

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	FDS in Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	9 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A programme leader change and a change from a written logbook to an eLogbook.

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 curriculum vitae
- Logbook form examples
- Audiology supervisor declaration form

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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has submitted information regarding the change from written logbooks to eLogbooks. The visitors also noted that the education provider has stated that this is an enhancement to the current system. The visitors are satisfied that this is an enhancement. However, in the mapping document, the visitors learnt that students and supervisors will receive appropriate training but the visitors did not see evidence to support this.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the training that will be delivered and how supervisors, including deputising supervisors, and students will be given support - particularly IT support - in order to use the eLogbooks offsite.

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.

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted the following statement on page 3 of the Audiology supervisor declaration: 'I declare that I am a registered Hearing Aid Dispenser, Audiologist or

Clinical Scientist and have held continuous full registration for at least two years with the HCPC and/or RCCP.' The visitors suggest that the education provider considers revising the wording of this statement so that it is clear that an audiologist who is not a hearing aid dispenser will not hold HCPC registration and that an audiological clinical scientist will hold HCPC registration but not as a hearing aid dispenser.

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	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	21 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
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 increased the number of students across the three social work programmes at the education provider.

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)
- Job description for senior lecturer
- Information about resources and usage
- Department student staff ratio

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: For this standard the education provider stated that if the programme recruits the maximum number of students, they would need 15 extra placements from the current placement providers which could be achieved. In addition, the education provider stated that there is ongoing work to train up practice placement educators to ensure that there are sufficient placements from the current placement providers. However, the visitors could not find the evidence to support this guarantee, and as such could not determine that there would be a sufficient number of placements to accommodate the proposed number of students. Therefore, they require additional evidence to demonstrate that the number, duration and range of practice placements will be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Evidence such a memorandums of understanding or PEP statistics that demonstrate that there will be sufficient capacity for the maximum number of students proposed 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.

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	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	21 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
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 increased the number of students across the three social work programmes at the education provider.

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)
- Job description for senior lecturer
- Information about resources and usage
- Department student staff ratio

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: For this standard the education provider stated that if the programme recruits the maximum number of students, they would need 15 extra placements from the current placement providers which could be achieved. In addition, the education provider stated that there is ongoing work to train up practice placement educators to ensure that there are sufficient placements from the current placement providers. However, the visitors could not find the evidence to support this guarantee, and as such could not determine that there would be a sufficient number of placements to accommodate the proposed number of students. Therefore, they require additional evidence to demonstrate that the number, duration and range of practice placements will be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Evidence such a memorandums of understanding or PEP statistics that demonstrate that there will be sufficient capacity for the maximum number of students proposed 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.

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	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme title	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	21 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
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 increased the number of students across the three social work programmes at the education provider.

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)
- Job description for senior lecturer
- Information about resources and usage
- Department student staff ratio

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: For this standard the education provider stated that if the programme recruits the maximum number of students, they would need 15 extra placements from the current placement providers which could be achieved. In addition, the education provider stated that there is ongoing work to train up practice placement educators to ensure that there are sufficient placements from the current placement providers. However, the visitors could not find the evidence to support this guarantee, and as such could not determine that there would be a sufficient number of placements to accommodate the proposed number of students. Therefore, they require additional evidence to demonstrate that the number, duration and range of practice placements will be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Evidence such a memorandums of understanding or PEP statistics that demonstrate that there will be sufficient capacity for the maximum number of students proposed 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.

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	Bournemouth University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	5 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

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 visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	British Psychological Society
Programme title	Qualification in Health Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	2 November 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Antony Ward (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	7 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist) Nigel Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has indicated changes to the module delivery and assessment for the Stage 1/FHEQ Level 4 physiology module in order to utilise new resources. The education provider also stated that there have been some addition and merges of teaching sessions.

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 handbook
- Module descriptors
- Tutorial and Anatomage session documentation
- Module modification pro forma

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted references to the 'HPC' in the BM-1211L Module Handbook and references to the 2007 HCPC SOPs for biomedical scientists in the module descriptor for Human Physiology. However, since 2012, the HPC has been called the HCPC and the most recent SOPs for biomedical scientists were updated in 2014. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider revise all documentation to ensure that any reference to the HCPC and its standards are up to date and accurate.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Cellular Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	7 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist) Nigel Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has indicated changes to the module delivery and assessment for the Stage 1/FHEQ Level 4 physiology module in order to utilise new resources. The education provider also stated that there have been some addition and merges of teaching sessions.

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 handbook
- Module descriptors
- Tutorial and Anatomage session documentation
- Module modification pro forma

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted references to the 'HPC' in the BM-1211L Module Handbook and references to the 2007 HCPC SOPs for biomedical scientists in the module descriptor for Human Physiology. However, since 2012, the HPC has been called the HCPC and the most recent SOPs for biomedical scientists were updated in 2014. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider revise all documentation to ensure that any reference to the HCPC and its standards are up to date and accurate.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Genetics Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	7 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist) Nigel Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has indicated changes to the module delivery and assessment for the Stage 1/FHEQ Level 4 physiology module in order to utilise new resources. The education provider also stated that there have been some addition and merges of teaching sessions.

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 handbook
- Module descriptors
- Tutorial and Anatomage session documentation
- Module modification pro forma

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted references to the 'HPC' in the BM-1211L Module Handbook and references to the 2007 HCPC SOPs for biomedical scientists in the module descriptor for Human Physiology. However, since 2012, the HPC has been called the HCPC and the most recent SOPs for biomedical scientists were updated in 2014. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider revise all documentation to ensure that any reference to the HCPC and its standards are up to date and accurate.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	7 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist) Nigel Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has indicated changes to the module delivery and assessment for the Stage 1/FHEQ Level 4 physiology module in order to utilise new resources. The education provider also stated that there have been some addition and merges of teaching sessions.

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 handbook
- Module descriptors
- Tutorial and Anatomage session documentation
- Module modification pro forma

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted references to the 'HPC' in the BM-1211L Module Handbook and references to the 2007 HCPC SOPs for biomedical scientists in the module descriptor for Human Physiology. However, since 2012, the HPC has been called the HCPC and the most recent SOPs for biomedical scientists were updated in 2014. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider revise all documentation to ensure that any reference to the HCPC and its standards are up to date and accurate.

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 Brighton
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	19 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Joanne Stead (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change from Josh Cameron to Tania Wiseman.

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 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	1
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
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	4 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Michael Branicki
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)
- Programme specification
- Staff 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 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	1
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel 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	4 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Michael Branicki
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)
- Programme specification
- Staff 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 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(s).....	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Dip HE Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	16 August 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Fellows (Paramedic) Susan Boardman (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has indicated that they wish to increase the student numbers for the programme by another 20 students to meet ambulance service commissioning numbers.

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)
- Letter from North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAAS)
- Letter from head of school regarding staffing for the programme
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Minutes of meeting with education provider and trust
- Mentor capacity spreadsheet

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.

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that the education provided intends to increase their commissioned student's numbers for the programme from 30 to 50 for a September 2016 start. The visitors were unable to see information on how the education provider ensures that the resources to support student learning in all setting is being effectively used. From the information the visitors were unable to determine that the learning resources in all settings, such as computers, texts and electronic books to support student have also been increased accordingly with the increase in student numbers. The visitors would like to see evidence that clearly demonstrates that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used and available to cope with the increase in student numbers.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that there is sufficient resources to support the student learning in all settings to cope with the increase in student numbers.

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that the education provided intends to increase their commissioned student's numbers for the programme from 30 to 50 for a September 2016 start. The visitors were unable to see from the evidence provided information on how the education provider ensures students understand the terminology of those who are involved in student training. It was not clear what role the practice placement educator takes. The visitors were unclear who would be allocated to the student on the ambulance and what role they will be playing on the placement. It was also unclear whether they would be a mentor, practice placement educator or senior paramedic. The visitors therefore require evidence that clearly defines these roles to ensure that the students understand who practice placement educators are and the role they perform in the student's training.

Suggested documentation: Documentary evidence that clearly identifies the roles and responsibilities of the practice placement educators to ensure that students understand about practice placement educators.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that the education provided intends to increase their commissioned student's numbers for the programme from 30 to 50 for a September 2016 start. It was unclear from the documentation provided if there are sufficient staff in place in the practice placement setting who are appropriately qualified and experienced to cope with the increased student numbers. The visitors noted the evidence provided demonstrated the vehicles available on placements but it did not clearly define the staff available at each placement setting. Also the visitors could not see who the practice placement educator is who will be working directly alongside the student in the ambulance and details of the role they have alongside the students. The visitors could not determine from the evidence received regarding the terminology of those who are involved in student training. It was unclear as to who was the mentor, the practice placement educator and the senior paramedics. The visitors were unclear as to whether there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting. Therefore the visitors were unclear as to whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates the appropriately qualified and experienced staff at each practice placement setting.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that the education provided intends to increase their commissioned student's numbers for the programme from 30 to 50 for a September 2016 start. It was unclear from the documentation provided if there are sufficient staff in place in the practice placement setting who are appropriately qualified and experienced to cope with the increased student numbers. The evidence provided showed how many practice placement staff are at each ambulance station but it did not indicate practice placement educators as having the relevant skills and knowledge to meet the increased number of students being accommodated on the programme. Also the visitors could not see who the practice placement educator is who will be working directly alongside the student in the ambulance and detail of the role they have alongside the students.

From the evidence provided, including the letter from NAST it was unclear to the visitors who have the appropriate skills, knowledge and experience to be able to assess the students on placement to provide the appropriate assessment feedback to the students. For the visitors be sure that this standard continues to be met further evidence demonstrating practice placement educators having the relevant knowledge and skills and experience to act as practice placement educators for this increase in student numbers is required.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates the knowledge skills and experience of practice placement educators for the programme and the roles they are performing in relation to practice placement education.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that the education provided intends to increase their commissioned student's numbers for the programme from 30 to 50 for a September 2016 start. The visitors noted in the letter from NWAAT indicated that not all staff at ambulance stations have undertaken appropriate practice placement education training. Also it appeared in the letter from NWAAT that the allocation of students on placement was carried out by the local "senior paramedic as part of their job description; many have now adopted a team mentorship approach to this taking final signoff responsibility on themselves after extensive formative assessment from paramedic mentors during placement blocks". Therefore the visitors were unclear if the practice placement educators who are on the ambulance vehicles with the students have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training. Also there was no clear indication as to how the sign off for the students undertaking training on the ambulance would work. Does the final sign off remain with the senior paramedic who may not be with the students whilst on the placement?

The visitors could not see who the practice placement educator is who will be working directly alongside the student in the ambulance and details of the role they have alongside the students. The visitors could not determine from the evidence received regarding the terminology of those who are involved in student training whether they would be a mentor, practice placement educator or senior paramedic. As this is unclear the visitors are seeking clarification to determine if the practice placement educator training taking by the relevant staff is appropriate to the role they are taking with the student.

For the visitors to be assured this standard continues to be met they would like to see evidence that demonstrates that those involved in student practice placement training take appropriate practice placement training to teach and assess students appropriately on the ambulances.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how those carrying out practice placement educator duties have undertaken practice placement educator training and what the sign off responsibilities are for those involved in the placement training for the students.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Programme title	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner Psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has changed the programme leader arrangements for this 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
- Curriculum vitae for the joint programme leaders

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	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner Psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has changed the programme leader arrangements for this 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
- Curriculum vitae for the joint programme leaders

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	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Michael Minns (Independent prescribing)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	24 August 2016

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources

Programme leader for the programme has changed.

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)
- Curriculum vitae for the 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 for prescribing 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 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 visitor 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 visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank 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	28 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Jane McLenachan (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

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)
- Programme leader 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 visitor must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	MA 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	28 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Jane McLenachan (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

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)
- Programme leader 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 visitor must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Name of validating body	Teesside University
Programme title	Prescription Only Medicine Certificate
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Date of submission to the HCPC	28 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Catherine Smith (Prescription only Medicine)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has appointed a new 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 new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor	2
Section five: Visitor's comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	19 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change of 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)
- Programme handbook
- New programme leader 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 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.

Section five: Visitor's comments

The visitor wishes to remind the education provider that as this programme leader is a temporary appointment for six months, the education provider should advise the HCPC when a full appointment is made to the role.

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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Patricia McClure (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
 SET 5: Practice placements
 SET 6: Assessment

As a result of the education provider's decision to move to 20 credits for programme modules the education provider has informed the HCPC of the changes to the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme modules to accommodate the change to 20 credit modules. The change to the credit modules also impacts on the practice placements 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

- Module descriptors
- Programme handbook
- Programme approval book
- Practice placement handbook
- Assessment form

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	Ruskin College
Name of awarding / validating body	The Open University
Programme title	BA (Honours) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full Time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	6 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider intends to change the programme leader to Olwen Summerscales.

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider intends to make changes to the weighting of assessments in each year of the programme impacting on the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme. Consequently the assessment strategy and design have been amended in relation to these 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
- Staff curriculum vitae
- OU regulations for validated awards
- Regulatory 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 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	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	15 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec

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 highlighted that they are making changes to the entry tariff for this programme by removing the requirement of "at least 100 points from natural science and social science" and "15 of the level 3 distinction credits must be from science units" for BTEC awards or other access routes. The education provider is also increasing the cohort number from 190 to 250 through the inclusion of ambulance technicians who wish to become paramedics.

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)

- Current course document
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Block plan for 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.

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	Sheffield Hallam University
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	5 August 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change from Jo Doughty to Laura Pattinson.

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 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	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	27 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Gary Dicken (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC of an exchange to a Canadian university for one level 5 student for the duration of their level 5 studies, including all modules, practice placements, and assessments. This fits in with a University wide exchange programme, where students can request completing part of their studies elsewhere. The education provider has noted this as a change to how one student will progress through 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)

- Course handbook
- Module descriptors
- Practicum employer agreement
- Social work handbook and practicum manual
- International experience reorientation programme
- Exchange programme mapping document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the 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 of Strathclyde
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 August 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 4: Curriculum

The education provider has advised the HCPC of a change of programme leader and amendments to two taught modules for the programme due to changes to bring in teaching within the department as the modules were previously taught by another education provider.

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
- Programme leader curriculum vitae
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module descriptors

- Supporting evidence for the major change

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 provided the visitors noted that in order to support the new programme staff have been required to fulfil different roles on the programme. However from the evidence provided it is unclear to the visitors how these new roles have been managed so that there is no impact on existing teaching and other duties. Therefore the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how the team continues to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to continue to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: The visitors received and reviewed the revised module descriptors for Anatomy and Physiology for speech and language pathology and Specialised Anatomy and Physiology for speech and language pathology. However the visitors were unclear as to how the teaching, learning and assessment for the modules are balanced and successfully address and measure the relevant learning outcomes for the programme. The visitors are also seeking clarification regarding the information about the multiple choice quiz examination (MCQ). The module descriptor body says it is a two hour examination, however the box regarding the assessment says one hour.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the assessment methods employed in the two modules identified, measure the learning outcomes.

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

For this standard the visitors reviewed the module descriptors, however from this evidence the visitors could not determine a clear rationale for the credit weighting for the two new modules and consequentially the requirements for student progression from these modules.

Specifically, the module for Anatomy and Physiology for speech and language pathology has 10 credits and appears to run across two semesters. The module Specialised Anatomy and Physiology for speech and language pathology is 20 credits and is listed as being a semester two module only. Therefore the visitors are seeking clarification regarding the relative weightings and requirements for student progression for the modules.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the assessment regulations clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, in relation to the two modules identified by the visitors.

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 Sussex
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	28 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change of 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 new programme leader
- Programme handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	21 October 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Rebecca Khanna (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

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 the 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 visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
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	30 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Jane McLenachan (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 the 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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	2 August 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Natalie Matchett (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider proposes to increase student numbers from 20 to 30 for each cohort.

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 curriculum vitae
- Information about Ability House
- Sheila Scott Building Map
- List of Occupational therapy specialist teaching resources
- Student and practice educator handbook
- Directory of Occupational therapy placements

- Student feedback on placements
- Practice educator dates

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: For this standard the visitors reviewed the curriculum vitae for the newly recruited staff. The visitors note that the education provider has recruited additional staff for 2016—17 in order to accommodate the increased student numbers. However, the visitors could not see a plan to increase the number of teaching staff as student numbers incrementally increase year on year. As such the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure that there will be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme as the programme recruits future intakes of 30 per year. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in place to deliver an effective programme as student numbers incrementally increase.

Suggested documentation: Evidence, such as a staff and resource plan that demonstrates that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective 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 noted that practical teaching will be delivered as two groups of 15 students in order to accommodate the student number increase, which could potentially increase the workload for the current staff in place. As such, the visitors could not determine how the current number of staff in place would be able to accommodate any increase in workload as a result of the increase in student numbers in order to deliver an effective programme. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme considering the introduction of the additional practical teaching session.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme with an increase in student numbers.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation that there has been an increase in learning resources in order to accommodate student number increases. However, the visitors noted from the evidence that there is one specialist practical teaching room which is designed to accommodate 20 students at a time. The visitors also noted from the evidence provided that the student group will be divided into two groups of 15 in order to accommodate the student number increase. However, it is not clear from the evidence how any timetabling adjustments made will ensure that the resources to support student learning will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the resources to support student learning in all settings will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Additional information about timetabling adjustments and further evidence which demonstrates that the resources to support student learning in all settings will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the 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: For this standard the visitors reviewed the information about the learning resources, specifically the teaching rooms, it was stated that to accommodate the cohort of 30, teaching would be divided into two groups of 15. The visitors further noted that the learning resources would be shared with other programmes which were also going through a student number increase. The evidence stated that the timetabling team would ensure that rooms would be made available for teaching, however the visitors could not see evidence of this, specifically how the specialist rooms that are shared with other professional programmes. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be readily available.

Suggested documentation: Evidence, such as a resource allocation document that demonstrates that the learning resources must be readily available to students and staff.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors reviewed the directory of placements available for the programme, the visitors could see that there were sufficient placements for the additional 10 students this year, however they could not see how there would be enough placements as student numbers incrementally increase year by year. Moreover the visitors could not see whether there would be any overlap with placements or how they would be monitored to ensure there are sufficient placements. As such the visitors could not determine that practice placements would continue to be integral to the programme considering the increase in students on the programme and require additional evidence to demonstrate this.

Suggested documentation: evidence, such as a placement structure that demonstrates that practice placements will continue to be integral to 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	5
Section five: Visitors' comments	5

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	12 August 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has highlighted a plan to increase the number of students on the programme from 20 students per cohort, one cohort per year to 30 students per cohort, one cohort per year.

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
- Information about Ability House
- Practice Educator handbook

- Practice education placements directory
- Student feedback of practice education placements
- Practice education training dates
- Learning environment profile forms
- Provisional timetable
- List of zoned academic staff by area
- Information about supporting students in contemporary practice education placements
- Process for sourcing placements
- BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy handbook
- Learning and Development principles for Chartered Society of Physiotherapy accreditation

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: For this standard the visitors reviewed the curriculum vitae for recruited staff. From a review of this documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider increased staff numbers prior to their plan to increase student numbers from 2016-17. The visitors note that the current staff numbers accommodate 20 students. However, the visitors could not see how the current capacity of staff is appropriate for the proposed 30 students per year. In addition, the visitors could not see a plan to increase staff numbers as student numbers incrementally increase year on year. As such the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure that there will be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme as the programme recruits future intakes of 30 per year. Therefore, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence, such as a staff and resource plan that demonstrates that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: For this standard the visitors reviewed the curriculum vitae for the newly recruited staff. However, the visitors noted that practical teaching will be delivered to two groups of 15 students, which could potentially increase the workload for the current staff in place at the academic setting. As such, the visitors could not determine how the current number of staff would be able to manage any increase in workload in order to deliver an effective programme as a result of the increase in student numbers.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme with an increase in student numbers.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation that there has been an increase in resources since 2013 in order to accommodate the increase in student numbers as well as developments to the programme. However, the visitors noted from the evidence that there is only one specialist practical teaching room which is designed to accommodate a maximum of 20 students. The visitors also noted from the evidence provided that the student group will be divided into two groups of 15 in order to accommodate the student number increase. However, it is not clear from the evidence how timetabling adjustments will ensure that the resources to support student learning will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the resources to support student learning in all settings will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Additional information about timetabling adjustments and further evidence which demonstrates that the resources to support student learning in all settings will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that there will be a further practical room to accommodate the increase in student numbers but no detail is provided in relation to whether this is suitably resourced for delivering the 'Guiding principles of physiotherapy practice' module. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the resources to support student learning in all settings will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Additional information about any further practical rooms to demonstrate how the resources to support student learning will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the 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: The visitors noted from the documentation that there has been an increase in resources since 2013 in order to accommodate the increase in student numbers as well as developments to the programme. However, the visitors noted from the evidence that there is only one specialist practical teaching room which is designed to accommodate a maximum of 20 students. The visitors also noted from the evidence provided that the student group will be divided into two groups of 15 in order to accommodate the student number increase. However, it is not clear from the evidence provided how the timetabling adjustments will ensure that the resources to support student learning for practical teaching will be sufficient for the proposed increase in

student numbers, especially considering that the specialist teaching rooms are to be shared with other programmes, such as occupational therapy. Therefore, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how learning resources are readily available to students.

Suggested documentation: Additional information about timetabling adjustments and further evidence to demonstrate that the learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to students and staff.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that there will be a further practical room to accommodate the increase in student numbers but no detail is provided in relation to whether this is suitably resourced for delivering the 'Guiding principles of physiotherapy practice' module. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this would be appropriate to the curriculum. Therefore, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: Additional information about any further practical rooms to demonstrate how learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum.

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: As part of the increase in student numbers, the visitors noted there the education provider is planning to increase the number of placements from current practice placement providers. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence that there will be a sufficient number of confirmed placements to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of practice placements with an increase in student numbers.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there will be a sufficient number of placements to support the delivery of the programme, such as confirmation from placement providers that they are able to support this increase in student numbers and provide additional placements.

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

Reason: As part of the increase in student numbers, the visitors noted there the education provider is planning to increase the number of placements from current practice placement providers. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence that there will be a sufficient number of confirmed placements to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. Therefore, they were unable to determine whether there will be more placements available with appropriately qualified and experienced staff or whether there will be more students at existing placements which would affect the ratio of students to staff. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there will be an adequate number of appropriately

qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting and require additional evidence.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there will be a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors were satisfied that there were a sufficient number of placements to meet the increase in student numbers. However, the visitors suggest that the education provider continues to review how they manage the growth in student numbers in relation to placements. Furthermore, the visitors noted that all practice placement educators will undertake practice placement educator training, including the new practice placement educators. The visitors encourage the education provider to keep a record of this training so that evidence that practice placement educators have attended training can be kept under review.

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 Worcester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	31 August 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist) Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

The education provider has highlighted they are making changes to two modules in the programme, specifically the learning outcomes related to modules PTHY2001 (Applied Sciences 1; Musculoskeletal physiotherapy) and PTHY2002 (Applied Sciences 2; Neurological and Cardio-vascular Respiratory Physiotherapy).

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider is combining a number of learning outcomes within module PTHY2002 and making changes to the way certain learning outcomes are assessed in both of the modules mentioned above. The education provider is also changing the minimum pass grade to D- for the Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs).

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 – old and amended

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 Worcester
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	John Donaghy (Paramedic) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has proposed changes to two of the modules on the programme. The education provider proposes to remove the current summative reflective assignment and replace it with a formative reflective assignment in the work based learning one module.

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)
- Revised 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.