appeal their practice assessment for the fear of being penalised. The visitors could not determine what mechanisms will be adopted to ensure that the assessment is fair and objective within the practice environment.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating who will be supervising, supporting and assessing learners whilst they are on their practice-based learning experience. The evidence should include the mechanisms which will be adopted to ensure that the assessment is fair and object within the practice environment.

## 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 23 August 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	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	08 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13449-C8Q1S1

### 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:

Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 April 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 28
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03879

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 made changes that will change how curriculum, placement and assessment activity will operate.

### 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 23 August 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	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Part time
Date submission received	11 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13277-J3W8B0

### 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
Nicola Smith	Physiotherapist
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 130
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03734

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist



First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03735

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 highlighted that they would like to run a Degree Apprenticeship programme in Physiotherapy. In order to assess the Degree Apprenticeship the visitors assessed the programme against the standards and considered the impact of the Degree Apprenticeship on the currently approved Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy 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 23 August 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	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Work based learning
Date submission received	11 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-13333-G3J6K5

### 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:

Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03783

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 use their existing work based learning BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme as a Degree Apprenticeship route.

### 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 23 August 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	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) in Social Work, WBL (Work based learning)
Date submission received	11 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13341-G2P5H0

### 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:

Gary Dicken	Social worker
Michael Branicki	Social worker
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03790

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 use their existing work based learning BA (Hons) in Social Work programme as a Degree Apprenticeship route.

### 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.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that the partnership arrangement in place for the degree apprenticeship will ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff available at practice placement setting. The visitors noted in the SETs mapping document (SET 5.6), the statement following 'not applicable (no changes made in this area)' and as such, no evidence was submit to demonstrate how this standard will continue to be met. Given the model of training, the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that there will be adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff available at practice placement setting

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff available at practice placement setting.

## 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 23 August 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 Derby
Name of programme(s)	MA Dramatherapy, University of Derby, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	21 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13413-N5M6N3

### 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:

Clare Hubbard	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Dramatherapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03844

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 overall professional responsibility lead for the programme mentioned above.

### 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 23 August 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 Derby
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy, Full time PG Dip Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	22 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13551-M2V0X1

### 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:

Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03960

Programme name	PG Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 August 2017

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03971

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 change in the person with overall professional 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.

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 23 August 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 Dundee
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9), Part time
Date submission received	28 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13538-Q2R5F9

### 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 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.

## 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 Rovardi	Independent prescriber
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03942

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing



	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03943

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03944

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03945

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continue to meet our standards, following changes 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 the HCPC of a change to the person who has overall professional responsibility 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: 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 23 August 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)	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time Pg Dip Dietetics (Pre-Registration), Full time MSc Dietetics, Full time MSc Dietetics, Part time
Date submission received	17 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13445-T5X0S4

### 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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Tracy Clephan	Dietitian
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03874

Programme name	Pg Dip Dietetics (Pre-Registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian

First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03875

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 December 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03876

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 December 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03878

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 changed the persons with overall responsibility for the programmes. There has also been a change of external examiner who is not on any register so needed review.

### 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 23 August 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)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	18 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13520-D0T4Q5

### 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:

Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03933

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 change in the management 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: 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 23 August 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 Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	12 January 2018
Case reference	CAS-13044-D3F9G0

### 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:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03279

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2005

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03601

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 were making changes to some modules and to the assessment strategy.

### 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.

The additional documentation request below applies to the physiotherapy programme only.

#### **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.**

- 4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**
- 4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.**
- 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.**
- 6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document and the documents submitted alongside the mapping. The documentation appeared to note a number of changes to the programme, including changes to learning outcomes and practice-based learning. However, the visitors were not able to see in the documentation a clear explanation of what would be involved in these changes. They noted that the SETs mapping document submitted with the documentation and did not appear to address several of the changes that were being made, including those identified in the major change notification form, and also that a SOPs document had not been submitted, which would have been useful in helping them assess changes to learning outcomes and assessment methods. They were unable to determine the nature of the changes to the physiotherapy programme, and therefore could not make a judgment about whether the changes planned would affect its ability to meet the standards of education and training.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider should submit a SETs mapping document clearly laying out all the planned changes to the programme, and clearly signposting the visitors to evidence demonstrating how the physiotherapy programme will continue to meet the standards. This should include the education provider clarifying whether or not they are making changes to admissions and practice-based learning. If there have been changes to learning outcomes and assessment methods that may affect learners' ability to meet the standards of proficiency, the education provider should also submit a SOPs mapping document which will enable the visitors to assess these 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 23 August 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)	Allied Health Professional Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, Part time Allied Health Professional Independent and Supplementary Prescribing Level 7 Part time
Date submission received	11 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13571-S3W2C8

### 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 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.

## 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:

Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Allied Health Professional Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03935

Programme name	Allied Health Professional Independent and Supplementary Prescribing Level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04025

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.

Changes have been made to the assessments for the level 6 programme. Also, the education provider wishes to deliver this programme at level 7 and therefore wants us to approve the new level 7 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 23 August 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	London Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Name of programme(s)	Paramedic Programme, Work based learning
Date submission received	09 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13392-J2K9W7

### 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
Tristan Henderson	Paramedic
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Paramedic Programme
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 October 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	MC03836

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 to address a shortfall in front-line paramedics and to enhance their programme they wish to increase learner numbers from 54 to 108 by increasing the number of cohorts from 3 to 6 per year. The education provider also intends to deliver this programme from one location rather than a number of locations

**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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors read the documentation to evidence the proposed change. From their reading of the evidence provided, they could not identify that there were sufficient appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme for the increased numbers of learners proposed for this programme. Therefore, visitors need to see further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient staff to deliver an effective programme for the increased number of learners for this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates that there are the staff in place to deliver an effective programme for the increase number of learners.

- 3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**
- 3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**
- 3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Reason:** The visitors read the documentation for the proposed increase in learner numbers for the programme. The visitors were unable to identify within the evidence provided that there will be sufficient physical resources available for the increased number of learners, especially as the teaching will now take place on the main teaching site rather than across several teaching sites as it had been previously. Therefore, the visitors need evidence that clearly demonstrates the resources that will be in place to support the increase learner numbers in all settings to deliver an effective programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clearly identifies all of the resources that will be available to take account of the increase numbers of learners entering the programme.

- 5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**
- 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:** The visitors read the documentation concerning how practice placements will now operate on the one site. However, the visitors could not determine from the information provided if there would be sufficient placements in place to cope with the increase in learner numbers including the non-ambulance placements. The visitors could not see how placements would be managed and supported to cope with the increase in learner numbers. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence that demonstrates that there will be sufficient practice placement areas in place to ensure that there are a sufficient number of placements for the increase in additional learners for the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient placements for the increase in learners.

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

**Reason:** As with SET 3.5, the visitors from reading the evidence provided could not determine if there would be sufficient experienced and qualified staff available to teach an increased number of learners. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that clearly demonstrates there is sufficient staffing for all practice placement settings to meet the placement needs of the increase in learner numbers.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clearly demonstrates that there are sufficient appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver placements to the increased learner numbers.

## 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 23 August 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	Liverpool Hope University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	15 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13514-G7J7S2

### 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:

Patricia Cartney	Social worker
Shaista Ahmad	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 November 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03922

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 Scott Massie now has overall professional responsibility for the programme mentioned above.

### 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 23 August 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	London South Bank University
Name of programme(s)	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Work based learning
Date submission received	05 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13542-H1P3S4

### 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:

Vicki Lawson-Brown	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Dip 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 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03948

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03949

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 change to the person with overall responsibility 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: 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 23 August 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)	MSc (Pre-Registration) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	26 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13394-M9G2B8

### 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:

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Aileen Patterson	Speech and language therapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc (Pre-Registration) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03837

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 is making changes to the admissions for the programme and changing aspects of the curriculum and assessment 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: 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 23 August 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	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	30 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13462-Y9J0T3

### 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:

Patricia Higham	Social worker
Sheila Skelton	Social worker
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 85
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03887

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 Rosanne Cooper now has overall professional responsibility for the programme mentioned above.

### 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 23 August 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	The University of Northampton
Name of programme(s)	Supplementary and Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Part time
Date submission received	18 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13508-W7D8P8

### 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 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.

## 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 Rovardi	Independent prescriber
Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Supplementary and Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
First intake	01 August 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03906

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 the HCPC that the programme will be delivered at a new site, as the education provider is moving to a new site entirely.

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

**Reason:** In the SETs mapping document provided, the education provider included a statement from Steve O’Brien, the Dean of Faculty of Health and Society. The statement is used to demonstrate support from the Faculty for the move to the new campus. However, the visitors note that this is not a signed statement – and that the education provider has not shown any formal support such a signed statement or business plan. As such, the visitors could not determine that the programme continues to have a secure place in the education provider’s business plan. Therefore, the visitors require further information in order to determine whether this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence to demonstrate that the programme does have a secure place in the education provider’s business plan, such as a signed statement from the Dean of Faculty of Health and Society.

**B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Reason:** In the SETs mapping document, the education provider states that the learning resources, including IT facilities will be significantly upgraded as a result of moving to the new campus. The education provider submitted information on the library and learning services, IT services and the 'Interactive Learning Environment'. From the information provided, the visitors could not see any information in relation to facilities such as seminar rooms, lecture theatres and classrooms. As such, the visitors could not determine if the size or number of rooms would be adequate in relation to the number of learners on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information in order to determine whether the learning resources will continue to be appropriate to the curriculum and be readily available to learners and staff.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence to demonstrate adequate numbers and accessibility of learning facilities (such a seminar rooms, lecture theatres etc.).

## 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 23 August 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 Nottingham
Name of programme(s)	MA in Social Work, Full time MA in Social Work, Work based learning PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Work based learning BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	19 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-13357-J4P0G3

### 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:

Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Anne Mackay	Social worker
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03808

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 4
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03809

Programme name	PG Diploma in 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 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03810

Programme name	PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 3
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03830

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 32
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03841

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 there will be a standardisation of the credit-weighting module for this programme. From September 2018 onward, the standard credit weighing will be 20 credits. As a result, the current approved curriculum, which is based on 15-credit module, will be changed to accommodate the 20 credit requirements.

### 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.

**3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** From a review of the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted that the programme team have removed the ‘service user perspective’ module and replaced this with other broader involvement in the programme. From this statement, the visitors were unable to determine what constitute as ‘border involvement’ given that the ‘service user perspective’ module has been removed from the programme. In order to determine that this standard continues to be met, the visitors require further evidence demonstrating how service users and carer are involved in the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers will be trained and supported.

**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 23 August 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	The Open University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Honours) Social Work (England), Distance learning BA (Honours) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship, Work based Learning
Date submission received	01 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13164-G5N0Y8

### 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 Gribbens	Social worker
David Childs	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Honours) Social Work (England)
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 260
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03668

Programme name	BA (Honours) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 February 2019
Maximum learner cohort	100
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03873

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 intends to introduce a social work degree apprenticeship programme. The new programme will be based on the currently approved BA (Honours) Social Work (England) programme but with some differences. These include the funding options available to applicants and the introduction of an end point assessment in place of the optional module of the same credit value.

### 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 23 August 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	Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust
Validating body	University of Oxford
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin Psych), Full time
Date submission received	19 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13585-L1Z8F1

### 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:

Gary Robinson	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin Psych)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 2000
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03977

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 of a change to the person with overall responsibility 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.

<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 23 August 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 Salford
Name of programme(s)	MA in Social Work, Part time
Date submission received	25 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13544-J4Q2Q7

### 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:

Michael Branicki	Social worker
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03950

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 the HCPC of a change to the named person with overall responsibility 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.

<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 23 August 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	St George's University of London and Kingston University
Validating body	St George's, University of London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	18 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13429-H6Y1X6

### 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:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Joanna Goodwin	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 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03852

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 is intending to double its student numbers from 20 (approved HCPC numbers) to 40.

**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 programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.**

**Reason:** The visitors, from reading the documentation provided noted that there was no evidence that there had been any feedback from current learners, external examiners or practice based educators since the programme started running in September 2017. The visitors were therefore unclear if these groups had been consulted on the increase in learner numbers for the programme as part of the programme monitoring and evaluation processes. The visitors need to see evidence that such measures have been taken as part of the review of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates that feedback from learners , external examiners and practice based educators to show that the programme has been monitored and evaluated appropriately.

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

**Reason:** From their reading of the documentation provided, the visitors could see that there had been an increase in a further member of staff to teach on the programme. The visitors also read that the education provider plans to run separate seminars for the increase in learner numbers. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider intended to manage the running of two seminars to cope with the increase of learner numbers. Therefore, the visitors need to see further evidence that demonstrates how the staffing for the programme will be managed to ensure there continues to be an adequate number of staff in place for the number of learners on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates how the increase in learner numbers will be managed across the programme so that the visitors can be assured that there are sufficient staff in place to deliver the programme.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the resource document provided as evidence for this change. This document was dated 2016, therefore the visitors were unclear as to whether the document has been revised to take account of the increase in learners for the programme. The visitors need to see evidence of how the education provider plans to manage all the resources for the programme including rooms to meet the demands of additional learners for the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that clearly indicates there are sufficient resources to support the learning of learners in all settings, especially rooming.

### **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:** The visitors could not see from their reading of the documentation that additional practice placement areas had been sourced to ensure that there are sufficient placements for the increase in learner numbers. The visitors could not see how the education provider intended to manage the increase in learner numbers across the three years of the programme. The visitors therefore, need further evidence that demonstrates that there are a sufficient number and diversity of practice placement areas to cope with the increase of learners as the programme progresses year on year.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that there will be sufficient practice placements for the increase in learner numbers across all years of 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 23 August 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)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	16 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13617-X5M6L7

### 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
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03989

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 about the change of the programme leader. Julie Walters who was initially the programme leader will be replaced by Colette Beecher from now onwards.

### 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 23 August 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 Sussex
Name of programme(s)	MA in Social Work, FT (Full time) PG Dip in Social Work, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	27 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13563-B0D3J2

### 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:

Graham Noyce	Social worker
Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 May 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03968

Programme name	PG Dip in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 August 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03999

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 introduce a PG Dip in Social Work at the point of admissions. This programme would run in addition to the current approved exit award for the MA in Social Work programme, where a learner would be awarded a PG Dip in Social Work (Masters exit route only) if they failed or did not complete the dissertation.

### 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 23 August 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)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Full time
Date submission received	09 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-13367-Z0Q2Z9

### 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:

Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 58
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03822

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 is looking to send two learners to a practice placement in Norway as part of the ERASMUS project. The learners will undertake this hospital – based practice based learning element in place of a final year practice based learning element in the United Kingdom.

**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:** The visitors read the documentation for this change and noted that two final year learners will complete a 14 week placement in a Norwegian health or social care setting approved by the University in Tromso. The education provider has planned for the provision of one hospital based placement providing a range of radiology services. The specifics of this placement will be aligned with learners’ preference and individual portfolio of required experience. However, it is unclear to the visitors what range of

radiology services are available at University Hospital Tromso, and if the learners will need to go to other hospitals in order to achieve the learning outcomes.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the range of radiology services and placements available that will enable the learners to achieve the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency when based in Norway.

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

**5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the submission states that two named staff at University Hospital Tromso will select experienced practice educators (PEs) and fully brief them in the education providers programme placement requirements, and that the PEs will attend a briefing of the placement regulations prior to the placement start. It is unclear to the visitors what preparation and training the Norwegian Clinical PEs will have / have had regarding the education provider's clinical practice 'scheme', assessment processes, and also the experience of those supervisors.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the processes to train and prepare the Norway based PEs for their role in the delivery of the learning outcomes of the education provider's radiography 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 23 August 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)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	04 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13444-N3M1P5

### 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	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03871

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 noted that the learner numbers for the programme has increased to 65 from September 2017 from the HCPC approved numbers of 45.

### 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:** The visitors on reading the evidence provided noted that learner numbers are to increase from 45 to 65 per year. However, it was not clear from the evidence provided if there would be an increase in staffing to ensure that there will be sufficient experienced and qualified staff in place to deliver the programme given the increase learner numbers. Additionally, the evidence on staffing provided does not indicate the roles for each staff member within the team to indicate that the staffing role had increased or changed because of the increase in learner numbers. Therefore, the visitors are unclear what additional staff resource has been put in place and whether these will be sufficient to deliver an effective programme. The visitors require further evidence that details the roles of the staff and where the increase in staffing is to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the education providers planning process to ensure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff will continue to be in place to deliver the programme effectively given the increase in learner numbers.

## **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:** The visitors read the evidence provided by the education provider to review how the education provider will provide additional placements for the additional learners. Based on the information provided it was not clear whether the number and range of placements would be appropriate and sufficient to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of learning outcomes. The visitors were unclear whether there would be sufficient places year on year to cope with the increase in learner numbers. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence that shows how the placements for the increased learners will be sufficient to achieve the learning outcomes for the programme and how placements will work year on year.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of how the education provider makes sure learners have access to an appropriate range of practice-based learning experiences, which reflect the nature, and the range of practice settings of occupational therapy. This evidence could also include a diagram illustrating placement occurrence

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

**Reason:** On reading the evidence provided, it is not clear to the visitors whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in the practice settings to supervise the increased learner numbers. The education provider did provide some evidence about liaison with practice providers. However, the visitors need further evidence to demonstrate that there are sufficient qualified and experienced practice based educators to cope with the increased number of learners on placements as the visitors could not determine that there are sufficient placement educators for the increase in learner numbers.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the education provider's strategy to ensure that there are sufficient practice based educators in place to meet the increase in learners 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 23 August 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 Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	05 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13455-B7P7G6

### 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:

David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03883

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 stated that they are introducing newly designed modules in year 1, year 2 and year 4. Year 3 modules remain unchanged.

### 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 23 August 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 Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing Programme, Part time Non Medical Prescribing Programme, Part time
Date submission received	20 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-13534-X1N1D6

### 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 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.



## 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:

Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing Programme
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC03939

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing Programme
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing

First intake	01 February 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03940

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 advised us of a change of person with overall responsibility 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: 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 23 August 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)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	23 July 2018
Case reference	CAS-13638-P8H3R8

### 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:

Beverley Blythe	Social worker
Patricia Cartney	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 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04002

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 decided to reduce the assessment burden for a module in the programme after learner feedback. This change will reduce the number of assessments for the learning outcomes of the course

### 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 23 August 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](#).