Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Date of submission to HPC	28 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) David Bevan (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	David Christopher

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2 Programme admissions

The education provider intends to increase the UCAS entry tariff from 180 to 200 points for the 2012-13 intake.

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider is proposing a change of programme leader.

SET 4 Curriculum

The education provider is making changes to the overall aims, philosophy and learning objectives of the programme, as well as changes to learning outcomes for four modules.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- SOPs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Assessment mapping matrix
- Admissions policy
- APEL policy and procedures
- Operating department practice – programme information
- Original and revised module and assessment documentation
- Internal application form for a new module or changes to a module
- Role descriptors and guidance documentation
- Staff CVs

Section three: Additional documentation

☒ The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to HPC	10 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitor	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme Management

The education provider has proposed changes to the Programme Leader from John Cossar to Mandy Jones. The change impacts on programme management within the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy – Design strategy for the education provider
- CV of new Programme Leader

Section three: Additional documentation

☒   The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐   The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐   There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change Visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	University of East Anglia
Programme title	Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Medical Care (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	12 July 2012
Name and profession of the HCPC visitors	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Change of course director from Louise Staffell to Nat Holding

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae Nat Holding

Section three: Additional documentation

☒   The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐   The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for on-going approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐   There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on on-going approval of the programme.

.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Date of submission to HPC	25 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist) Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health psychologist)
HPC executive	Niall Lennon

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has notified HPC about the appointment of Joanne Lusher as the new programme leader for the Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Document on course management structure
- Curriculum Vitae of new course leader Joanne Lusher
- Curriculum Vitae of deputy course leader Esther Murray
- SETs mapping document

Section three: Additional documentation

☒　　The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐　　The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒　　There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐　　There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Date of submission to HPC	26 June 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

The Non-Medical Prescribing unit has been subject to periodic review and successful re-approval by the NMC (revised unit to commence in September 2012). Following feedback from students and practice, and in the light of revised University documentation the following changes were made.

The changes have the potential to affect the following:

SET 4 Curriculum

Reduction in the number of learning outcomes from 15 to 5, as the education provider has set a maximum of 5 learning outcomes per unit. The previous learning outcomes have been mapped to the new learning outcomes, and the revised learning outcomes fully meet the DH and NMC requirements for prescribers. There is no change to the curriculum or content of the unit.

SET 6 Assessment

The assessments for the unit have been amended, and students will no longer be required to submit a written assignment in addition to a written portfolio. The

unit is now assessed by two examinations, a 4000 word portfolio and an assessment of practice that includes a client / patient consultation. Students are assessed on each learning outcome and the revised assessment still ensures that students are fit to prescribe following successful completion of the unit.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Prescribing Unit descriptor
- CPD programme specification 2012

Section three: Additional documentation

☒ The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	Pg Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Date of submission to HPC	16 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anne-Marie Conway (Therapeutic radiographer) Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Jamie Hunt

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum

Redesign of modules to accommodate repositioning and updating of topics within the modules. New modules created to identify specific clinical components.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- BSc – PgD Placement Report Book
- BSc and PgD combined SHA Annual Report 2009-10

- Assessor Application
- Approved Exemption Request Form
- Academic Calendar
- 2011 PgD Assessment Grid
- Submission Definitive Document
- Student Support
- Student Clinical Assessment Guidelines Version 1.4
- Rationale and Supporting Information
- Proposed Changes to PgD
- Programme Specification
- PgD RONC Course AQR for 10-11
- Module Schedule
- Map Module to Learning Outcomes
- Feedback Harvested from Service Users and Clinical Staff
- Curriculum Data
- Course Management Committee Interim Meeting 2011-12
- CMC minutes 28 March 2012
- Clinical Education
- Clinical Assessor Specification
- Case Discussion Assessment Criteria
- Competence for Practice 1 and 2 Module Descriptors 2012-13
- ARP 1 and 2 Module Descriptors 2012-13
- ROP 1, 2 and 3 Module Descriptors 2012-13
- PPT Module Descriptor 2012-13
- IPTO Module Descriptor 2012-13
- FRO Module Descriptor 2012-13
- Mark Collins CV 2012
- Keely Rowbotham CV 2012

Section three: Additional documentation

☒ The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the

programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change Visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme title	MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 July 2012
Name and profession of the HCPC visitors	Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Change of programme leader from Ian Henderson to Jonathan McConnell.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Course Specification
- Overview and Resources
- Curriculum vitae for Jonathan McConnell

Section three: Additional documentation

☒   The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐   The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐   There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change Visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 July 2012
Name and profession of the HCPC visitors	Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Change of programme leader from Ian Henderson to Jonathan McConnell.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Course Specification
- Overview and Resources
- Curriculum vitae for Jonathan McConnell

Section three: Additional documentation

☒ The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Date of submission to HPC	16 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Mary Ann Elston (Lay visitor)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Programme leader change from Brian Ratcliffe to Susan Lennie.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae of new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

☒ The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

hpc health professions council

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University Campus Suffolk
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of submission to HPC	30 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Niall Lennon

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has notified HPC about the appointment of Jane Harvey-Lloyd as the new programme leader for the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Jane Harvey-Lloyd's curriculum vitae
- Diagnostic radiography programme definitive validation document

Section three: Additional documentation

☒   The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐   The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐   There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Date of submission to HPC	11 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Jamie Hunt

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 – The education provider has informed the HPC that the programme will sit in a new Clinical science department.

SET 4 – Learning outcomes have changed for several modules. The visitors need to review whether these changes affect the delivery of the standards of proficiency.

SET 5 – Learning outcomes for practice placements have been reviewed and updated.

SET 6.1 – The education provider has stated that a new record of achievement has been developed for each practice placement.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:
• Change notification form
• Major change SETs mapping document

- Practice placements Competency Framework
- Module descriptors
- KnowCanDo Assessment Framework document
- Overview of Quality Monitoring and Enhancement of Dietetics Programmes at education provider
- Quality Monitoring of Dietetic Placements – The Student Experience Visits: A Guide

Section three: Additional documentation

☐ The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☒ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider indicated in the change notification form that there has been a change to the learning outcomes of module XN7038. However, the visitors do not have any further information on this module or how this SET is affected.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest provision of additional documentation of the module descriptor to determine whether there is any subsequent impact upon this standard.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider indicated in the change notification form that there has been a change to module XN7038 which affects SET 6.4. However, the visitors do not have any further information on this module or how this SET is affected.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest provision of additional documentation of the module descriptor to determine whether there is any subsequent impact upon this standard.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider indicates that programme changes are planned which may impact upon the aegrotat award.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest provision of additional documentation of the proposed changes to determine whether there is any subsequent impact upon this standard.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐   There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Date of submission to HPC	11 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Jamie Hunt

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 – The education provider has informed the HPC that the programme will sit in a new Clinical science department.

SET 4 – Learning outcomes have changed for several modules. The visitors need to review whether these changes affect the delivery of the standards of proficiency.

SET 5 – Learning outcomes for practice placements have been reviewed and updated.

SET 6.1 – The education provider has stated that a new record of achievement has been developed for each practice placement.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:
- Change notification form
- Major change SETs mapping document

- Practice placements Competency Framework
- Module descriptors
- KnowCanDo Assessment Framework document
- Overview of Quality Monitoring and Enhancement of Dietetics Programmes at education provider
- Quality Monitoring of Dietetic Placements – The Student Experience Visits: A Guide

Section three: Additional documentation

☐   The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☒   The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider indicated in the change notification form that there has been a change to the learning outcomes of module XN7038. However, the visitors do not have any further information on this module or how this SET is affected.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest provision of additional documentation of the module descriptor to determine whether there is any subsequent impact upon this standard.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider indicated in the change notification form that there has been a change to module XN7038 which affects SET 6.4. However, the visitors do not have any further information on this module or how this SET is affected.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest provision of additional documentation of the module descriptor to determine whether there is any subsequent impact upon this standard.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider indicates that programme changes are planned which may impact upon the aegrotat award.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest provision of additional documentation of the proposed changes to determine whether there is any subsequent impact upon this standard.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐   There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Date of submission to HPC	30 April 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management
SET 4 Curriculum
SET 6 Assessment

There has been a change to the programme leader for the programme. It is also the case that, as part of the education provider's review of its assessment process and the change to credit ratings for all programmes throughout the institution, there has been a change to the modular structure of the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:
- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Module descriptors
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Practice handbook
- Student handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

☒ The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☐ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of West London
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Date of submission to HPC	30 May 2012
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) David Bevan (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Niall Lennon

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum

The programme team have highlighted changes to the modular structure of this programme to fit the revised education provider's academic timetable. These changes have involved alteration of the structure and delivery of the curriculum including a revised timetable for the programme.

SET 5 Practice placements

The programme team have highlighted changes to the timetable has altered the way students are prepared for practice placement. They have also highlighted that the documentation provided to students and practice placement educators has been updated to reflect these changes.

SET 6 Assessment

The programme team have highlighted changes to the assessment of the modules and therefore the programme's assessment strategy.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Programme handbook
- Major change SOPs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Module specifications

Section three: Additional documentation

☐   The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

☒   The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Reason: From their reading of the documentation the visitors determined that the education provider clearly described the changes to the programme's second year and how there would now be three double modules instead of the existing single 20 credit modules. However, the visitors noted that the academic assessment submission dates for the level 5 'enhancing practice in anaesthetics and recovery' and 'enhancing operating department practice' modules are both in week 24. As both modules suggested assessment dates coincide the visitors were concerned that students may feel overburdened due to the volume of work to be submitted and require additional support as a result.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider intends to monitor students' progress through the programme and what systems of support will be in place to ensure students will not be disadvantaged by the changes.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**

- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Reason: The education provider has stated that clinical assessment records will now include more overt mentor evaluation of students 'non-technical' skills. These include clinical / psychomotor, communication, professional attitude and relationships and confidentiality and punctuality. However the education provider has not indicated how the mentors in the practice placement setting will be prepared for this change. The visitors were therefore unsure how practice placement providers have been made aware of these changes and what their role will be in ensuring 'non-technical' skills are met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of how practice placement providers are fully prepared for the changes being made to the evaluation of students in the practice placement setting. This evidence might include samples of a new mentor handbook and new clinical assessment records as well as additional clarification about how mentors will be informed and prepared for these changes to the assessment of students in the practice placement setting.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.