

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | Birmingham City University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time |
| Date submission received | 09 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15956-R1Y4X0 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Kenneth Street | Paramedic |
| Paul Bates | Paramedic |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| First intake | 01 September 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04574 |

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 they are reapproving the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science provision. This provision will include a route onto the programme from year two for clinicians who already hold Associate Ambulance Practitioner (AAP), Institute of Healthcare Development (IHCD) technician and Combat Medical Technician (CMT) 1 qualifications. The modules and programme have been restructured in terms of delivery to minimise the number of cohorts in both clinical practice and theory at the same time. The programme has also introduced a new practice partnership, with West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS) NHS University Trust replacing East Midlands Ambulance Service. The programme will adopt the practice assessment document used within WMAS.

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.

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

Reason: To meet this Standard, the visitors were made aware that the education provider has entered into a new practice partnership with West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS) NHS University Trust. The visitors were also informed that WMAS holds a mentor register. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider maintains responsibility for the governance and quality assurance of practice-based learning, and has effective systems and processes in place to support this. The visitors therefore need further evidence that there is enough appropriately qualified and

experienced staff for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning, and that the education provider maintains responsibility for this.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to submit further information that there is enough appropriately qualified and experienced staff for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning, and how they maintain responsibility for this.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To meet this Standard, the visitors were made aware that the education provider has entered into a new practice partnership with West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS) NHS University Trust. The visitors were also informed that WMAS holds a mentor register. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider maintains responsibility for the governance and quality assurance of practice-based learning, and has effective systems and processes in place to support this. The visitors therefore need further evidence about how the education provider makes sure that practice educators are suitable and able to support and develop learners in a safe and effective way, and maintains responsibility for this.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to submit further information about how they make sure that practice educators are suitable and able to support and develop learners in a safe and effective way, and how they maintain responsibility for this.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: To meet this Standard, the visitors were made aware that the education provider has entered into a new practice partnership with West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS) NHS University Trust. The visitors were also informed that the WMAS virtual learning environment provides regular mentor updates. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider maintains responsibility for the governance and quality assurance of practice-based learning, and has effective systems and processes in place to support this. The visitors therefore need further evidence about how the education provider makes sure practice educators undertake regular training so they are appropriately prepared to support learning and assess learners effectively.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to submit further information about how they make sure practice educators undertake regular training so they are appropriately prepared to support learning and assess learners effectively, and how they maintain responsibility for this.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Lincoln |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time |
| Date submission received | 22 January 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15927-H3G2X7 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Gemma Howlett | Paramedic |
| Matthew Catterall | Paramedic |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| First intake | 01 September 2018 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04571 |

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 will be introducing a new programme titled Certificate of Higher Education (Cert HE) Ambulance Clinical Technician. Furthermore, the education provider will be opening the option for additional learners to take part in the third year of the programme to ‘top-up’ previous qualifications to BSc level. While these programmes do not lead to HCPC registration, they will share resources, particularly staff and placements that are currently utilised by the HCPC approved programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: The education provider submitted documents to show that the introduction of the certificate of higher education (Cert HE) will require additional teaching resources and staffing. The education provider highlighted the resources and staffing that will be required but did not highlight when these would be acquired. As the additional learners will be sharing teaching during their first year, they will be drawing on the existing pool of resources and teaching staff. While the visitors can see that the education provider has identified the relevant resources and staffing increases, they were not made aware of a time frame for implementing them. As the education provider has not indicated that these resources and staff will definitely be in place in time for the start of the Cert HE programme they noted that both programmes would have to rely on the current pool of resources. As the education provider has indicated the current pool of resources is insufficient for effective delivery of both programmes. If the programmes cannot be

delivered without these resources and staff in place the programme is not sustainable or fit for purpose. The education provider must show how they will ensure that these resources and staff will be in place in time for the additional learners starting the programme, for all learners to meet their learning needs.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that teaching and staffing resources will be appropriately in place in time for the start of the Cert HE programme.

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

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document the education provider indicated they are proposing that those staff deemed as competent by EMAS in the competencies covered in the first year of the programme, and who are permitted to use these competencies in their day to day work, can sign off individual competencies in the Clinical Assessment Portfolio for first year students only. The visitors were not clear how they would be prepared and supported by the education provider to assess learners. The education provider also provided information around how practice educators are trained but this information did not state that these additional staff would be included in this. This meant the visitors could not determine the specific role of these additional staff involved in assessment for year 1 learners. The documentation suggests that these staff are not undertaking the same role as practice educators. The education provider must clarify the role of these members of staff. They must also ensure that learners are being supported in year 1 appropriately by members of staff that are appropriately qualified, experienced, have relevant knowledge and skills to support effective and safe learning. They must also clarify how these members of staff are appropriately trained and continuously supported to be involved in practice assessment.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the staff deemed competent by EMAS for assessing year 1 learners in assessment are appropriately qualified and experienced.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Liverpool |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 19 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15934-Q5G3B7 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Joanna Goodwin | Occupational therapist |
| Joanne Stead | Occupational therapist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 January 1998 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 54 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04573 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes identified 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 to the curriculum with new programme learning outcomes. The modules (name and form), the assessment strategy and the content have also been updated.

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | London South Bank University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Apprenticeship, Work based learning |
| Date submission received | 20 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-16013-M9H2H8 |

Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details | 2 |
| 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:

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Alexander Harmer | Operating department practitioner |
| Joanne Thomas | Operating department practitioner |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Operating department practitioner |
| First intake | 01 September 2012 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04590 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice Apprenticeship |
| Mode of study | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession | Operating department practitioner |
| First intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04620 |

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 proposing to introduce a degree apprenticeship programme, starting in September 2020. This will be delivered alongside the existing BSc (Hons) provision but will comprise a significant proportion of work-based learning.

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | The University of Northampton |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Apprenticeship Route, Full time |
| Date submission received | 27 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-16120-X1Q0C8 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|------------------------|
| Claire Brewis | Occupational therapist |
| Jane Grant | Occupational therapist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Apprenticeship Route |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04649 |

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 increase its learners up to 15 per cohort, from the currently approved numbers of 10 learners per cohort. The education provider has confirmed that current teaching staff and practice educators will be providing the necessary support to accommodate this change.

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | Oxford Brookes University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Flexible |
| Date submission received | 02 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-16009-P6N7P2 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Gemma Howlett | Paramedic |
| Susan Boardman | Paramedic |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| First intake | 01 September 2016 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04585 |

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science |
| Mode of study | FLX (Flexible) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| First intake | 01 September 2016 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04586 |

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 proposing changes to the programmes, following a review of the curriculum, to ensure they remain current for modern paramedic practice.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Reason: Through their documentary review, the visitors were able to identify the education provider's process for learners to obtain appropriate consent from service

users in practice-based learning. However, they noted that there was no evidence that demonstrated how consent would be obtained from both service users and learners when they take part as service users themselves in practical and clinical teaching. As such, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures learners respect individuals' rights and that they understand what will be expected of them as regulated health and care professionals. The visitors therefore require further information on how appropriate consent is obtained from both service users and learners before they can determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating the education provider's process for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners when they take part as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | Queen Margaret University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Music Therapy, Full time, MSc Art Psychotherapy (International), Full time MSc Art Psychotherapy (International), Part time |
| Date submission received | 01 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-16089-M8G8F6 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Janek Dubowski | Arts therapist - Art therapist |
| Rosie Axon | Arts therapist - Music therapist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Music Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Music therapy |
| First intake | 01 September 2015 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04625 |

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Art Psychotherapy (International) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Art therapy |
| First intake | 01 September 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04632 |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Art Psychotherapy (International) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Art therapy |
| First intake | 01 September 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04633 |

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 had proposed to change all module credit weightings for this programme from 30 to 20 credits each and integrate research methods into all modules. Other changes includes having three modules taught collaboratively with other health related programmes and changes to some of the module assessments.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

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

HCPC major change process report

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

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

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

Section 2: Programme details

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

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

HCPC major change process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Suffolk |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time |
| Date submission received | 22 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-16143-J5R7G5 |

| | |
|--|---|
| 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:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Mark Widdowfield | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Linda Mutema | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 78 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | MC04659 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes identified 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 indicated they have increased their learner numbers and will increase further due to increased availability of practice-based learning. We have a record of 42 learners per year for this programme, but the education provider has increased this in a phased way resulting in a cohort of 78 from September 2020.

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