

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Liverpool
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma (PGDIP) Therapeutic Radiography & Oncology, Full time
Date submission received	08 July 2020
Case reference	CAS-16134-H1D5J9

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:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Amy Taylor	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma (PGDIP) Therapeutic Radiography & Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 January 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04738

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 introducing a new programme (Post Graduate Diploma (PGDIP) Therapeutic Radiography & Oncology) to replace their existing PGDip Radiotherapy programme starting from January 2021.

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.

6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence provided for this standard, including the programme specification and the Assessment guidance document. The visitors also reviewed the education provider’s Code of Practice on Assessment. Throughout their review, the visitors were unable to identify details of the assessment policies that clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme, as this was not provided. The visitors also noted that there was no statement that all modules must be passed and are none compensatory. They noted that the module descriptors do not convey this information; some indicate that they are non-elective although this is not indicated on all of the descriptors. On some of the modules, for instance Radiotherapy

Theory and Clinical Practice 3 (HEAD, NECK & THORAX) (RADT 724), the visitors noted the statement “progression: by the end of the academic year in order to progress all learners must meet the minimum clinical competency requirements of the PGDIP Therapeutic Radiography & Oncology programme.” The visitors noted this statement could be misleading to learners and could indicate that the academic component does not need to be passed for progression. Therefore, the visitors require that the education makes clear within the assessment policies, specific requirements for progression and achievement.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to ensure that learners understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme and how these policies are clearly communicated to both learners and educators.

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 September 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](#).