

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Chester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time MSc Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	01 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-13120-C7T9P1

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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03645

Programme name	Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03646

Programme name	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03647

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 BSc (Hons) was reducing in length from four to three years, and there were changes to assessment, practice-based learning and curriculum for the MSc and the PgDip.

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 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	MA Art Therapy, Full time MA Art Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	19 December 2017
Case reference	CAS-12983-N0B8K1

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	6

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:

John Crossfield	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Art Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03570

Programme name	MA Art Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03571

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 reported that they will be making changes to programme admissions, curriculum, practice placements and assessment.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors noted that the programme specification contained details around the admissions process for learners. The visitors noted that there were inaccuracies contained within the documentation regarding HCPC

requirements. For example, it indicates in the programme specification that successful completion of the programme gives the learner entitlement to register with the HCPC. However, this is not accurate as successful completion of the programme gives the learner the eligibility to 'apply for registration' with the HCPC. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the documentation has been amended to reflect the correct information:

- art therapy is not a state registered profession, the profession and programme is approved by the HCPC;
- completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC rather than entitlement to register; and
- The HCPC do not require qualified art therapists to register with the British Association of Art Therapists (BAAT) as a full member.

Suggested evidence: Amended documentation with the accurate information that is available to prospective and enrolled learners.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors noted that learners will now undertake "self-initiated" and "supervised global" placements in their final year. The visitors were unable to determine what the self-initiated and supervised global placement" entailed and how this would ensure that learners are able to experience a range of learning experiences which can sufficiently develop all aspects of their professional practice. Specifically, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the supervised global and self-initiated placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the programme learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate that the self-initiated and supervised global placements contribute to a range of practice placements appropriate to the profession.

5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors identified that learners can undertake a self-initiated placement in the second and final year of the programme rather than being allocated one. The education provider mentioned in the major change notification form that learners will be encouraged to take part in supervised global and self-initiated placements however in the documentation provided there was no evidence of this. As such, the visitors require further information to ascertain whether the supervised global placements are permitted on this programme. Additionally, the visitors require information about how the education provider ensures that there is a thorough and effective processes in place to monitor the new supervised global and self-initiated placements should a learner wish to undertake one.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate that there is a thorough and effective system in place to monitor all placements.

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors understood that learners source their own global placement; however, they could not see what mechanisms were in place to check that the practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As such, the visitors were unable to determine if the practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to support learners in the self-initiated and global placement setting the education provider is offering for final year placements. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates what process is used to ensure that all practice based learning environments are staffed with practice placement educators who have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to ensure that it is supportive for learners in achieving their required competencies.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating what process is used to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners whilst on placement.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted that assessment of placement learning would now be formative rather than summative. Learners will be required to complete a formative assessment on which the module tutor would provide feedback. Following receipt of the feedback, the learners can develop the work further which they can submit, as part of a summative assessment submission. The visitors were also unclear about what learners are required to complete and to what standard in order to progress on the programme. As such, the visitors require clarification on the new assessment strategy and the requirement for a learner to progress to ensure that the learners completing the programme can practice safely and effectively. From the information provided, the visitors were unable to see how the marking scheme outlined in appendix one would be applied to the new assessment modules. As such, the visitors would like to see further clarification of the marking scheme, and how it relates to the new modules. In this way, they can determine whether the new assessment methods adequately measure the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification of the new assessment strategy and marking scheme used on placements and any evidence, which demonstrates how the assessment methods measure the learning outcomes.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted that there are two interim awards (postgraduate diploma and postgraduate certificate) available to learners on the programme. However, it was not clear to the visitors, how learners are made aware that these exit awards would not confer eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. Consequently, the visitors require the documentation to be amended to ensure that the correct information is available to learners.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate the requirements for learner achievement throughout the programme. In particular, amended documentation to ensure that only successful completion of the programme grants a learner eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC.

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 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	14 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-13235-C4C3W3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation	3

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Patricia Higham	Social worker
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03714

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

The education provider has informed the HCPC of a change to the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	26 January 2018
Case reference	CAS-13150-C7T5L0

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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03659

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

The education provider highlighted a number of changes to the academic teaching and management staff on the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: On review of the evidence provided, the visitors note that there has been a decrease in staff on the programme due to a 'Voluntary Severance Scheme'. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear if the severance scheme has effected the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme. In addition, the visitors were not clear if the education provider has a plan in place for additional staff resources if required. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence from the education provider to demonstrate how they continue to meet this standard.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of how the 'Voluntary Severance Scheme' has effected this programme. In particular, whether there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	27 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-13284-F2Y3K0

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:

Aileen Patterson	Speech and language therapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03745

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

The education provider advised of a change to the person with overall responsibility for the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Middlesex University
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work, Full time accelerated Post-Graduate Diploma Social Work, Work based Learning
Date submission received	19 December 2017
Case reference	CAS-13053-K1C6J4

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:

Paula Sobiechowska	Social worker
Gary Dicken	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03606

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

First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 19
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03617

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

The education provider has informed the HCPC that it has been successful in obtaining funding from the Department for Education for a Step up to Social Work award. The education provider plans to integrate this award into the Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work, which was approved in November 2017. The education provider has stated that the curriculum and assessment for this programme award will be the same as the recently approved programme.

As part of this change, the previously approved name of Post-Graduate Diploma Social Work (Step Up), FTA (Full time accelerated) (for the assessment reference MC03617) has been updated to Post Graduate Diploma Social Work, WBL (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: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the learners had already commenced the programme as the Step Up route on the programme is the same as the currently approved Postgraduate diploma in social work. The visitors did not receive any evidence for the admissions procedures provided to the learners on the new route to ensure that they had sufficient information to make an informed choice to take up their place on the programme. The visitors noted that applicants to the step up route might require different information to learners on the full time accelerated route, particularly around funding, employment status and placements. The visitors need to see evidence of the admissions procedures that ensure the learners on the programme receive the information they require to make an informed choice about the step up route on to the programme. In this way, the visitors can to be assured that this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the admissions procedures provided to the learners entering the programme.

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

Reason: In their reading of the evidence, the visitors noted that the education provider intends to increase the number of teaching staff to support the nineteen learners on the step up route. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to see how many new staff members there are, what their role in the programme is and how the education provider has ensured that the staff are appropriately qualified and experienced. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine if there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. The visitors need further evidence that demonstrates there is a sufficient number of teaching staff on the programme with the appropriate qualification and experience to deliver the programme to nineteen learners on the step up route.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates the staffing for the programme is sufficient to deliver an effective programme, such as roles and qualifications of new staff on the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	PG Dip Social Work (Employment based), Work based learning PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time
Date submission received	01 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-13229-H0Y4L4

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:

Paula Sobiechowska	Social worker
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Employment based)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 42
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03712

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 46
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03713

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 reported a change in the person with overall professional responsibility.

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 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science, Full time
Date submission received	05 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-13329-J4D0J6

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:

Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03780

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.

A change was made regarding the person with overall responsibility for the programme.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Roehampton University
Name of programme(s)	MA Art Psychotherapy, Full time MA Art Psychotherapy, Part time MA Dramatherapy, Full time MA Dramatherapy, Part time MA Music Therapy, Part time MA Music Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	13 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-12191-G4J9T0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

John Crossfield	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Phoene Cave	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Tina Pyman	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

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.

Programme name	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2009

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03410

Programme name	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03411

Programme name	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Dramatherapist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03414

Programme name	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Dramatherapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03415

Programme name	MA Music Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Music therapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 4
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03417

Programme name	MA Music Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Music therapist
First intake	01 September 2006

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 8
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03418

The education provider informed the HCPC that it is making revisions to the programme to ensure the programme remains current and fit for purpose. These changes are proposed for implementation from September 2018.

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 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	St George's University of London and Kingston University
Validating body	St George's, University of London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	07 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-13223-Z8F4F6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Visitors' recommendation	3

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03711

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 report a change in programme leader.

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 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Part time
Date submission received	15 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-13248-C4P0M0

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:

Vicki Lawson-Brown	Social worker
Gary Dicken	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 February 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03715

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.

After discussions with the learners, it has been agreed that the part time route for the programme will move from its base at South Staffs College Lichfield to the education provider’s main campus.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: From the evidence provided the visitors could not see any information highlighting that the part time route will now be taught on the main campus only. The visitors did not receive information that will be given to applicants to indicate the part time programme is only on the main campus and therefore give applicants the information required to make a choice about taking up a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that demonstrates that the education provider has revised the admissions information to ensure that applicants can make a choice as to whether to take up a place on the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates the education provider has revised admissions information that allows applicants to make an informed choice to take up a place on the part time programme at the new site.

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

Reason: The visitors could not see from the evidence if there are sufficient staff in place to deliver to a further 15 part time learners at the main campus alongside the full time cohort. Furthermore, there was no evidence provided that demonstrated how the remaining learners at the Lichfield site will receive appropriate teaching and support whilst they complete their studies. The visitors require evidence that demonstrates that there will be an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme on the main site with the increase of 15 learners and the remaining learners at the Lichfield site.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates that there are an adequate number of staff in place to deliver to an effective programme at the main education provider campus and the Lichfield site.

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

Reason: From their reading of the evidence provided the visitors could not see how the addition of the 15 part time learners alongside the 50 full time learners ensures that there are sufficient resources in place to deliver the programme. The visitors did not receive any indication of the resources for the learners in all settings including those learners who remain at the Lichfield site. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly demonstrates that there are resources in place to support all the learners in all the settings, including administrative support, IT facilities and library resources.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that there are sufficient resources in place to deliver an effective programme on the main education provider campus and the Lichfield site.

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 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which will be available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Swansea University
Name of programme(s)	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for Emergency Medical Technicians, Part time
Date submission received	05 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-13197-L5K8T0

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:

Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for Emergency Medical Technicians
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03703

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 reported that existing learners who work and live in North Wales will now have the block-teaching element of the programme delivered to them in North Wales as opposed to the learners traveling to Swansea.

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 24 May 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).