Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme title	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD)
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	23 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A change in programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	22 October 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has highlighted their intent to introduce a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. The part time route will be directly based on the full time route, affecting only the time frames in which the programme is delivered. The education provider anticipates that the new programme will be undertaken by students through a part time route across five years.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Standard of proficiency mapping document
- Document 2 Links to University's websites and handbook
- Document 3 Interview questions / scoring criteria
- Document 4 External staff
- Document 5 Staff Curriculum vitae
- Document 6 Department structure
- Document 7 Diagram to show how our programme matches the MS Programme structure
- Document 10 HCPC competencies
- Document 11 Learning agreement
- Document 12 Mapping documents
- Document 13 Programme handbook
- Document 14 Equality document Health Care Science life Science part-time
- Document 15a Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 1
- Document 15b Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 2
- Document 15c Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 3
- Document 15d Project handbook
- Document 16 Programme specification
- Document 17 Patient carer and Public involvement strategy
- Document 18 Programme enhancement plan 2015

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the information about the programme on the education provider's website. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. As part of this introduction the visitors noted that students are expected to have full support of their employer to undertake this programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine where applicants who will be employees are made aware that their employers will provide placements to potential students on this programme. Therefore, the visitors were unsure if potential applicants have all the information about admission procedures to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate potential students and their employers are aware of the placement arrangements at the point of application to the programme.

3.2   The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. In addition, the visitors noted that the placements were an integral part of the programme and were dependent upon the student being employed by the host laboratory. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will manage cases where student's employment status changes during the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on how the programme will effectively managed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will manage cases whereby the student's employment status changes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. In addition, the visitors noted that the placements were an integral part of the programme and were dependent upon the student being employed by the host laboratory. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how student progression or achievement would be managed if the student's employment status changed during the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on the assessment regulation for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Additional evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how student progression and achievement could be managed in the event of changes to a student's employment status.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

From the review of the documentation, the visitors were satisfied that the introduction of the part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes meets the standards of education and training (SETs). However, in scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that the online award information on the website stated "125 hours of placement" instead of the "25 weeks of placements" that the visitors have approved this programme for. The visitors consider the duration of placement to be key information for students and therefore to ensure students are not unintentionally misinformed, the visitors recommend that the education provider correct the website to reflect the true duration of placement for this programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Science (Cellular Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	22 October 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has highlighted their intent to introduce a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. The part time route will be directly based on the full time route, affecting only the time frames in which the programme is delivered. The education provider anticipates that the new programme will be undertaken by students through a part time route across five years.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Standard of proficiency mapping document
- Document 2 Links to University's websites and handbook
- Document 3 Interview questions / scoring criteria
- Document 4 External staff
- Document 5 Staff Curriculum vitae
- Document 6 Department structure
- Document 7 Diagram to show how our programme matches the MS Programme structure
- Document 10 HCPC competencies
- Document 11 Learning agreement
- Document 12 Mapping documents
- Document 13 Programme handbook
- Document 14 Equality document Health Care Science life Science part-time
- Document 15a Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 1
- Document 15b Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 2
- Document 15c Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 3
- Document 15d Project handbook
- Document 16 Programme specification
- Document 17 Patient carer and Public involvement strategy
- Document 18 Programme enhancement plan 2015

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the information about the programme on the education provider's website. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. As part of this introduction the visitors noted that students are expected to have full support of their employer to undertake this programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine where applicants who will be employees are made aware that their employers will provide placements to potential students on this programme. Therefore, the visitors were unsure if potential applicants have all the information about admission procedures to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate potential students and their employers are aware of the placement arrangements at the point of application to the programme.

3.2   The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. In addition, the visitors noted that the placements were an integral part of the programme and were dependent upon the student being employed by the host laboratory. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will manage cases where student's employment status changes during the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on how the programme will effectively managed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will manage cases whereby the student's employment status changes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. In addition, the visitors noted that the placements were an integral part of the programme and were dependent upon the student being employed by the host laboratory. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how student progression or achievement would be managed if the student's employment status changed during the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on the assessment regulation for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Additional evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how student progression and achievement could be managed in the event of changes to a student's employment status.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

From the review of the documentation, the visitors were satisfied that the introduction of the part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes meets the standards of education and training (SETs). However, in scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that the online award information on the website stated "125 hours of placement" instead of the "25 weeks of placements" that the visitors have approved this programme for. The visitors consider the duration of placement to be key information for students and therefore to ensure students are not unintentionally misinformed, the visitors recommend that the education provider correct the website to reflect the true duration of placement for this programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	22 October 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has highlighted their intent to introduce a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. The part time route will be directly based on the full time route, affecting only the time frames in which the programme is delivered. The education provider anticipates that the new programme will be undertaken by students through a part time route across five years.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Standard of proficiency mapping document
- Document 2 Links to University's websites and handbook
- Document 3 Interview questions / scoring criteria
- Document 4 External staff
- Document 5 Staff Curriculum vitae
- Document 6 Department structure
- Document 7 Diagram to show how our programme matches the MS Programme structure
- Document 10 HCPC competencies
- Document 11 Learning agreement
- Document 12 Mapping documents
- Document 13 Programme handbook
- Document 14 Equality document Health Care Science life Science part-time
- Document 15a Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 1
- Document 15b Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 2
- Document 15c Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 3
- Document 15d Project handbook
- Document 16 Programme specification
- Document 17 Patient carer and Public involvement strategy
- Document 18 Programme enhancement plan 2015

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the information about the programme on the education provider's website. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. As part of this introduction the visitors noted that students are expected to have full support of their employer to undertake this programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine where applicants who will be employees are made aware that their employers will provide placements to potential students on this programme. Therefore, the visitors were unsure if potential applicants have all the information about admission procedures to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate potential students and their employers are aware of the placement arrangements at the point of application to the programme.

3.2   The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. In addition, the visitors noted that the placements were an integral part of the programme and were dependent upon the student being employed by the host laboratory. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will manage cases where student's employment status changes during the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on how the programme will effectively managed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will manage cases whereby the student's employment status changes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. In addition, the visitors noted that the placements were an integral part of the programme and were dependent upon the student being employed by the host laboratory. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how student progression or achievement would be managed if the student's employment status changed during the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on the assessment regulation for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Additional evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how student progression and achievement could be managed in the event of changes to a student's employment status.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

From the review of the documentation, the visitors were satisfied that the introduction of the part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes meets the standards of education and training (SETs). However, in scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that the online award information on the website stated "125 hours of placement" instead of the "25 weeks of placements" that the visitors have approved this programme for. The visitors consider the duration of placement to be key information for students and therefore to ensure students are not unintentionally misinformed, the visitors recommend that the education provider correct the website to reflect the true duration of placement for this programme.

hcpc health & care professions council

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	22 October 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has highlighted their intent to introduce a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. The part time route will be directly based on the full time route, affecting only the time frames in which the programme is delivered. The education provider anticipates that the new programme will be undertaken by students through a part time route across five years.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Standard of proficiency mapping document
- Document 2 Links to University's websites and handbook
- Document 3 Interview questions / scoring criteria
- Document 4 External staff
- Document 5 Staff Curriculum vitae
- Document 6 Department structure
- Document 7 Diagram to show how our programme matches the MS Programme structure
- Document 10 HCPC competencies
- Document 11 Learning agreement
- Document 12 Mapping documents
- Document 13 Programme handbook
- Document 14 Equality document Health Care Science life Science part-time
- Document 15a Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 1
- Document 15b Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 2
- Document 15c Work based Learning handbook and Professional Practice 3
- Document 15d Project handbook
- Document 16 Programme specification
- Document 17 Patient carer and Public involvement strategy
- Document 18 Programme enhancement plan 2015

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the information about the programme on the education provider's website. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. As part of this introduction the visitors noted that students are expected to have full support of their employer to undertake this programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine where applicants who will be employees are made aware that their employers will provide placements to potential students on this programme. Therefore, the visitors were unsure if potential applicants have all the information about admission procedures to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate potential students and their employers are aware of the placement arrangements at the point of application to the programme.

3.2   The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. In addition, the visitors noted that the placements were an integral part of the programme and were dependent upon the student being employed by the host laboratory. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will manage cases where student's employment status changes during the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on how the programme will effectively managed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will manage cases whereby the student's employment status changes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, in particular the programme specification and programme handbook. The visitors noted that the education provider is intending on introducing a part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes. In addition, the visitors noted that the placements were an integral part of the programme and were dependent upon the student being employed by the host laboratory. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how student progression or achievement would be managed if the student's employment status changed during the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on the assessment regulation for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Additional evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how student progression and achievement could be managed in the event of changes to a student's employment status.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

From the review of the documentation, the visitors were satisfied that the introduction of the part time route to the existing HCPC approved Healthcare Science Life Science programmes meets the standards of education and training (SETs). However, in scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that the online award information on the website stated "125 hours of placement" instead of the "25 weeks of placements" that the visitors have approved this programme for. The visitors consider the duration of placement to be key information for students and therefore to ensure students are not unintentionally misinformed, the visitors recommend that the education provider correct the website to reflect the true duration of placement for this programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
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	18 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has 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)
- Programme specification
- Curriculum vitae of the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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	18 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has 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)
- Programme specification
- Curriculum vitae of the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	13 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

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

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

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	4 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change of programme leader in Joint leadership.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Graham Noyce (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 November 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Criteria B: Programme management and resources

A change of programme leader 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae of the new programme leader
- Curriculum vitae of Allan Brownrigg
- Management structure of the mental health practice programme
- 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.4   There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of an appropriate professional register

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitor noted that the new programme leader who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme, is a registered social worker and not an approved mental health professional (AMHP). The visitor recognises that it is possible for a programme leader to be someone who is not AMHP qualified but who is on relevant part of an appropriate professional register. The visitor was provided with the curriculum vitae (CV) of the new programme leader as evidence to meet this standard. The CV provided contained limited detail as to how the new programme leader meets the requirements necessary to have overall professional responsibility for an AMHP programme. In addition, the visitor noted that the new programme leader's level of experience is limited in relation to AMHP education. Because the new programme leader is not a registered AMHP, and because of the lack of limited evidence about her experience in the submission, the visitor was unable to determine if the candidate is appropriately qualified and experienced for the role of programme leader. This is due to insufficient detail contained within the curriculum vitae. Therefore, the visitor will require additional evidence to ensure this standard continues to meet the criteria.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence regarding the programme leader experience, such as a more detailed curriculum vitae. The education provider should also submit information outlining any other support mechanisms that has been put in to place.

B.6   Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge

Reason: In the major change mapping document the visitor observed that Allan Brownrigg provided "extensive professional experience in mental health and was in practice as an Approved Social Worker". From the management flowchart and associated documentation, it is unclear who the module leaders for specific taught elements of the course are. The flowchart suggests that Allan Brownrigg may have overall management responsibility for a range of courses, however it does not detail what teaching responsibility, if any, Allan has divested to actual module teaching and delivery. From the associated documentation it is unclear where members of staff with appropriate teaching expertise of AMHP competencies provide input into direct module teaching and delivery of the AMHP programme.

The management flowchart identifies "experts by Experience, Patient Experience

Programme, Placement Providers, AMHPs, BIAs, Mental Health Professionals" as contributors to the teaching. However in scrutinising the evidence, the visitor was unable to determine who these people are, where their teaching responsibilities lie or their direct contributions to identified and specific areas of curriculum delivery. As such, the visitor requires further evidence to determine if subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to determine that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The education provider may wish to consider including module curriculum content together with details of who delivers specific content, together with their relevant skills and experience.

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

☐   There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	MA Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 November 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Criteria B: Programme management and resources

A change of programme leader 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae of the new programme leader
- Curriculum vitae of Allan Brownrigg
- Management structure of the mental health practice programme
- 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of an appropriate professional register

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitor noted that the new programme leader who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme, is a registered social worker and not an approved mental health professional (AMHP). The visitor recognises that it is possible for a programme leader to be someone who is not AMHP qualified but who is on relevant part of an appropriate professional register. The visitor was provided with the curriculum vitae (CV) of the new programme leader as evidence to meet this standard. The CV provided contained limited detail as to how the new programme leader meets the requirements necessary to have overall professional responsibility for an AMHP programme. In addition, the visitor noted that the new programme leader's level of experience is limited in relation to AMHP education. Because the new programme leader is not a registered AMHP, and because of the lack of limited evidence about her experience in the submission, the visitor was unable to determine if the candidate is appropriately qualified and experienced for the role of programme leader. This is due to insufficient detail contained within the curriculum vitae. Therefore, the visitor will require additional evidence to ensure this standard continues to meet the criteria.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence regarding the programme leader experience, such as a more detailed curriculum vitae. The education provider should also submit information outlining any other support mechanisms that has been put in to place.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge

Reason: In the major change mapping document the visitor observed that Allan Brownrigg provided "extensive professional experience in mental health and was in practice as an Approved Social Worker". From the management flowchart and associated documentation, it is unclear who the module leaders for specific taught elements of the course are. The flowchart suggests that Allan Brownrigg may have overall management responsibility for a range of courses, however it does not detail what teaching responsibility, if any, Allan has divested to actual module teaching and delivery. From the associated documentation it is unclear where members of staff with appropriate teaching expertise of AMHP competencies provide input into direct module teaching and delivery of the AMHP programme.

The management flowchart identifies "experts by Experience, Patient Experience

Programme, Placement Providers, AMHPs, BIAs, Mental Health Professionals" as contributors to the teaching. However in scrutinising the evidence, the visitor was unable to determine who these people are, where their teaching responsibilities lie or their direct contributions to identified and specific areas of curriculum delivery. As such, the visitor requires further evidence to determine if subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to determine that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The education provider may wish to consider including module curriculum content together with details of who delivers specific content, together with their relevant skills and experience.

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

☒　　　There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

☐　　　There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	UAWd Approved Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 November 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Criteria B: Programme management and resources

A change of programme leader 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae of the new programme leader
- Curriculum vitae of Allan Brownrigg
- Management structure of the mental health practice programme
- 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of an appropriate professional register

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitor noted that the new programme leader who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme, is a registered social worker and not an approved mental health professional (AMHP). The visitor recognises that it is possible for a programme leader to be someone who is not AMHP qualified but who is on relevant part of an appropriate professional register. The visitor was provided with the curriculum vitae (CV) of the new programme leader as evidence to meet this standard. The CV provided contained limited detail as to how the new programme leader meets the requirements necessary to have overall professional responsibility for an AMHP programme. In addition, the visitor noted that the new programme leader's level of experience is limited in relation to AMHP education. Because the new programme leader is not a registered AMHP, and because of the lack of limited evidence about her experience in the submission, the visitor was unable to determine if the candidate is appropriately qualified and experienced for the role of programme leader. This is due to insufficient detail contained within the curriculum vitae. Therefore, the visitor will require additional evidence to ensure this standard continues to meet the criteria.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence regarding the programme leader experience, such as a more detailed curriculum vitae. The education provider should also submit information outlining any other support mechanisms that has been put in to place.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge

Reason: In the major change mapping document the visitor observed that Allan Brownrigg provided "extensive professional experience in mental health and was in practice as an Approved Social Worker". From the management flowchart and associated documentation, it is unclear who the module leaders for specific taught elements of the course are. The flowchart suggests that Allan Brownrigg may have overall management responsibility for a range of courses, however it does not detail what teaching responsibility, if any, Allan has divested to actual module teaching and delivery. From the associated documentation it is unclear where members of staff with appropriate teaching expertise of AMHP competencies provide input into direct module teaching and delivery of the AMHP programme.

The management flowchart identifies "experts by Experience, Patient Experience

Programme, Placement Providers, AMHPs, BIAs, Mental Health Professionals" as contributors to the teaching. However in scrutinising the evidence, the visitor was unable to determine who these people are, where their teaching responsibilities lie or their direct contributions to identified and specific areas of curriculum delivery. As such, the visitor requires further evidence to determine if subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to determine that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The education provider may wish to consider including module curriculum content together with details of who delivers specific content, together with their relevant skills and experience.

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (Physiotherapists)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Michael Minns (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 November 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources

There has been a change of programme leader 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for programme leader
- Curriculum vitae of programme team members
- 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 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 visitor 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

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (Podiatrists)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Michael Minns (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 November 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources

There has been a change of programme leader 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for programme leader
- Curriculum vitae of programme team members
- 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 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 visitor 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

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
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)
- Education certificates for the new programme leader
- New programme leader's involvement in fitness to practice aptitude course

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitor was unable to determine whether the new programme leader who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme, is a registered Hearing aid dispenser. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitor was unable to locate any evidence of registration with the HCPC. The visitor recognises that it is possible for a programme leader to be someone who is not from the relevant part of the register if arrangements are in place. However, the visitor was not provided with any evidence on registration or the arrangements in place if the programme leader is not HCPC registered. Also there was no evidence of his teaching experience and activity with the programme prior to taking on the programme leadership.

The visitor was provided with the academic certificate of the new programme leader and fitness to practice aptitude course as evidence to meet this standard. The evidence provided contained limited detail as to how the new programme leader meets the requirements necessary to have overall professional responsibility for this programme. Because the visitor was unable to determine whether the new programme leader is a registered Hearing aid dispenser, and because of the lack of limited evidence about his experience in the submission. The visitor was unable to determine if the candidate is appropriately qualified and experienced for the role of programme leader. Therefore, the visitor will require additional evidence to ensure this standard continues to meet the criteria.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence regarding the programme leader experience and registration, such as a detailed curriculum vitae. The education provider should also submit information outlining any other support mechanisms that has been put in to place.

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

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicholas Haddington (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 November 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

☒   The visitors 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 visitor 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

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for Physiotherapists and Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicholas Haddington (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 November 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

☒   The visitors 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 visitor 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

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Supplementary & Independent Prescribing for Physiotherapists and Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicholas Haddington (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 November 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

☒   The visitors 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 visitor 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

Name of education provider	Hidden Hearing Limited
Programme title	Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	5 October 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has proposed changes to practice placements for this programme. Students will be sent earlier on domiciliary visits during their placements.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Training and procedure manual section 4
- Pre-registration grading logbook 2015
- Service user consent and feedback 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.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained information about guidance and support available to students during practice placements to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. The pre-registration grading logbook 2015 page 14 states "The PE (or delegated HAD) will accompany the Pre-Registered dispenser and observe a minimum of three full test appointments with new clients, in a domiciliary setting". The visitors did not see the details of these full tests appointments. The visitors noted that not all diagnostic test appointments lead to hearing aid purchase and if fitting of hearing aids is an outcome of the appointment, this would occur at a further appointment. The visitors considered the wording "full test appointment" unclear. The visitors were unclear whether students would always be directly supervised for the whole patient journey or just three supervised appointments which may or may not cover the whole patient journey. This lack of clarity leaves the possibility of students going on to indirect supervision without being observed appropriately and could lead to progression when only part of the patient journey has been observed. Therefore, the visitors will need further evidence to show how supervision encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Suggested documentation: Details about the definition of a full test appointment and what it entails.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained information about guidance and support available to students during practice placements to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. The pre-registration grading logbook 2015 page 9 states "Post impression taking otoscopy properly carried out (where appropriate) and recorded". The visitors considered post impression otoscopy an important safety check and it considered it should always be carried out. On the basis of this variance in carrying out otoscopy where appropriate, the visitors were unable to determine how this learning method will ensure safe and effective practice. Therefore, the visitors will need further evidence to demonstrate how students' supervision and learning encourage safe and effective practice.

Suggested documentation: Rationale about why students can carry out post impression otoscopy where appropriate and not all the time.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: The education provider has highlighted a change to the management of placement supervision for trainees. It includes, early domiciliary appointments to be conducted with indirect supervision during the programme. The documentation submitted by the education provider contained information about guidance and support available to students during practice placements. However, visitors were unsure about the time line of introducing these levels of supervision for trainees. The visitors were unsure if students will have enough in-branch experience prior to domiciliary activities to ensure supervision and learning encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Suggested documentation: Details when students will be sent on domiciliary visits during the programme. A full time table of what students must have achieved prior to their domiciliary visits with indirect supervision.

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 in the pre-registration grading logbook 2015 page 10 "It is expected that the time period for a Pre-Reg dispenser to progress through this process to have their own diary, working under indirect supervision, will not be less than one working week and is not likely to exceed 4 working weeks. In exceptional circumstances, this may be extended by a further 4 weeks subject to manager discretion". The visitors noted the rationale for this proposed change as set out in the pre-registration grading logbook 2015 page 13, is the level of branch activity, presumably low numbers of branch appointments. The visitors suggest that using only time criteria of number of weeks to achieve progression may result in variable levels of activity between

individual students. The education provider should consider a combination of timescale and number of clients as criteria for to achieve progression.

The visitors also noted in the pre-registration grading logbook 2015 page 9 "Demonstrates awareness in dealing with difficult, challenging or aggressive people". The visitors suggest, the education provider may wish to change the word "difficult" as it may not reflect the respect with which clients should be seen.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
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	10 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Bernadette Waters (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 has recruited two new members of staff and made changes to the placement arrangements.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Curriculum vitae of new members of staff
- Practice educator courses for physiotherapy and occupational therapy 2015-16

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Mary Hare
Name of validating body	Edexcel
Programme title	Higher National Diploma Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	4 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A change in programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	19 October 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist)
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 the new programme leader
- Curriculum vitae for department staff
- Student 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.

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

Reason: The visitor noted in the major change notification form that the overall management for the school remained with Julie Philips and that Joanne Ashby had taken over the role as programme leader for the programme. The visitor noted that Joanne Ashby is not on the HCPC register for Speech and language therapists. Whilst noting that Joanne has academic and research experience in the area of psychology along with significant pastoral and curriculum development leadership, the visitor could not see how Joanne would be supported in her role as programme leader for the BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology. Therefore the visitor would like to see further evidence detailing how Joanne will be supported in her role and details of the staff and their roles and responsibilities within the School to ensure that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that details the support in place for Joanne Ashby as the new programme leader and evidence that details the staff and their roles and responsibilities within the school who will support Joanne Ashby.

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

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work (Employment based)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Goemans (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 specification
- Curriculum vitae of new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist) Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has revised the programme modules as part of the review of the programmes to ensure the programme remains current and meets the new benchmarking statement for biomedical science.

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
- Previous and 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 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 visitor(s) agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

Whilst the visitors were content that the documentation received demonstrated that the changes made to the programme continues meet the standards, they did notice discrepancies in the documentation provided that needed to be amended before it is given to students. In particular the visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For instance, there are several references to 'HPC' (see page 61and 62 of the evidence document) . All reference such as these must be updated to reference the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council' as the name of the Council was changed in the Health and Social Care order 2012. There are also references to "state registration" (Pages 28, 46 and 48 of the evidence document).

The visitors also noted that there were differences in the module titles from the descriptors to the teaching and learning matrix. For example, the Clinical biochemistry is referenced as Medical biochemistry. .

Finally the visitors noted that the IBMS portfolio given as evidence is not the current version – it was issue 3 rather than issue 3 V2. The visitors would also recommend that the education provider provides the students going on placements with the most up to date version.

These inaccurate information and references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore recommend the programme team to check all student documentation to ensure any such errors are removed.
date version.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Sandwich)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist) Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has revised the programme modules as part of the review of the programmes to ensure the programme remains current and meets the new benchmarking statement for biomedical science.

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
- Previous and 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 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 visitor(s) agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

Whilst the visitors were content that the documentation received demonstrated that the changes made to the programme continues meet the standards, they did notice discrepancies in the documentation provided that needed to be amended before it is given to students. In particular the visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For instance, there are several references to 'HPC' (see page 61and 62 of the evidence document) . All reference such as these must be updated to reference the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council' as the name of the Council was changed in the Health and Social Care order 2012. There are also references to "state registration" (Pages 28, 46 and 48 of the evidence document).

The visitors also noted that there were differences in the module titles from the descriptors to the teaching and learning matrix. For example, the Clinical biochemistry is referenced as Medical biochemistry. .

Finally the visitors noted that the IBMS portfolio given as evidence is not the current version – it was issue 3 rather than issue 3 V2. The visitors would also recommend that the education provider provides the students going on placements with the most up to date version.

These inaccurate information and references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore recommend the programme team to check all student documentation to ensure any such errors are removed.
date version.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care
Mode of delivery	Full time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	John Donaghy (Paramedic) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 5: Practice placements

There has been a reduction to the number of supernumerary hours for some students whilst on placement.

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
- Documentation from South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS)
- College of Paramedics curriculum guidance
- Placement documentation
- Practice education handbook

- Minor change consultation
- Clinical mentor model
- Practice assessment document
- Clinical capabilities framework
- Competency checklist
- Development reviews
- Record of additional clinical competencies
- Tutorial appointments
- E-Portfolio documents
- Meeting minutes with SCAS
- Letter from Health Education Thames Valley (HETV)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	BSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Fellows (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has 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)
- Programme specification
- Curriculum vitae of the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Fellows (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has 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)
- Programme specification
- Curriculum vitae of the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Regent's University London
Name of awarding body	The Open University
Programme title	DPsych Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

There has been a programme leader change from Martin Milton to Elaine Kasket.

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 Elaine Kasket

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

Name of education provider	University of Roehampton
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	6 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

There has been a programme leader from Rachel Darnley-Smith to Tessa Watson.

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 Tessa Watson

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

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	6 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist)
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)
- Programme specification
- Curriculum vitae of new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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.

![hcpc health & care professions council logo]

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
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	20 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq

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 the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq

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 the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme title	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for Emergency Medical Technicians
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	4 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources
SET 6: Assessment

There has been a change to the programme lead and a change to the assessment for the numeracy module to enable the assessment to go through the education provider's moderating processes.

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 new programme lead
- Bridging module
- Assessment regulations

- Minutes from School curriculum approval board

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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that a new programme lead is on the appropriate part of the register as a paramedic. However, it is not clear from the evidence provided whether this position is a full time post. In addition, there is no evidence provided that details how the new programme lead will be supported in this role by senior members of the programme team. Because of this the visitors are unclear about how the education provider will ensure that there is sufficient support in place for this change in programme management.

Additional evidence: Evidence to clarify whether the new programme lead role is a full time position. Also the visitors also seek evidence to demonstrate the education provider's managerial support process to ensure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff will be available to support the new programme lead in their roll.

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

Reason: The major change documentation indicates the numeracy (drug calculation) paper is increasing to 60 minutes and questions to 40. This is confirmed by the accompanying minutes. However there is no rationale provided on this time or question increase with the pass mark appearing to stay the same at 80% of competency around drug calculations. This assessment change is not contextualised across the whole programme on whether 100% of drug calculations would eventually be demonstrated or 80% achievement would be sufficient. This means the visitors are unable to assess whether the assessment strategy and design enable students to meet the relevant standards of proficiency.

Additional Evidence: Further documented evidence around the nature of the assessment change proposed and the context of the safer medicate system at an 80% pass mark.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	13 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer)
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 specification
- 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

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
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	9 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Graham Noyce (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)
- Programme specification
- 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

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
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	9 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Graham Noyce (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)
- Programme specification
- 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

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme title	PG Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	9 November 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Graham Noyce (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)
- Programme specification
- 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.