

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences), Full time BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS), Full time BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS), Part time
Date submission received	02 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15822-X8K7S4

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	7

### 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:

Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Sara C Smith	Biomedical scientist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04523

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04524

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04525

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04526

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04551

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04552

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 replace the four existing BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences – Life Sciences programmes, with a new single programme title ‘BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS)’. The new BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS) programme will be a co-terminus degree award programme, which will allow learners on the existing IBMS accredited BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme. to transfer on to this programme at the end of year two, after which they will have to do a twelve month practice-based learning placement during their third year. Additionally,

the education provider has proposed to revise the practice-based learning and module learning outcomes for this 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.

#### **3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.**

**Reason:** The education provider has proposed making changes by developing a new co-terminus degree award programme. The changes also include transferring learners from the existing four BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences – Life Sciences programmes, to the new programme which will involve a twelve month practice-based learning placement during their third year. This will include support from practice-based learning to accommodate learners for a 48 week placement. From reviewing the documents submitted for this major change, the visitors noted the last set of ‘BMS advisory minutes’, showing collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers, was for December 2018. Though there was nothing mapped for this standard as the education provider stated no changes made to this standard. However, without any further evidence or information provided the visitors could not determine if there has been any more formal communication since December 2018. From this, the visitors could not ensure ongoing support from the local NHS trusts for the proposed changes to the programme. It was also not clear if aspects such as availability and capacity of practice-based learning have been discussed in the last year. Due to this, the visitors

could not determine if this standard has been met as it could not be established whether there has been regular collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers to discuss the proposed changes.

**Suggested evidence:** Information or document demonstrating regular collaboration has taken place between the education provider and practice education providers to confirm discussions or support for the proposed changes to the programme. As per the requirement of this standard, the education provider must also clarify if and how regular and ongoing collaboration will take place.

### **3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.**

**Reason:** From reviewing the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors noted the education provide mentioned the close proximity of communication between the Placement Education Facilitators (PEFs) within the NHS Trusts and the Programme Leader, to ensure provision of placements for all learners on the existing four BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences) programmes. The evidence also mentioned the bi-annual Biomedical Science Advisory Board meeting, which consisted of discussions regarding practice-based learning provisions.

From reviewing the "Appendix 7" document, the visitors noted under 'section 2.2 Applied Research Project' that learners will be on day release' to carry out finishing their final year project within the workplace. The visitors were not clear if the day release means learners will be at the practice-based learning setting once a week in the final year to complete this project. From this, the visitors were not clear if and how, capacity and availability for the final year learners completing this project has been determined. Without seeing any further collaboration of evidence beyond December 2018 minutes between the education provider and practice education providers, the visitors were not sure if there have been discussions to consider how capacity of leaners doing their project in the final year will be looked at in addition to supporting learners who will be on the 48 week placement. Due to this, the visitors were not sure if all learners doing the 48 week placement and the final year project will have access to practice-based learning at the same time. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must clarify:

- what does 'day release' for final project year learners mean and the number of days/length of time they will need access to practice-based learning to complete the project; and
- how capacity and availability of practice-based learning will be determined to accommodate learners on the 48 week placement and those doing the final year project.

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

**Reason:** For this standard, the education provider stated in the mapping document that the learning outcomes for the new 12 month placement are simply an amalgamation of those on the "Life Science placement" to help in supporting the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs). From reviewing the

submission, the visitors noted in “Appendix 3” document on page eight, it was stated that the education provider will undertake two placement visits per year to ensure that learner’ performance is progressing satisfactorily and to ensure that learners are receiving the necessary training as required.

From this, the visitors were not clear regarding what form of communication will take place between the learners, practice education providers and the education provider in between the two regular mentioned visits. It was also not clear to the visitors how it is ensured that support is provided to learners before or after the visit. Additionally, it was also not clear from the documentation provided if and what kind of support and assistance will be provided to learners who will be on the new 12 month placement. Due to no clarity on how learners will progress at the practice-based learning, the visitors could not determine how will this help in achieving the learning outcomes and the SOPs. Therefore, the visitors could not judge how the structure and duration of practice-based learning will support learners in achieving the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must provide clarity and information:

- demonstrating what form of communication will take place between the learners, practice education providers and education providers, before and after the regular visits carried out by the education provider;
- how learners on 12 months placements receive support as they will be most likely away from the education provider; and
- how it is ensured that progress at the practice-based learning will provide support to learners in achieving the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

**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:** From reviewing the “Appendix 3” document, the visitors noted it was a list of “assessors”. The list included the assessors’ names, relevant discipline, hospital name and whether they are trained but not yet verified. From seeing this list, the visitors could not determine on who “assessors” actually are. It was not clear if they are staff working in the practice-based learning who are responsible for delivering and assessing learners or whether they are learners taking the required level of competence on this programme. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if there will be adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Additionally, from reviewing the “Appendix 9” document the visitors noted there will be an Applied Research Project to be undertaken within the practice-based learning. If this is not available, then learners will complete a laboratory-based project within the education provider’s premises. Without seeing any further information, the visitors could not determine if this topic has been discussed between the education provider and practice-education provider. Additionally, it has been mentioned under condition for SET 3.5 where the visitors could not seeing any further information regarding collaboration

between the education provider and practice education provider. Due to this, the visitors could not judge if the practice educators will have the relevant knowledge and skills to provide support to learners on the Applied Research Project in the practice-based learning.

As stated regarding "Appendix 3" document, the visitors were not clear regarding the roles of assessors'. From this document, the visitors noted the 'Trained but not yet verified' column as blank against some of the named individuals. Due to this, it was not clear how the programme ensures every named individual is made to do the required training and how the records are updated. Additionally, the visitors could not see any information in other relevant submissions regarding how and if any logs are kept or maintained with regards to training of practice educators. Due to this, it was not possible to judge if and when practice educators undertake regular training, which will be appropriate and help in providing support to learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must provide information or documentation:

- clarifying who are the 'Assessors' and what is their role in the context of this programme;
- demonstrating what steps or communication has taken place to ensure there will be enough and sufficient practice educators to provide support to learners, for the Applied Research Project;
- demonstrating if practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to provide support to learners undertaking the Applied Research Project at their practice-based learning place; and
- how is it ensured practice educators undertake regular training appropriate to their role for this programme. Additionally, is there a log or record of the practice educator training maintained.

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