

## 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 .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Anglia Ruskin University
<b>Programme title</b>	FDS in Hearing Aid Audiology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Distance Learning
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispenser
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	3 March 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has indicated a programme leader change from Maryanne Maltby to Vinay Manchaia.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV for Dr Vinaya Manchaiah

### 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.

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

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitor noted that the programme leader role has been filled by a member of the programme team. However, it was not clear what impact, if any, this has had on the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, and therefore further information is required to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitor requires further evidence regarding the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, following the appointment of Vinay Manchaia to the role of programme leader.

#### **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

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3
Section five: Visitors' comments .....	4

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	24 January 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

A full overview of the programme has been undertaken. How the programme content has been packaged into modules has been changed. Programme philosophy, modules and learning outcomes have been written to more explicitly refer to care and the practice and skill focus within the programme.

They have also indicated other changes to assessment regulations; a decrease to the number of assessment attempts, the clinical assessment is no longer aligned to a clinical module and there has been alignment of module learning objectives with clinical assessment at each of the three years of the programme

to ensure clinical practice and theoretical concepts are fully integrated with each other.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography Programme Specification
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography module descriptors (2011)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography module descriptors (September 2014)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography clinical placement handbook guidance notes for students
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography clinical placement handbook guidance notes for clinical staff
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography clinical assessment guidance notes (Level 4)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography clinical assessment guidance notes (Level 5)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography clinical assessment guidance notes (Level 6)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography clinical placement handbook and assessment document (Level 4)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography clinical placement handbook and assessment document (Level 5)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography clinical placement handbook and assessment document (Level 6)

### **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 has submitted documentation detailing changes to modules and learning outcomes alongside other information for this major change submission. The education provider has not submitted mapping documentation to show how those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for diagnostic radiography. The visitors could not determine how the learning outcomes for the programme ensure students can meet the SOPs. The visitors also noted some module descriptors could be confusing for students. The module descriptors for Introduction to Professional Life and Musculoskeletal System refer to 4 learning outcomes instead of 3. The

module descriptor for Digestive, Endocrine and Vascular systems does not give clear links regarding when immune and vascular systems are covered during the programme. The visitors therefore require additional information to ensure this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence that demonstrates the learning outcomes for the programme ensure students can meet the SOPs for diagnostic radiography.

### **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 have noted the education provider has submitted documentation detailing changes to learning outcomes and assessment alongside other information for this major change submission. The visitors saw that some of the module descriptors submitted do not link learning outcomes to the assessment:

- Progressing to Practitioner
- Research in Radiography
- all Level 6 optional modules

The visitors also noted the Level 6 optional module descriptors did not provide details of the nature of coursework assessment. With the lack of detail of the assessments the visitors were unable to determine how the assessment strategy and design ensures that students are able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for diagnostic radiography.

**Suggested documentation:** Further evidence demonstrating how the assessments of the learning outcomes ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for diagnostic radiography.

### **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.

## **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted the module descriptors had been updated and amended in some but not all cases. For the following diagnostic and radiotherapy modules, the visitors felt that it was important for the programme team to ensure both the essential reading and background reading book lists are reviewed and update Academic and Professional Practice 1, Academic and Professional Practice 3 and Research Methods

## 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 five: Visitors' comments .....	4

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	24 January 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

A full overview of the programme has been undertaken. How the programme content has been packaged into modules has been changed. Programme philosophy, modules and learning outcomes have been written to more explicitly refer to care and the practice and skill focus within the programme.

They have also indicated other changes to assessment regulations; a decrease to the number of assessment attempts, the clinical assessment is no longer aligned to a clinical module and there has been alignment of module learning objectives with clinical assessment at each of the three years of the programme

to ensure clinical practice and theoretical concepts are fully integrated with each other.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy Programme Specification
- BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy module descriptors (2011)
- BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy module descriptors (September 2014)
- BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy clinical practice handbook guidance notes for students
- BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy clinical practice handbook guidance notes for staff
- BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy clinical placement scoping
- BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy clinical portfolio

### **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 has submitted documentation detailing changes to modules and learning outcomes alongside other information for this major change submission. The education provider has not submitted mapping documentation to show how those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for therapeutic radiography. The visitors could not determine how the learning outcomes for the programme ensure students can meet SOPs. Additionally the visitors saw that the module descriptor for Compassionate Care in Radiotherapy refers to learning objectives instead of 'Learning outcomes'. The visitors considered this lack of consistency could be confusing for students. The visitors therefore require additional information to ensure this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** evidence that demonstrates the learning outcomes for the programme ensure students can meet the SOPs for therapeutic radiography

## **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 have noted the education provider has submitted documentation detailing changes to learning outcomes and assessment alongside other information for this major change submission. The visitors saw that some of the module descriptors submitted do not link learning outcomes to the assessment:

- Academic and Professional Studies
- Progressing to Practitioner
- Research in Radiography
- Drug Therapy

The visitors also noted one module descriptor that did not provide detail of the nature of coursework assessment (Holistic Care in Oncology). With the lack of detail of the assessments the visitors were unable to determine how the assessment strategy and design ensures that students are able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for therapeutic radiography.

**Suggested documentation:** Further evidence demonstrating how the assessments of the learning outcomes ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for therapeutic radiography.

### **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.

## **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted the module descriptors had been updated and amended in some but not all cases. For the following diagnostic and radiotherapy modules, the visitors felt that it was important for the programme team to ensure both the essential reading and background reading book lists are reviewed and updated for Academic and Professional Practice 1, Academic and Professional Practice 3 and Research Methods.

## 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>	Bournemouth University
<b>Programme title</b>	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	18 December 2013
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Stephen Oates (Operating department practitioner) David Bevan (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources  
SET 4 Curriculum

The education provider has indicated a change of programme leader to Lesley Elcock. The education provider has also indicated that following a 5 yearly review of the programme, changes to the placements have been internally approved, with the plan for placements to be reduced from 5 to 4, and for these placements to increase in length. There are also intended changes to the assessment of students' theoretical knowledge and professional attitudes and skills, in line with the proposed changes to the curriculum.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Proposed modules
- Program diagram
- Program Specification
- Briefing and Resources document – including SOPs mapping document
- Framework Briefing
- Unit Directory
- CV – Lesley Elcock

### **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:** From a review of the module descriptors provided, the visitors noted changes to the Foundations in Perioperative Practice, and the Developing Perioperative Practice modules. A standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document was also provided. Because the SOPs were not mapped to the specific learning outcomes for these two modules, the visitors could not determine that the learning outcomes continue to ensure students are able to meet all SOPs upon completion of the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require further evidence of how the learning outcomes for the Foundations in Perioperative Practice, and the Developing Perioperative Practice modules ensure that the relevant standards of proficiency are met.

#### **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.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2
Section five: Visitors' comments .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Iron Mill Institute, Exeter
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	University of Worcester
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Dramatherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Arts therapists
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Dramatherapy
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	3 February 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC Visitors</b>	Jane Fisher Norton (Dramatherapist) Donald Wetherick (Music Therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

#### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has informed us that their facilities for academic and professional training will be relocated and delivered at the Iron Mill Institute.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Southwest School/University of Worcester partnership agreement
- MA in Dramatherapy, Programme Specification
- Student resource book – revised page 11
- Iron Mill College, room hire booking form
- Iron Mill College, room hire terms/agreement

- Iron Mill College, interior photographic images and notes
- Morwenstow/Iron Mill College property details, including ground plan
- Iron Mill College resources check list
- Southwest School Dramatherapy library
- Barnfield theatre/studio contract
- Barnfield theatre photographic image

### **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.

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted that the current partner agreement with University of Worcester expires in August 2015, and that the education provider intends to recruit staff in 2015 for this programme. The visitors would like to remind the education provider to notify HCPC through the major change process as and when they make these changes, or when the evidence to support these changes will be available.

The visitors would also like to remind the education provider that HCPC does not make requirements in terms of practice days, as suggested on page five of the MA Dramatherapy 2014 Programme Specification. The HCPC does not prescribe any required length for the placement aspects of a programme, instead the HCPC requires the education provider to demonstrate that the length of practice

learning on the programme effectively supports the delivery of any associated learning outcomes. The visitors suggest that the education provider revises the relevant documentation to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed about any HCPC requirements.

## 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>	Leeds Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Programme title previously - BSc (Hons) Clinical Language Sciences (Speech and Language Therapy))
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	19 February 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Martin Duckworth (Speech language therapist) Catherine Mackenzie (Speech language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

As part of this curriculum review / restructure the programme title is changing. The BSc (Hons) Clinical Language Sciences (Speech and Language Therapy) will become BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy from the September 2014 cohort. There will be no further intakes to the BSc (Hons) Clinical Language Sciences (Speech and Language Therapy).

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

The curriculum has been reviewed and restructured as part of the University's strategy 'Refocusing the Undergraduate Curriculum'. The modular structure has

been altered including the introduction of an 'e-portfolio' into the clinical practice module, Clinical and Professional Skills 2.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Module descriptors for the programme
- Light Touch SPA CLSSP Course Name Change
- Approval Statement BSSLT
- Programme specification and appendices 1 – 7

### **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.

#### **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:** Within this change, the education provider has introduced a new 'e-portfolio' as an assessment method for the clinical practice module. The visitors could not determine how this would be implemented in the practice placement settings. There was no information demonstrating how this new assessment method would be introduced to the students and practice educators to ensure all would be able to access it online whilst on their placements. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that no students are disadvantaged by this change.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence to demonstrate how this change will be implemented across the placements and how students and practice educators will be prepared for this change, for example through training or updated handbooks.

#### **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.....	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>	Teesside University
<b>Programme title</b>	BA (Hons) Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	7 March 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	David Childs (Social Worker) Robert Goemans (Social Worker)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 2 Programme admissions  
SET 4 Curriculum

The proposed change is to allow graduates of another Teesside University programme (Cert HE Social Work Support) to be exempted from the first year of the programme and join the BA at the beginning of year two.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Evaluation Document.- Amendment to Programme Specification in BA programme
- Cert HE mapping with BA 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 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.....	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>	Teesside University
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	14 March 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitor</b>	Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

This change is a change to the programme leader. Mark Nevins (PA11212) will replace Marion Richardson. This took effect from 2 January 2014.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for M. Nevins

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Birmingham
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	11 March 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitor</b>	Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

This change is a change to the programme leader. Carolyn Roskell (PH29998) has taken over the position from Gill James.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Appendix 1 Pilot 2014 Screening Form
- Appendix 2 Photographs of facilities
- Appendix 3 2013-14 School Structure Organisation
- Appendix 4 External Examiner report 2013
- Appendix 5 Annual Programme Review 2013 School Summary
- Appendix 6 MSc Physiotherapy Pre-Reg Programme Review Minutes
- Appendix 7 Curriculum vitae for Carolyn Roskell

- Appendix 8 MSc Physiotherapy Programme Team
- Appendix 9 Curriculum vitae for new module leads

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitor 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**

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 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

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme title</b>	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part Time
<b>Relevant entitlements</b>	Supplementary Prescribing
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	13 February 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The programme leader for this programme has changed. Jenny Adams has left this position and has been replaced by Jane Collins and Justine Raynsford who now share this position.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV Jane Collins
- CV Justine Raynsford
- Module Descriptors Level 6 & 7

### **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**

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 .....	2
Section five: Visitors' comments .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of East Anglia
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	4 March 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Stephen Oates (Operating department practitioner) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 5 Practice placements  
SET 6 Assessment

The education provider has highlighted proposed changes to the assessment of the programme, in particular, changes to the credit distribution of each module, the assessment of learning outcomes, and methods of assessment. These changes could impact on the way in which SETs 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 are met. The education provider also indicated changes to the assessment of practice, from a system of grading students through a percentage system, where students can only achieve up to 75 per cent, to the newly proposed ODP attributes scale and moving from two summative assessments on placement to more formative summative assessment. These changes could impact on the way SET 6.1 is met.

In addition the education provider has indicated that under this new assessment

of practice method, the assessment of students will move from being based on learning outcomes, to being based on attributes. Therefore it could impact on SET 6.4 and 6.5.

Whilst the changes outlined impact mainly on standards regarding assessment, SETs regarding practice placements could also be impacted, for example SET 5.11, as visitors will want to be assured that students, practice placement providers and educators are made fully aware of the changes to assessment and how they are going to be implemented.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme Handbook
- Assessment of Practice Year 2 Term A
- Assessment of Practice Year 2 Term A

### **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.

## **Section five: Visitors' comments**

Whilst the visitors are satisfied that the programme continues to meet the SETs, and students will meet the SOPs following the changes to the programme, the visitors would like to recommend that the programme team continue to communicate with practice placement providers regarding any further programme changes.

## 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 .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Leeds
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	31 March 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitor</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

#### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The programme leader for this programme has changed from one person (Stephen Morley) to two in a joint position (Jan Hughes and Gary Latchford).

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Additional documentation supporting the staff changes
- Curriculum vitae of Dr Latchford and Dr Jan Hughes

### **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**

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 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

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 Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full Time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic Radiographer
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	13 March 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic Radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

#### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The programme leader Leslie Robinson is replaced by Frederick Murphy. He is taking over the overall management of the programme and will now be the programme lead.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme leader 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 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.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical Psychologist
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	13 March 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitor</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The programme leadership for this programme has changed from Nick Maguire to Lusía Stopa.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for new programme leader Luisa Stopa

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitor 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**

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 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

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Ulster
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Speech and Language Therapist
<b>Date of submission to the HCPC</b>	17 April 2014
<b>Name and profession of the HCPC visitors</b>	Martin Duckworth (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Hollie Latham

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

There has been a change of Programme leader from Jenny Hylands to Rosalind Rogers.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Rosalind Rogers' 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**

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.