

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	4
Section five: Visitors' comments	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	3 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions

The education provider has reviewed the entry requirements for the programme

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has informed the HCPC that there will be an increase in student numbers for the programme.

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has reviewed the curriculum and assessment for the programme.

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 specification
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Resources document
- Education provider academic planning handbook
- NHS values based recruitment guide
- College of Paramedics mapping document
- QAA benchmarking mapping document
- Practice development portfolio
- Clinical placement module guide
- 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.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided but were unclear as to what the admissions policy for the programme is. The visitors saw that East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EMAS) are involved in the recruitment of the additional students to the programme. The visitors could not determine how the admissions process for the programme is managed. The visitors noted that there are three programmes altogether detailed in the documentation, including a Dip HE, as this is now a separate programme and there is a Top-up BSc. The visitors therefore want to see evidence that demonstrates clearly the procedures for admissions to the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme to be assured that the applicant has the information needed to make a decision as to whether to take up the offer of a place on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the admissions to the programme to ensure that applicants have the information they need to take up the offer of a place on the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors note that the education provider proposed to increase staff numbers year on year, however they could not see any indication of whether there will

be budgeting to support the proposed increase in staffing. As such, considering the increase in student numbers and the potential impact on other paramedic programmes, the visitors could not determine that there will continue to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors need evidence that clearly demonstrates that the programme will be effectively resourced with staff in order to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the proposed staffing arrangements that will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: The visitors could not determine from the evidence provided that indicated that there will be sufficient mentors and placement staff at EMAS to support the increase in student numbers coming on to the programme when the students are in the placement setting. The visitors noted the statement from EMAS saying that they will support the placement and mentors. However no evidence detailing the mentors, how many are trained and where they will be placed to support the learning of the students on placement.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective placement experience for the additional number of students on the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the module descriptors for the programme. The visitors could not see if there was a pass mark for all the modules and whether there are any exemptions for the modules and whether there are any prerequisites for the programme. Also for the Level 5 Pharmacology module there is a formative assessment pass mark of eighty per cent but this mark does not contribute to the overall mark for the module. The visitors would therefore like to see evidence that clearly demonstrates the pass marks for all modules and any exemptions and prerequisites that might be applied to modules.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the assessment for the modules measure the learning outcomes for the programme.

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 on reading the documentation noted that the UCAS points given are the previous version and that the points system has been revised. The visitors recommend that the education provider updates all relevant admissions documentation to reflect the change before the documentation is made available for applicants to 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

Name of education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

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:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BA Honours in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social Worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has increased the entry requirements for the programme and there has also been a change to the programme leadership.

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 specification
- Curriculum vitae of new programme leader
- Other staff curriculum vitae
- Programme handbook
- Programme flyer

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

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social Worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has increased the entry requirements for the programme and there has also been a change to the programme leadership.

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 specification
- Curriculum vitae of new programme leader
- Other staff curriculum vitae
- Programme handbook
- Programme flyer

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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist) Natalie Matchett (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Due to a change in the funding arrangements from the NHS the education provider has proposed to change the cohort numbers for the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) full time to 75.

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 specification
- Staff curriculum vitae
- MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) strategy

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.

5.2 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 the increase in numbers for the masters programme meant that there would be a decrease in numbers for the undergraduate programme and therefore should not impact on the number of academic staff required. However it is not clear from the evidence submitted whether placement educators would be prepared for this increase in master's student numbers and whether this additional pressure to services will mean they will not have the increased capacity to accommodate sufficient numbers and the range of appropriate placements to enable learning outcomes to be achieved for the Masters programme at level 7.

Additional evidence: Evidence of placements showing the number and duration of placements to take students at masters level to ensure that an adequate number and range of practice placements to effectively deliver the learning outcomes for the programme.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: The visitors were unclear about how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient numbers of appropriately qualified practice placement staff at placements to ensure that the staff are sufficiently qualified to teach students at level 7. To ensure that this standard continues to be met the visitors need to see evidence to demonstrate that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates that there are an appropriate number of qualified and experienced staff to teach the additional students at level 7.

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

Reason: The visitors were unclear about how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient numbers of placement staff at placements to ensure that they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to teach students at level 7. To ensure that this standard continues to be met the visitors want to see evidence to demonstrate that there continues to be adequate placement educators who have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to teach students at level 7.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates that there are practice placement educators who have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to teach the additional students at level 7.

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

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	4 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has changed the curriculum and assessment for certain modules within the programme, and has moved module timings around to allow more time for further study within the modules.

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)
- Rationale for changes being made
- Rationale presentation
- Rationale for the changes to the programme course structure diagram

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

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	David Childs (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

There has been a programme leader change to Stephen Jordan.

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 specification
- Curriculum vitae for Stephen Jordan

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	Pg Dip Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 April 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer) Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

SET 6: Assessment

Due to commissioning from Health Education North West (HENW), the education provider has increased student numbers on the PgDip Radiotherapy programme from 12 per year to 24 per year for cohorts starting in 2016 and 2017. In addition to this, there is a change in programme leader.

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)
- Staff CV for proposed programme leader

- Attendance mapping
- Student Clinical Placement Numbers Mapping
- Head of Directorate report
- Placement staff list
- Planning for PgDip and BSc (Hons) – Students in placement
- Planning distribution
- Practice placement coordinators report
- Commissioning intentions for 2016-17

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.

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

Reason: From the evidence submitted the visitors noted that due to commissioning from Health Education North West (HENW), student numbers on the Pg Dip Radiotherapy programme will increase from 12 per year to 24 per year for cohorts starting in 2016 and 2017. In conjunction with this increase, the numbers on the undergraduate programme will reduce from 34 to 30. The visitors were provided with some modelling of the potential demand for practice placements, however, it was not clear from the evidence provided what additional staff resource will be required to accommodate the increase in student numbers for the Pg Dip Radiotherapy programme. As such, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place on this programme.

Additional evidence: Evidence of how the education provider will ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in place in order to deliver the programme effectively.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From the evidence submitted the visitors noted that due to commissioning from HENW, student numbers on the Pg Dip Radiotherapy programme will increase from 12 per year to 24 per year for cohorts starting in 2016 and 2017. In conjunction with this increase, the numbers on the undergraduate programme will reduce from 34 to 30. The visitors were provided with some modelling of the potential demand for practice placements, however, the visitors were not provided with information on the capacity and resource in place for this programme. As such, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider will ensure that resources in place effectively support the required learning and teaching activities for this programme.

Additional evidence: Further evidence to show that resources in place effectively support the required learning and teaching activities for this programme.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Reason: From the evidence submitted the visitors noted that due to commissioning from HENW, student numbers on the Pg Dip Radiotherapy programme will increase from 12 per year to 24 per year for cohorts starting in 2016 and 2017. In conjunction with this increase, the numbers on the undergraduate programme will reduce from 34 to 30. The visitors were provided with some modelling of the potential demand for practice placements, however, the visitors were not provided with information on the capacity and resource in place for this programme. As such, the visitors were unclear with the change in profile of and general increase in student numbers, how the education provider will ensure that the learning resources, including IT facilities, will be appropriate to the curriculum and be made readily available to students and staff.

Additional evidence: Further evidence to show that the learning resources, including IT facilities, are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to students and staff.

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

Reason: From the evidence submitted the visitors noted that due to commissioning from HENW), student numbers on the Pg Dip Radiotherapy programme will increase from 12 per year to 24 per year for cohorts starting in 2016 and 2017. In conjunction with this increase, the numbers on the undergraduate programme will reduce from 34 to 30. The visitors were provided with some modelling of the potential demand for practice placements. However, the visitors were not provided with information on how the education provider will ensure that practice placements have sufficient capacity to continue to support the delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes. As such, the visitors were unclear how the education provider will facilitate placements to ensure that all students have access to a range of placements that will support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Additional evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate that all students have access to a range of placements that will support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: From the evidence submitted the visitors noted that due to commissioning from HENW, student numbers on the Pg Dip Radiotherapy programme will increase from 12 per year to 24 per year for cohorts starting in 2016 and 2017. In conjunction with this increase, the numbers on the undergraduate programme will reduce from 34 to 30. The visitors were provided with some modelling of the potential demand for practice placements. However, the visitors were not provided with information on how the education provider will ensure with the effective increase in student numbers, that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at

practice placement. As such, the visitors were unable to determine if there are enough members of staff at practice placement to support students in their learning in a safe environment.

Additional evidence: Further evidence on how the education provider will ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are at the practice placement setting.

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

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	Pg Dip Audiology (with clinical competency certificate - CCC)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	26 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has removed two optional modules for the programme to reduce the assessment burden.

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate - CCC)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	26 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has removed two optional modules for the programme to reduce the assessment burden.

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

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

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme title	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	26 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

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:

- 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

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	26 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

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:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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

Name of education provider	Oxford Brooks University
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 April 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
 SET 3: Programme management and resources
 SET 4: Curriculum
 SET 5: Practice placements
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has made several changes to the programme. These changes include a move to a new campus, upgrading of learning resources and changes to the curriculum and assessment of the programme.

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 specification
- New facilities floor plans
- ODP Open day presentation
- Updated module descriptors
- External examiner reports
- ODP programme team minutes
- ODP subject committee minutes
- Student feedback
- ODP inventory list

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

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	31 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Whitmore (Paramedic) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources
 SET 4: Curriculum
 SET 5: Practice placements
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has flagged several changes to the programme, namely changes to the schedule of assessment, curriculum and practice placement structure. These changes affect a number of the SETs as listed above.

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)

- Placement documentation
- Curriculum and assessment documentation
- Course handbook
- Pre-registration standards of conduct
- Letters from the South Central Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust

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

Name of education provider	Queen's University of Belfast
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	19 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lincoln Simmonds (Clinical psychologist) Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has introduced new regulations for dealing with students who are failing placements, in addition to this two joint programme leaders have been appointed while the education provider recruits a permanent programme leader.

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: Staff curriculum vitae
- Appendix 2: Programme specification
- Appendix 3: Handbook course regulations and academic modules 15-16

- Appendix 4: Placement handbook
- Appendix 5: Research handbook
- Appendix 6: Fitness to practice procedure

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.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided and noted that two interim programme leaders have been internally appointed while a permanent programme leader is recruited. The visitors also noted that there was a part time clinical tutor post vacant, from this evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the education provider would ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme during this period of time where temporary arrangements are in place. As such the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, such as recruitment plans or workload plans.

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

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Dietitian
Date of submission to the HCPC	2 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Allison Nicolls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has made changes to placements in line with national changes.

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 specification
- Module descriptors
- Student placement portfolios
- Narrative to placement changes

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

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Step Up)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Childs (Social worker in England) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

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:

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

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

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	31 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider highlighted a change to the mark scheme for level 7 modules

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)
- Email to external examiners
- Email to staff
- Presentation on the introduction of the 50 pass mark
- Revised level 7 marking scheme
- Standards assessment regulations
- Academic board level 7 pass mark document
- Copy of revised level 7 marking scheme scaling table
- Update course document

- Amended student handbook
- Example revised marking descriptor
- Practice course document

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the 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

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	Pg Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	31 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider highlighted a change to the mark scheme for level 7 modules

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)
- Email to external examiners
- Email to staff
- Presentation on the introduction of the 50 pass mark
- Revised level 7 marking scheme
- Standards assessment regulations
- Academic board level 7 pass mark document

- Copy of revised level 7 marking scheme scaling table
- Update course document
- Amended student handbook
- Example revised marking descriptor
- Practice course document

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the 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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Southampton Solent University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 April 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Dorothy Smith (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A change in programme leader.

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)
- Staff profile

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.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitor noted the education provider has submitted a staff profile as evidence for the change in programme leader. In assessing the evidence, the visitor noted that the staff profile focused entirely on the proposed programme leader's qualification, teaching and research. From this the visitor was satisfied that the proposed programme leader is appropriately qualified. However, the visitor was unable to determine from the evidence the appropriate previous experiences held by the proposed programme team and how these experiences will enable them to have overall professional responsibility for the programme. In addition, the visitor noted that the staff profile provides a statement that the proposed programme leader is a registered social worker in England, however, no information was provided to support this statement.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the programme leader's experience and registration status.

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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Southampton Solent University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 April 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Dorothy Smith (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A change in programme leader.

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)
- Staff profile

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.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitor noted the education provider has submitted a staff profile as evidence for the change in programme leader. In assessing the evidence, the visitor noted that the staff profile focused entirely on the proposed programme leader's qualification, teaching and research. From this the visitor was satisfied that the proposed programme leader is appropriately qualified. However, the visitor was unable to determine from the evidence the appropriate previous experiences held by the proposed programme team and how these experiences will enable them to have overall professional responsibility for the programme. In addition, the visitor noted that the staff profile provides a statement that the proposed programme leader is a registered social worker in England, however, no information was provided to support this statement.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the programme leader's experience and registration status.

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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of submission to the HCPC	16 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Joanne Thomas (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
SET 3: Programme management and resources
SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has proposed to run an additional cohort of ten students per year in partnership with University Hospital North Midlands NHS Trust who will provide the additional placements.

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)
- Example of record of attendance
- Mentor briefing pack
- Course handbook

- Student evaluation feedback
- Module monitoring report
- Numeracy activity
- Placement provider group minutes
- Course management committee minutes
- Student attendance record
- Conduct of professional behaviour
- Communication activity and scoring
- Interview schedule
- Programme specification
- Annual monitoring report
- Internal advert
- September 2016 training plan
- September year one timetable
- Educational audit document
- University Hospitals of North Midlands theatres specialities
- Royal Stoke Hospital mentor register

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.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence which stated that two new members of staff would be recruited in order to support the additional cohort. However the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided when the additional staff would be recruited and that they would be recruited in time for the first new cohort. As such the visitors could not determine that the standard continued to be met without evidence to demonstrate when and how the new staff would be recruited.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, such as a recruitment plan and job adverts.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence which stated that two new members of staff would be recruited in order to ensure that subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. However from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine the qualifications and experience the new members of staff would be required to have. As such the visitors could not determine that the

subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge and require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, such as a job descriptions for the new posts which outline the expected qualifications and experience.

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

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	2 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A change in programme leader.

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 proposed programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	MSc Audiological Science with Certificate in Clinical Competency (CCC)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	11 March 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
 SET 3: Programme management and resources
 SET 4: Curriculum
 SET 6: Assessment

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 handbooks
- Annual student experience reviews
- Development and enhancement plan
- Admissions materials
- Chair's report, exam board
- Departmental teaching committees

- Quality review framework
- Ear institute action plan 2015
- Internal quality report ear institute
- Module feedback form
- External examiner reports
- Departmental teaching committee membership list and meeting minutes
- Student staff consultative committee meeting minutes

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: The education provider submitted documentation which directed visitors to the programme website for admissions information. However the visitors were unable to locate where applicants would be able to find information regarding fees for the full duration of the programme. Specifically the programme website states that “The fee advertised is for the first year of the programme. The fee for the second year has not yet been set.” The visitors note that in order for applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme they will need information regarding fees for the full duration of the programme. In addition to this, the website outlines a ‘step off’ award for the programme, Postgraduate Diploma in Audiological Science with Certificate in Clinical Competency (CCC). However the visitors were unable to locate where applicants could find information outlining whether the step off award will give applicants eligibility to apply to the Register. The visitors note that in order for applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme they will need information which clearly outlines which exit points of the programme will provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. Finally, the visitors were unable to locate where applicants would be able to find information regarding the location, length and duration of practice placements for the new programme structure. The visitors note that in order for applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme they will need information regarding the length and structure of placements. The visitors therefore require additional documentation which demonstrates how the admissions procedure gives applicants the information required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence which demonstrates how the admissions procedure gives applicants the information required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. Evidence such as updated website information including second year fees, placement information and that the step off award will provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma in Audiological Science with Certificate in Clinical Competency (CCC)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	11 March 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
 SET 3: Programme management and resources
 SET 4: Curriculum
 SET 6: Assessment

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 handbooks
- Annual student experience reviews
- Development and enhancement plan
- Admissions materials
- Chair's report, exam board
- Departmental teaching committees

- Quality review framework
- Ear institute action plan 2015
- Internal quality report ear institute
- Module feedback form
- External examiner reports
- Departmental teaching committee membership list and meeting minutes
- Student staff consultative committee meeting minutes

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: The education provider submitted documentation which directed visitors to the programme website for admissions information. The website outlined that this programme would be available to students as a 'step off' from the MSc Audiological Science with Certificate in Clinical Competency (CCC). However, the information provided did not outline that this programme will provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors note that in order for applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme they will need information which clearly outlines if this programme will provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. In addition to this, the visitors were unable to locate where applicants would be able to find information regarding the location, length and duration of practice placements for the new programme structure. The visitors note that in order for applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme they will need information regarding the length and structure of placements. The visitors therefore require additional documentation which demonstrates how the admissions procedure gives applicants the information required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence which demonstrates how the admissions procedure gives applicants the information required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. Evidence such as updated website information including placement information and clarity that this programme will provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

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	3
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University Campus Suffolk
Name of validating body	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	28 January 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

As part of the programme's five year review the education provider has updated the curriculum and assessment for the programme.

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 specification
- Revised module mapping

- Revised handbooks
- Revalidation document
- Revised admissions policy
- Sample placement agreements
- Assessment regulations
- Undergraduate handbook
- Stakeholder feedback
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Sample practice assessment document
- Admissions data report
- Standards of proficiency mapping

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: In reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors noted that the changes impact on how the curriculum is taught and delivered. The revisions have been made to the teaching and learning approaches to assist the students in preparing for practice placement. The visitors further noted that the SOPs mapping document and the module guides showed the revised learning outcomes, however the evidence did not demonstrate the changes that had occurred. Therefore the visitors were unclear from the evidence provided how the new curriculum continues ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOP's) for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the changes in the learning outcomes, for example the previous module guides and SOPs mapping document and the new module guides and SOPs mapping document.

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: In reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors noted that the changes impact on how the curriculum is taught and assessed. The revisions have been made to the teaching and learning approaches to assist the students in preparing for practice placement. The visitors further noted that the SOPs mapping document and the module guides showed the revised learning outcomes, however the evidence did not demonstrate the changes that had occurred. Therefore the visitors were unclear from the evidence provided how the new curriculum continues ensure that those who

successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOP's) for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the changes in the learning outcomes, for example the previous module guides and SOPs mapping document and the new module guides and SOPs mapping document.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise

Reason: In reviewing the evidence the visitors noted the intention to reintroduce grading on clinical placement instead of pass or fail. From the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how student performance would be measured in the placement setting with this change. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the changes made to the assessment of student performance on placement ensure fitness to practise.

Additional documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the changes made to radiotherapy practice placement assessment modules, and how this is conveyed to the students.

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 that there were several references to the HPC. The visitors recommend that the documentation is reviewed again to remove all erroneous references to the HPC before the documents are provided to students for the next academic session.

The visitors noted that service users are being asked to provide formative assessment. The visitors would advise the education provider that the involvement of service users in the programme should be included in the annual monitoring audit for the programme due in 2016–17.

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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	13 January 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
 SET 3: Programme management and resources
 SET 4: Curriculum
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider have highlighted that the programme delivery will change from three years to two years.

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 specification
- Staff CVs

- Module specifications
- Desirable and essential experiences cohort 2016
- Programme Design and Consultation Document
- Radiotherapy and Oncology Theory and Practice Module Handbook
- Handbook MSc 2 Year Practice Placements

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the submission, the visitors noted that the curriculum has been amended in line with national drivers and feedback from students. As part of the evidence the visitors were provided with the programme team staff CV's and descriptions of the modules. However, from a review of the documentation the visitors could not see which member of staff was responsible for each module. As a result, the visitors were therefore unable to determine what subject areas are being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors therefore require further information that demonstrates who the module leaders are for each module.

Suggested documentation: Further information regarding the staff members that are responsible for each module of the programme, and their relevant specialist expertise and knowledge in regards to their role.

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

Reason: From a review of the submission, the visitors noted several inconsistencies in the documentation relating to the number of placement weeks and student holidays. For example, the clinical handbook states that there are three placements of 14 week. It also says that in second module the students have two weeks planning, four weeks SIM/CT and eight weeks megavoltage. This adds up to 14 weeks and the students also take a weeks' holiday and an inter-professional experience. Therefore the visitors were unclear as to the actual time spent on practice placement for the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence on the number, duration and range of practice placement and how they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcome.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence on the number, duration and range of placement for this programme and how they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcome.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes

Reason: The visitors noted that there was a difference between the clinical module handbook and the module descriptor for UZYSWS: Radiotherapy and Oncology Theory and Practice with regard to the assessment listed. The module descriptor gives the assessment as portfolio 100% weighting and the clinical module handbook gives the assessment as examination with 100% weighting. From the evidence provided the visitors were unable to determine how the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcome. As such, the visitors therefore require clarification as to the correct assessment method for this module in order for this standard to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further clarification on the assessment methods employed.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the evidence provided discusses a common credit framework across the education providers programmes. However, no evidence was provided to explain how this framework would impact on this programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine any impact on the assessment regulation for this programme and how students would progress within the new framework. Therefore were unable to determine how the assessment regulation in place clearly specific requirements for student progression and achievement, in particular what would be considered a pass or fail under the new framework.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the assessment regulations for the education provider and how the regulations impact on the progression and achievement for students on the programme.

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

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Prescribing Principles (Level 3)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of submission to the HCPC	31 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard A: Programme admissions

Standard B: Programme management and resources

Standard C: Curriculum

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend this programme to include therapeutic radiographers. The suggested changes impact on a number of areas across the standards for prescribing predominantly around, admissions, programme management and assessment.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme application form

- Staff curriculum vitae
- Designated medical practitioner single competency framework
- Module specifications
- Stakeholder comments
- Joint approval document
- Programme structure document
- Draft programme timetable
- E-portfolio
- Single competency framework

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 for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Prescribing Principles (Level M)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of submission to the HCPC	31 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard A: Programme admissions

Standard B: Programme management and resources

Standard C: Curriculum

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend this programme to include therapeutic radiographers. The suggested changes impact on a number of areas across the standards for prescribing predominantly around, admissions, programme management and assessment.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme application form

- Staff curriculum vitae
- Designated medical practitioner single competency framework
- Module specifications
- Stakeholder comments
- Joint approval document
- Programme structure document
- Draft programme timetable
- E-portfolio
- Single competency framework

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 for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Principles of Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of submission to the HCPC	31 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard A: Programme admissions
Standard B: Programme management and resources
Standard C: Curriculum

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend this programme to include dietitians and therapeutic radiographers. The suggested changes impact on a number of areas across the standards for prescribing predominantly around, admissions, programme management and assessment.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme application form
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Designated medical practitioner single competency framework

- Module specifications
- Stakeholder comments
- Joint approval document
- Programme structure document
- Draft programme timetable
- E-portfolio
- Single competency framework

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 for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.