

## Major Change Visitors' Report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Bangor University
<b>Programme title</b>	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	3 April 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 6 Assessment

The education provider has informed HPC that they wish to appoint a new external examiner who is not on the relevant part of the register. The proposed external examiner is from another regulatory register.

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 proposed external examiner – Adele Millington

## Major Change Visitors' Report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Westminster
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	17 February 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Mary Macdonald (Biomedical scientist) Bill Gilmore (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

#### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The School of Biosciences has merged with the School of Integrated Health to become the School of Life Sciences. This has led to some senior staff changes. The programme leader has also changed with Anthony Warford taking over leadership of the programme in an interim capacity. He will lead this programme with help from the former programme leader Carol D'Souza.

#### SET 4 Curriculum

#### SET 6 Assessment

Changes have also been made to the programme's modular content with the introduction of several new modules and removal of older modules. This has also changed the overall assessment strategy for the programme to better fit the new modular structure.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form – Applied Biomedical Science PT
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences Programme Specification 2012
- SOPs cross-referencing template
- Critical reflection for Biomedical Sciences
- Tutors Manual
- Workplace manual
- Curriculum Vitae for all staff
- Module descriptors

### **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

<b>Section one: Programme details</b> .....	1
<b>Section two: Submission details</b> .....	1
<b>Section three: Additional documentation</b> .....	2
<b>Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)</b> .....	4

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Plymouth
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	12 January 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Victoria Adenugba

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 3 Programme management and resources

There have been a number of staff changes within the programme. This includes changes in hours for a number of existing staffing, and new staff joining the programme.

## SET 5 Practice placements

The practice placement team consists of three members of staff. Two members of this team have been re-deployed to other areas of the curriculum, and have been replaced by two other members of staff.

The part time route is still not offered as an active programme, as it has not been subject to commissions by the SW England Strategic Health Authority.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form (completed by education executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Table of staff
- Michael Iwama Curriculum Vitae
- Lee Price Curriculum Vitae
- Anita Slade Curriculum Vitae

### 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. Programme management and resources

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the education provider has submitted information about the changes in the staff FTE to the programme but there is no information on workload redistribution and duties of staff in the team to ensure that SET 3.5 is met.

The visitors noted that the education provider has made staff changes within the Practice Placement Team to replace two members of this team who are being redeployed to other areas of the curriculum. The education provider has not provided details of relevant expertise of the two new members of staff, or of relevant training mechanisms in place to ensure that the two new practice placement co-ordinators are able to meet the demands of their new role so that the visitors can determine if there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require more information on how the workload of the staff reducing their hours (J. Hurst & M. Dawson) and the staff member on sick leave (C. Drysdale nee Taylor) will be redistributed amongst the staff to support effective programme management, teaching, learning and assessment on the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy.

The visitors require information (eg, staff CV's) to ensure that the two new members of staff joining the practice placement team have relevant expertise in this area. The visitors also require information of training mechanisms in place and succession planning strategies that have been used to ensure that the two new practice placement co-ordinators are able to meet the demands of their new role.

### **3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the education provider has submitted information about the changes in the staff FTE to the programme but there is no information on workload redistribution and duties of staff in the team to ensure that SET 3.6 is met.

The visitors noted that the education provider has made staff changes within the Practice Placement Team to replace two members of this team who are being redeployed to other areas of the curriculum. The education provider has not provided details of relevant expertise of the two new members of staff, or of relevant training mechanisms in place to ensure that the two new practice placement co-ordinators are able to meet the demands of their new role so that the visitors can determine that staff have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require more information regarding how workload will be redistributed from the staff reducing their hours to the existing staff.

The visitors require information (eg, staff CV's) to ensure that the two new members of staff joining the practice placement team have relevant expertise in this area. The visitors also require information of training mechanisms in place and succession planning strategies that have been used to ensure that the two new practice placement co-ordinators are able to meet the demands of their new role.

#### **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.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	13 February 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Simon Walker (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

The education provider has informed the HPC of plans to introduce a number of prospective changes to the first year of the programme. As a result of a curriculum review across the education provider three first year modules from the approved provision will no longer be available.

As a result the education provider has proposed the formation of a number of new modules, the movement of modules within the programme and sharing some modules with the radiography programme. The new modules will hold a different credit weighting to the previous modules. The removal of existing and additional of new modules has resulted in revised learning outcomes. The following documents were provided as part of the submission:



- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Context document outlining proposed changes to first year modules
- Mapping to HPC standards of proficiency
- Module change pro-forma
- Amended programme specification document
- Modules descriptors

### **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.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the major change documentation the visitors noted that the Programme Specification did not include the new modules for the proposed changes to the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to ascertain if the information about the proposed changes would be communicated to prospective applicants.

**Suggested Documentation:** A fully revised Programme Specification is required to include all new modules including appropriate credits for the new proposed programme.

#### **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 that the respiratory system is not included in the syllabus for the module 'Anatomy and Physiology (MIRT111)'. The visitors were therefore unable to determine where students cover the respiratory system within the curriculum. The visitors require the education provider to highlight where in the curriculum the respiratory system is covered and make this more explicit within the documentation.

**Suggested Documentation:** Highlight where in the curriculum the respiratory system is covered and make this more explicit within the documentation.

#### **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the Programme Specification does not include any reference to Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations (IRMER) 2011 Amendment. The visitors were therefore not clear how and where the education provider updates students on the implications of these changes.

**Suggested Documentation:** Further details outlining where the IRMER 2011 Amendment is covered within the curriculum. Evidence might include a revised Programme Specification that includes the IRMER 2011 Amendment.

#### **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.

## Major Change Visitors' Report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	13 February 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Simon Walker (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

The education provider has informed the HPC of plans to introduce a number of prospective changes to the first year of the programme. As a result of a curriculum review across the education provider three first year modules from the approved provision will no longer be available.

As a result the education provider has proposed the formation of a number of new modules, the movement of modules within the programme and sharing some modules with the diagnostic radiotherapy programme. The new modules will hold a different credit weighting to the previous modules. The removal of existing and additional of new modules has resulted in revised learning outcomes.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Context document outlining proposed changes to first year modules
- Mapping to HPC standards of proficiency
- Module change pro-forma
- Amended programme specification document
- Modules descriptors

### **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.

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

**Reason: From a review of the major change documentation the visitors** noted that the Programme Specification did not include the new modules for the proposed changes to the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to ascertain if the information about the proposed changes would be communicated to prospective applicants.

The visitors also noted discrepancy in the radiotherapy section of the 'Proposed First year1' document. The visitors noted that the document gives contradictory credit values compared with the module descriptors for year 1. 'MIRT 131' is stated as having 15 credits whereas the module descriptor states 22.5. Also 'HEAL 111' is omitted from the table and this therefore results in a total of 120 credits. The visitor understanding is that the credit weighting is currently 135 (according to the assessment table) and the education provider is not proposing to change this. Confirmation is therefore required to confirm that there are 360 total credits within the programme and 120 credits at level 5.

**Suggested Documentation:** A fully revised Programme Specification is required to include all new modules including appropriate credits for the new proposed programme. A revised 'Proposed First year1' document to include the correct credits for MIRT131 and the inclusion of HEAL111 in the modules only table.

#### **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:** From a review of the major change documentation the visitors noted that the module 'Preparation for Radiotherapy Practice RADT116' is omitted from the standards of proficiency mapping document. The visitors were therefore unable to determine if all the standards of proficiency are mapped against the curriculum. The visitors also noted that the respiratory system is not included in the syllabus for the module 'Anatomy and Physiology (MIRT111)'. The visitors were therefore unable to determine where students cover the respiratory system within the curriculum. The visitors require a revised mapping document to include the omitted module ('Preparation for Radiotherapy Practice RADT116'). The visitors also require the education provider to highlight where in the curriculum the respiratory system is covered and make this more explicit within the documentation.

**Suggested Documentation:** A revised mapping document to include the omitted module ('Preparation for Radiotherapy Practice RADT116'). The visitors also require the education provider to highlight where in the curriculum the respiratory system is covered and make this more explicit within the documentation.

#### **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the Programme Specification does not include any reference to Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations (IRMER) 2011 Amendment. The visitors were therefore not clear how and where the education provider updates students on the implications of these changes.

**Suggested Documentation:** Further details outlining where the IRMER 2011 Amendment is covered within the curriculum. Evidence might include a revised Programme Specification that includes the IRMER 2011 Amendment.

#### **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

<b>Section one: Programme details</b> .....	1
<b>Section two: Submission details</b> .....	1
<b>Section three: Additional documentation</b> .....	2
<b>Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)</b> .....	6

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Huddersfield
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	7 February 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 2 Programme admissions

From 2013 entry to the programme, the education provider is no longer accepting BTEC National Diploma Health and Social Care single award.

##### SET 4 Curriculum

A number of 20 credit modules are being combined to create 40 credit modules. Some existing inter-professional modules will now also include nursing students in addition to AHP students. A new inter-professional module has been created in line with the nursing curriculum. A new occupational therapy module has been created.

## SET 5 Practice placements

The non-practice teaching elements of one practice module will be removed and absorbed into different modules. Learning outcomes on practice placements will now include assessment of inter-professional working skills.

## SET 6 Assessment

The assessment strategy within many of the existing modules has been changed, particularly those modules that have become 40 credit modules. Assessment of practice based experience modules will now include assessment of inter-professional working skills.

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 Specification document
- Programme Specification document
- Appendices 1-13

### 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.

### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the education provider has developed a number of new modules. The visitors also noted that the module specification document states that the same member of staff is listed as the module leader for all of the new modules. The visitors require further information as to whether this is the case, and if so, an outline of the rationale for this to demonstrate that the member of staff is able to effectively manage all of the new modules.

**Suggested information:** The visitors require further information as to whether this is the case, and if so, an outline of the rationale for this to demonstrate that the member of staff is able to effectively manage all of the new modules.

#### **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 that the education provider has introduced 30 and 40 credit modules and further developed interprofessional learning (IPL) on the programme. The education provider has mapped the programme against the appropriate frameworks and SOPs. However, as the visitors were not provided with a complete list of all the programme modules, it has not been possible for the visitors to cross-reference the SOPs and ensure they are met in full. The visitors noted that Appendix 8 is incomplete. The visitors therefore require a completed programme structure including an outline of all programme modules.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require a completed programme structure including an outline of all programme modules.

#### **4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Reason:** From a review of the 'Programme Handbook' (14.4.4) the visitors noted that it states that students will be given the opportunity to reflect on their skill development following practice placements in module 'HFT 1012 Skills for Practice'. The visitors were unable to find reference to this period of reflection in the module descriptors or in the overview of the programme. The visitors also noted that the 'Programme Handbook' (14.4.7) states that students will be given the opportunity to reflect on their practice based experiences within module 'HIT 1005 Enhancing Occupational Performance for Individuals and Groups'. The visitors were unclear how this will be facilitated as all practice placements appear to take place following the academic modules. The visitors therefore require further information that clearly outlines an overview of the programme structure, module descriptors for the programme and further information about the practice placement structure that demonstrates the links between theory and practice.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information that clearly outlines an overview of the programme structure, module descriptors for the programme and further information about the practice placement structure that demonstrates the links between theory and practice.

#### **4.9 When there is inter-professional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the education provider has developed a number of new IPL modules. The visitors also noted that existing IPL modules were previously only for AHP students, and will now include nursing students. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation submitted, how the profession-specific skills and knowledge of occupational therapy students would be adequately addressed. In addition the visitors noted inaccuracies between documentation relating to which students would be taught in which IPL module. The visitors finally noted that in 'HIG 1001', it states that it is a pre-requisite that NMC competencies are met – this is not a pre-requisite for OT students. The visitors therefore require further information outlining how the IPL modules will be taught, who will teach them and details of the input the occupational therapy



faculty will have in these modules. The visitors also require details of which professions will be taught within each IPL module, and require evidence that the correct information is presented consistently across all relevant documentation to ensure that profession-specific skills and knowledge are addressed.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information outlining how the IPL modules will be taught, by whom and details of the input the occupational therapy faculty will have in these modules. The visitors also require details of which professions will be taught within each IPL module, and require evidence that the correct information is presented consistently across all relevant documentation to ensure that profession-specific skills and knowledge are addressed.

#### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Reason:** The visitors note that the Level 5 modules including for example 'HIT 1005 Enhancing Occupational Performance for Individuals and Groups', have a greater number of direct teaching hours and directed study, than Level 4 modules. The visitors were unclear as to the rationale for this and therefore require further information to support the differentiation. The visitors noted that if the differences are due to inaccuracies then all module descriptors should be revisited to ensure the direct teaching hours, directed study and independent study are checked.

**Suggested documentation:** A rationale to support the differentiation in direct teaching hours, directed study and independent study between Level 4 and Level 5 modules. The visitors noted that if the differences are due to inaccuracies then all module descriptors should be revisited to ensure the direct teaching hours, directed study and independent study are checked.

#### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there are inaccuracies between the documents submitted regarding the lengths and total hours of practice placements. The visitors noted that in Appendix 8, it appears that all placements take place between weeks 34 and 42. However, this is unclear from the documentation presented.

**Suggested documentation:** A programme structure diagram that clearly illustrates the dates, lengths and total hours of the programme placements.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that PPE hours appear to be calculated differently within different documents, for example in the Programme document (13.4) the placement hours are documented differently to the Module descriptors. It appears that the placement hours total 900 hours throughout the programme. The visitors

require clarification of the total number of practice placement hours the students will complete during the programme

The visitors were also unclear from the documentation provided, whether module 'HFT 1012' consists of one day a week placements, followed by a 5 week block. It was also unclear whether the 70 hours of practice included in module 'HHT 1024' are included in the total placement hours for the programme. The visitors therefore require clarification of the duration of each placement including the total number of hours. This information should include details of how the hours are calculated for 'HFT 1012' and confirmation of whether the students have one day a week placements followed by a 5 week block. The visitors also require further information on module 'HHT 1024', including whether this is a placement module with a placement assessment, or a theory/practice module with some placement visits.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors therefore require clarification of the duration of each placement including the total number of hours. This information should include details of how the hours are calculated for 'HFT 1012' and confirmation of whether the students have one day a week placements followed by a 5 week block. The visitors also require further information on module 'HHT 1024', including whether this is a placement module with a placement assessment, or a theory/practice module with some placement visits.

#### **6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that module 'HFG 1000 Professional Development and Research 1' appears to have a greater assessment load in comparison to other 20 credit modules within the programme. The visitors also noted that there were inaccuracies within 'Appendix 9' Assessment overview as previous modules appear to be included on the diagram.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require further information regarding the rationale for the assessment load within module 'HFG 1000'. The visitors also require an amended Appendix 9 and the dates for submission of assessed work so that the student workload can be accurately measured across the programme.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the assessment schedule listed in Appendix 9 does not correlate with the assessment information within the module descriptors. The visitors also noted a number of inaccuracies for example it appears that modules from previous programme have been included in the diagram provided.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information outlining the assessment schedule for the programme with dates and assessment requirements detailed.

## **6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Reason:** From a review of the assessment timetable the visitors found it difficult to determine how students would have time to prepare for submitting and for resubmissions as the practice placements appear to follow the academic modules each year. The visitors require a clearly dated assessment schedule and an accurate teaching timetable to include practice placement dates.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require a dated assessment schedule and teaching timetable that include practice placement dates. The education provider may want to include a table that details all the modules, their credits and the assessment attached to each module.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that under section 13.6.1 of the programme document, it is stated that students should be successful in a minimum of 120 credits across all assessment and associated coursework in order to progress. The visitors also noted it states that students may also be allowed to trail one 20 credit non-clinical module into the following year if they have demonstrated overall good performance. The visitors noted that there are now few 20 credit modules as part of this programme. The visitors require further information on the rationale for this given the limited number of 20 credit modules within the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors would like further information on the rationale for this given the limited number of 20 credit modules within the programme.

## **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.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hertfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Art Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Art therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	27 January 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

The education provider is making changes to the learning outcomes to increase the relevance of the curriculum to contemporary art therapy practice by subsuming a first year module across the Art therapy practice modules; and incorporating evidence based practice into new inter-professional learning modules. There have also been changes to the assessments of the revised modules.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Old and new programme specifications
- Old and new module descriptors
- Assessment overview

### **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.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Undergraduate Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	15 March 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	James Pickard (Podiatrist) Alison Wishart (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 6 Assessment

The education provider has indicated that it will allow the opportunity for students to complete the programme over a maximum of two years rather than the current one year. This will allow students who are experiencing difficulties in completing the programme the chance to complete the programme.

The education provider is also seeking to appoint an external examiner who is not on the relevant part of the HPC register but is registered with another regulator. The education provider has provided evidence that whilst the proposed examiner is not on the HPC register they are sufficiently qualified to take on the role of external examiner.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form

- Context pack
- Curriculum vitae for Louise Cope
- Module descriptors
- Module grid
- Extenuating circumstance form
- External examiner reports and institutional response

### **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.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Masters Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	15 March 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	James Pickard (Podiatrist) Alison Wishart (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 6 Assessment

The education provider has indicated that it will allow the opportunity for students to complete the programme over a maximum of two years rather than the current one year. This will allow students who are experiencing difficulties in completing the programme the chance to complete the programme.

The education provider is also seeking to appoint an external examiner who is not on the relevant part of the HPC register but is registered with another regulator. The education provider has provided evidence that whilst the proposed examiner is not on the HPC register they are sufficiently qualified to take on the role of external examiner.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form



- Context pack
- Curriculum vitae for Louise Cope
- Module descriptors
- Module grid
- Extenuating circumstance form
- External examiner reports and institutional response

### **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

<b>Section one: Programme details</b> .....	1
<b>Section two: Submission details</b> .....	1
<b>Section three: Additional documentation</b> .....	2
<b>Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)</b> .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Central Lancashire
<b>Programme title</b>	Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	15 March 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist/podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	David Christopher

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 6 Assessment

The education provider has informed HPC of a change to the external examiner for the programme. The new examiner is not HPC registered because the education provider was unable to identify and recruit an examiner who was appropriately qualified and experienced as well as being HPC registered.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- External Examiner CV

### **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

<b>Section one: Programme details</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Section two: Submission details</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Section three: Additional documentation</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Section four: Recommendation of the visitor</b> .....	<b>2</b>

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time Mixed mode
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	22 December 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitor</b>	James Petter (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Victoria Adenugba

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Programme leader change

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 for Patrick Henry

### **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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is 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 visitor 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

<b>Section one: Programme details</b> .....	1
<b>Section two: Submission details</b> .....	1
<b>Section three: Additional documentation</b> .....	2
<b>Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)</b> .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Newcastle University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Language Pathology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	27 March 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Martin Duckworth (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	David Christopher

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Programme leader change

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV for new programme leader (Carolyn Letts)

### **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

<b>Section one: Programme details</b> .....	1
<b>Section two: Submission details</b> .....	1
<b>Section three: Additional documentation</b> .....	2
<b>Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)</b> .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Newcastle University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Sciences
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	27 March 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Martin Duckworth (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	David Christopher

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Programme leader change

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV for new programme leader (Nick Miller)



### **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.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	9 February 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Catherine Mackenzie (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 5 Practice placements  
SET 6 Assessment

These groups of SETs have been affected by changes made in the light of new policies to rationalise the credit units and produce a more coherent framework across the programme to enhance the learning of the students

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)

- Current/Proposed programme structure
- Programme specification
- External examiners feedback
- Response to student meeting
- Module descriptors

### **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.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Biomedical Scientist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	17 February 2012
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Mary Macdonald (Biomedical scientist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

The education provider is undergoing a period of change to improve the learning and teaching experience, and efficiency of programme delivery across all programmes – Enhancing Quality in Assessment and Learning (EQAL). The changes describe modifications to the undergraduate framework of the programme to take it from a 20 credit module system to a 30 credit system. Level 4 changes were reviewed by HPC visitors in January 2011 and it was deemed that the programme continued to meet the standards. The education provider has now provided information relating to changes to Level 5 and Level 6 units.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Biomedical science undergraduate programme scheme
- Biomedical science programme specification
- Summary of equalisation changes March 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.

### **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.