

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time DipHE Operating Department Practice (South West), Full time DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	04 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15086-F4J7N8

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:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
John Archibald	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 August 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04452

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice (South West)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 January 2018

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04469

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04470

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

The education provider has informed us they propose running their BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme in the south west, in partnership with the Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust (RD&E).

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 26 November 2019 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	Canterbury Christ Church University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	25 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14520-H2Y2J2

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.....	12

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Beverley Blythe	Social worker in England
Patricia Cartney	Social worker in England
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04491

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04288

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

The education provider has informed us that they intend to offer an apprenticeship route for the existing BA (Hons) Social Work programme. The education provider has highlighted that learners on the apprenticeship route will undertake the same modules as the currently approved programme, although the attendance pattern for apprenticeship learners will vary. The education provider has highlighted that the apprenticeship learners may join learners on the current approved programme for certain taught modules. While the education provider intends to use the same programme design, there will be changes to the currently approved programme to incorporate aspects required for a degree apprenticeship.

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 process 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 documentation, the visitors were made aware information about the programme is on the education provider's website and within the programme validation document and programme handbook. However, the visitors were unable to view information about the degree apprenticeship programme on the education provider's website. The visitors were unsure how the education provider provided information around an applicant's current role and employment status.

The visitors also noted that the initial stages of application are 'usually' conducted by the employer or lead partner and that the recruitment and selection day 'typically' involves a range of activities and tests. The visitors were unclear as to what processes and activities are undertaken and therefore require further information as to show applicants are clearly informed about the application and recruitment process.

The visitors were therefore unclear how the information for applicants allowed for informed decision-making. The visitors therefore require further information so applicants are provided with all the information they need to come to a fully-informed decision about taking up a place on a programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of the information provided throughout the admissions process that is clear and thorough and allows for informed decision-making by both applicant and education provider.

2.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation that applicants must be supported by their employer and that there is no formal entry criteria. The visitors were also informed that employers and learning providers will decide whether they think a candidate is suitable and capable of completing their apprenticeship. However, the visitors could not find information about how the selection process works and how the education provider ensures they have overall responsibility for overseeing the admissions criteria and processes of employers. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures the academic and professional entry criteria are appropriate to the level and content of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of how the education provider ensures the academic and professional entry criteria are appropriate to the level and content of the degree apprenticeship programme.

2.3 The admissions process must ensure that applicants have a good command of English.

Reason: From a review of the documents, the visitors were made aware the same process to make sure applicants have a good command of English will apply for the degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors considered there to be a different initial admissions process for the degree apprenticeship programme, where the employer undertakes the initial scrutiny of applicants. The visitors could not find any information

about this and how the employer's processes fit with that of the education provider. The visitors are unclear what the process is for assessing an applicant's command of English. The visitors therefore require further information about how the education provider ensures learners are able to use the English language at the necessary level to communicate effectively with service users and carers, educators and others, and to complete the programme successfully.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the programme ensures learners are able to use the English language at the necessary level to communicate effectively with service users and carers, educators and others, and to complete the programme successfully.

2.4 The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Reason: From the documents provided, the visitors were made aware applicants to the degree apprenticeship programme must undertake a criminal conviction check. The visitors were also informed applicants may undergo additional checks as required by their employer. However, the visitors were unclear whether the additional check would take place and how applicants are informed when and how their employer would undertake this check. The visitors therefore require further evidence of whether and how partner organisations assess the suitability of applicants.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of how partner organisations assess the suitability of applicants.

2.5 The admissions process must ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.

Reason: From the documents provided, the visitors were made aware applicants to the degree apprenticeship programme must meet health screening requirements. The visitors were also informed applicants may undergo additional checks as required by their employer. However, the visitors were unclear whether the additional check would take place and how applicants are informed about when and how their employer would undertake this check. The visitors therefore require further evidence of whether and how partner organisations assess the health of applicants.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of how partner organisations assess the health of applicants.

2.6 There must be an appropriate and effective process for assessing applicants' prior learning and experience.

Reason: From the documents provided, the visitors were informed there is no change to the way the programme meets this standard. However, the visitors did not receive full information about how applicants experience will be assessed to recognise their prior learning to determine eligibility for the degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors require more information about the process in assessing applicant's prior learning and experience.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence, such as an assessment document, of the process to recognise an applicant's prior learning and experience.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were informed the current arrangements for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme will apply for the degree apprenticeship programme. However, the visitors considered there to be a different initial admissions process for the degree apprenticeship programme, where the employer undertakes the initial scrutiny of applicants. The visitors could not be sure the admissions process is open and impartial and does not discriminate unfairly against certain applicants. The visitors therefore need to see further evidence of how the education provider ensures employers are employing equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants, and how they are implemented and monitored.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of how the education provider ensures employers are employing equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants, and how they are implemented and monitored.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: The visitors were made aware the education provider has expressed a commitment to developing and supporting apprenticeships. They were also made aware the degree apprenticeship programme is embedded within the business plans of the education provider and the faculty it sits within. However, the visitors were unclear whether employers are committed to supporting the programme to ensure it is sustainable as they did not receive evidence there was clear support for the programme which would demonstrate appropriate support for the programme from employers. The visitors were also unclear about whether there are sufficient and appropriate resources in order to deliver the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the programme was secure and is supported by all stakeholders involved.

Suggested evidence: Further documentary evidence which demonstrates that all stakeholders are committed to employing learners and providing resources to the programme to make it sustainable as a result.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: From the evidence provided, the visitors were informed there were a broad range of programme monitoring and evaluation systems. However, the visitors were informed the timing of the programme and its delivery will not mirror the delivery cycle of the 'standard' undergraduate programme. The visitors were unclear how this will impact on the cycles of monitoring and evaluation. The visitors therefore require further information about how the programme will monitor and evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the programme and the systems that are in place.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the programme will monitor and evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the programme and the systems that are in place.

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

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were informed the same process will apply for the degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors were informed workplace mentors will have additional training and workshops, and mentors will have six weekly review meetings with academic staff to support apprenticeship practice-based learning. However, the visitors did not see information about when the additional training and workshops will be delivered, and what their content is. The visitors also did not see information about whether the reviews have been timetabled into the programme yet. The visitors require further information about the training, workshops and reviews for academic learning mentors and workplace mentors.

Suggested evidence: Further information about the training, workshops and reviews for academic learning mentors and workplace mentors.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider has stated that they will apply the same process for their full time programme. They have also stated that there will be an increased use of social media to facilitate the involvement. The visitors noted there was no evidence of how social media is used to involve learners. As evidence, the education provider refers to programme specification document. The document discusses how the education provider will use different strategies to engage with the process such as end of programme evaluation and apprentice representation at programme meetings. Although the education provider has shown examples of learner involvement, the visitors are unsure if, and when, learners will be given time off work or studies to be a student representative. As such, the visitors require evidence of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The visitors require information on, when and how, learners are provided with time off work or studies to be representatives.

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware the education provider has stated there is a commitment from the university to provide additional staffing where required as the degree apprenticeship programme develops. As evidence, the education provider supplied a supporting statement and a teaching partnership agreement. The visitors had noted that there was no information on how the education provider will assess the new workload impact. As the staff will be used for both programmes, the visitors are unclear on if there are an adequate number of staff to facilitate the programmes. As such, the visitors require further information on the rationale to justify the number of staff in place, and the proportion of their time spent working on the programme, in relation to the practical requirements of the programme, the number of learners, their needs and the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must evidence about the rationale to justify the number of staff in place, and the proportion of their time spent working on the degree apprenticeship programme, in relation to the practical requirements of the

programme, the number of learners, their needs and the learning outcomes to be achieved.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware the staff delivering the taught modules to the apprentices will be the same staff on the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. They have also stated staff are actively involved in research, attending and presenting at workshops and conferences. However, the visitors were unclear as to whether staff had received training in factors related to the distance learning approach of the programme. The visitors were also unsure whether other educators such as mentors had received training and if so, what that training consisted of. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence how educators continue to develop and maintain their professional and academic skills to be able to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence how educators continue to develop and maintain their professional and academic skills to be able to deliver the programme effectively.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Reason: From a review of the mapping document, the visitors were made aware the education provider had identified resources in the setting of the education provider. However, this standard is about the resources to support learning in all settings. The visitors were unclear what resources are going to be in place to support learning in the workplace. The visitors were also unsure of the systems which allow the education provider to assess how resources are used and how effective and accessible they are for learners and educators in all settings. The visitors therefore require further information as to how the education provider ensures programme resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further information as to how the education provider ensures programme resources are readily available to learners and educators and are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the degree apprenticeship programme.

3.13 There must be effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in all settings.

Reason: The education provider states that apprentice learners will have access to a full range of support services and they will be allocated personal tutors. As evidence, the mapping document refers to programme specification. This document talks about the different ways learners can, and will, be supported throughout the programme. The visitors noted there was no information on who learners should contact during out of hours. The education provider has stated there will be personal tutors for learners, however, it is not clear how learners will be provided with support outside of office

hours. Furthermore, there is no other information on who is the next point of contact if the personal tutor is not available. Therefore, the visitors need to see further evidence of the academic and pastoral support learners will have in place in all settings.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of the academic and pastoral support learners will have in place in all settings.

3.15 There must be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.

Reason: From the evidence provided for this standard, the education provider stated the same policy and process will apply. The visitors were unclear about whose complaint process learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme should use as they will be spending time away from the education provider and will also be employees at the employer setting. The visitors therefore require clarity about how and to whom learners should make complaints in all settings on the degree apprenticeship programme.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how and to whom learners should make complaints in all settings on the degree apprenticeship programme.

3.16 There must be thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

Reason: From the evidence provided, the visitors were informed the same policies and procedures will apply for the degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors reviewed the learner handbook and saw that learners are referred to the University Fitness to Practice processes if there was an issue relating to their fitness to practice. However, from their review of the documentation the visitors saw that fitness to practice issues will initially be dealt with by the employer and investigated by the education provider if required. The visitors were therefore unclear whether there is an effective process in place to continuously reassess the suitability of learners' conduct, character and health. The visitors require further information about the effective process to ensure the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

Suggested evidence: Further information about the effective process to ensure the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

4.6 The learning and teaching methods used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the evidence provided, the visitors were informed the learning and teaching methods were the same. However, the visitors were also made aware that 80% of the programme takes place in the workplace and that a range of different learning and teaching methods are going to be used. For instance, the role of the Personal Academic Tutor to link theory and practice in practice-based learning and the use of VLE. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the learning and teaching methods used to deliver the programme support learners to achieve the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how the learning and teaching methods used to deliver the programme support learners to achieve the learning outcomes.

4.7 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Reason: From the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware the learning and teaching methods reflect those already used on the approved programme as the professional and academic level is the same. There is an emphasis on active peer learning, enquiry-based approaches and experiential learning throughout the programme. The visitors noted they had not seen clear evidence of how the education provider will deliver the programme differently to support the higher use of distance learning on the apprenticeship programme. The visitors therefore are unclear how the delivery of the programme supports the different context of learning on the apprenticeship programme.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the delivery of the programme supports the different context of learning on the apprenticeship programme.

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors were made aware learners will have the opportunity to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions during work-based and assessed practice learning, the faculty's interprofessional learning (IPL) events and in teaching. However, due to the reduced learning at the education provider, the visitors were unclear whether the timetable for apprentices will allow them to take part in IPL events. The visitors therefore need further information about how the education provider will ensure the timetable of learners means they are able to attend IPL events.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the education provider will ensure the timetable of learners means they are able to attend IPL events.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware that practice-based learning settings have their own processes for gaining consent which must be followed by students prior to undertaking any work. However, the visitors were not able to see how the education provider oversees the procedure for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners in these settings. Therefore, the education provider must provide further information about the effective process for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners in practice-based learning settings.

Suggested evidence: Further information about the effective process for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners in practice-based learning settings.

5.1 Practice-based learning must be integral to the programme.

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: From a review of the documents, the visitors saw that the indicative timetable indicated the Assessed Practice Module 1 in level 5. The education provider indicated the length of the module was 14 weeks. However, from the details contained in the indicative calendar the visitors were unclear of the length of the module as it could be construed to be as little as 11 weeks.

The visitors were also unclear whether the Assessed Practice Module 2 impacts on the assessment period for the preceding module, Law and Policy for Professional Social Work Practice. From the indicative calendar it was unclear whether the first two weeks of the Assessed Practice Module 2 takes place in the same weeks as the assessment for the Law and Policy for Professional Social Work Practice module.

The visitors require clarity on the length of Assessed Practice Module 1 and when it takes place, and of any impact on the assessment for the Law and Policy for Professional Social Work Practice module. The visitors also require information about the education provider's reasons for this design of practice-based learning on the programme to ensure practice-based learning is used effectively as a key part of the programme. The visitors were also unsure whether the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning allows learners to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and the SOPs.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification on the length of Assessed Practice Module 1 and when it takes place, and of any impact on the assessment for the Law and Policy for Professional Social Work Practice module. The education provider must also submit information about the reasons for this design of practice-based learning on the programme, to ensure learners progress during practice-based learning in relation to the SOPs and the learning outcomes of the programme.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware the education provider audited and evaluated all workplaces using the Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) tool. However, the visitors were unclear whether individual practice learning contracts will be signed by both the employer and the education provider to address issues around safety and support, in particular around lone working and health and safety. Therefore, the visitors could not be sure the practice-based learning settings are suitable and support safe and effective learning.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the education provider will ensure the practice-based learning environment is safe and supportive for learners and service users. Specifically, whether contracts will be signed by both employer and education provider.

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware workplace mentors for learners on the new programme will be drawn from the same

pool of experienced practice educators. However, the visitors were not clear whether there is capacity for the number of learners on the proposed programme, alongside current provision, to be supported effectively with the current provision of practice educators. The visitors were also unclear on the rationale behind the number of staff in practice-based learning, how they are involved and what their qualification and experience levels must be.

Suggested evidence: Further information about how the education provider justifies a suitable number of staff for the number of learners and the level of support specific to learner needs.

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

Reason: From a review of the documents, the visitors were informed the education provider maintains a database of practice educators and mentors with details of their qualifications. The visitors were also informed mentors will receive additional training and attend workshops as required to develop their understanding of the apprenticeship requirements. However, the visitors were unclear whether attendance at these workshops and training will be compulsory, and whether it was planned prior to the start of the degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors therefore require further information about the training and workshops to ensure those who work in practice-based learning are suitable and able to support and develop learners in a safe and effective way.

Suggested evidence: Further information about the training and workshops to ensure those who work in practice-based learning are suitable and able to support and develop learners in a safe and effective way.

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 a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware of training workshops for practice educators. However, the visitors were unclear whether this training is compulsory. The visitors were also not sure whether workshops have been scheduled prior to the start of the degree apprenticeship programme. Therefore, the visitors could not be sure practice educators are appropriately prepared so they are able to support learners and assess learners effectively.

Suggested evidence: Further information about the training practice educators will undertake including information about whether their attendance at training workshops by mentors will be compulsory, and about the timetable for training to be delivered.

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 26 November 2019 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 Essex
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time MSc Physiotherapy (pre registration), Full time
Date submission received	25 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-15013-W5D5X1

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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Nicola Smith	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04418

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (pre registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2004

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04419

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 range of new modules to their BSc (Hons) and MSc Physiotherapy programmes from September 2020. These changes would bring about changes to the programme outcomes.

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.

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

Reason: The education provider referred the visitors to their staff curriculum vitae (CVs) as their evidence for this standard. They also stated in their mapping document that they have recently recruited a physiotherapy academic to a teaching and research post to further strengthen expertise within the teaching team, with another 1.0 WTE post to be advertised in autumn 2019. The document also stated that staff to learner ratio will be 9.9 WTE staff to 158 learners by 2020. From this information, the visitors understood

that the education provider has plans to ensure that overall, there will be adequate number of staff available to deliver the programme. However, they could not find any information in the handbook or module outlines about who will be teaching individual modules on the programme to ensure the programme is delivered effectively. As such the visitors could not determine whether the qualifications and experience of the staff in place or those to be recruited are appropriate to specific areas of the programme and as a result, they could not determine that this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further information that demonstrates that staff who will be leading individual modules are appropriately qualified and experienced. This information should outline their names, CVs and the modules they will be leading.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: In their mapping document, the education provider stated that their teaching team continues to grow, as their learner numbers have grown each year. The document also stated that Sports and Exercise staff as well as other health colleagues within the School of Health & Social Care are regularly invited to contribute to and lead relevant sessions on different topics, as appropriate. The visitors were also referred to the resources document which contained staff CVs, and they also reviewed the programme handbooks and module outlines. From their review, the visitors could see that the education provider intends to use a variety of staff with different specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver different aspects of the programme. However, they could not find any information in the handbook or module outlines about who is leading and teaching individual modules. As such, they were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. The visitors therefore require additional information about individuals who would be leading different modules on the programme to ascertain they have the specialist knowledge and expertise required.

Suggested evidence: Further information on individual staff who would be leading and teaching individual modules. This should include their names, CVs and the modules they will be leading.

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 26 November 2019 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 Lancaster
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time MA Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	07 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15780-S4V0Z1

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:

Christine Stogdon	Social worker in England
Anne Mackay	Social worker in England
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04504

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

First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04505

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 introduced a new module, revised learning outcomes, recruited new staff and made new assessment methods for both the programmes. There had also been changes to two practice-based learning modules for the MA Social work programme only.

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 26 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	11 October 2019
Case reference	CAS-15471-G2G0C6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Dawn Blenkin	Occupational therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04476

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 notified us that they intended to increase learner numbers 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: 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 26 November 2019 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	Swansea University
Name of programme(s)	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals , Part time
Date submission received	12 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15400-F7N1F1

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04473

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

The education provider has made changes to how learners on the programme are assessed for modules SHGM05 - Clinical Assessment and Decision making in Non-Medical Prescribing and SHGM06 - Pharmacology Principles and Practice. They have also reduced the number of cohorts per year on the programme from four to two with a maximum of 35 learners per cohort but the overall number of learners per year remains at 70. These changes were implemented from September 2019.

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 26 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy), Part time Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy), Full time
Date submission received	19 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-15108-Y5G3B1

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:

Stephen Davies	Practitioner psychologist Clinical psychologist
Antony Ward	Practitioner psychologist Counselling psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 1
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04456

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 January 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04457

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 made changes to the entry and selection criteria for these programmes. Additionally, the module content, learning outcomes and assessment strategy have been redeveloped for the existing modules.

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 26 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

