hcpc health & care professions council

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Dip HE Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	26 July 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Kenneth Street (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Independent Prescribing (1)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 July 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider is making changes across the programme. The changes include revised application procedures, changes to the curriculum and assessment for the programme and also updates on service user and carer recruitment 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)
- They said we said document
- Designated medical practitioner handbook
- Website information

- New programme leader curriculum vitae
- New staff curriculum vitae
- Values based scenario for application
- Draft application information sheet
- Draft numeracy test information
- Programme hand books
- Mapping document for competency framework
- Overarching information document
- Portfolio of prescribing practice
- Application form
- Student handbooks
- Student profile for website

Section three: Additional documentation

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

☒ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme

Reason: The visitors reviewed the admissions documentation for the programme. The visitors noted throughout the documentation the education provider has referred to applicants to the programme as Allied Health Professionals (AHPs). From this the visitors could not determine if this just applied to the Podiatrist and Physiotherapist tick box on the application form, or if this covered Therapeutic radiographers too now that the prescribing legislation had been extended to include this AHP group. Therefore the visitors need further evidence that clearly states the AHPs the education provider will accept onto the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that clearly demonstrates the programmes that will be entitled to register on this programmes.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete

the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Supplementary Prescriber to Independent Prescriber Conversion Programme
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 July 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider is making changes across the programme. The changes include revised application procedures, changes to the curriculum and assessment for the programme and also updates on service user and carer recruitment 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)

- They said we said document
- Designated medical practitioner handbook
- Website information
- New programme leader curriculum vitae
- New staff curriculum vitae
- Values based scenario for application
- Draft application information sheet
- Draft numeracy test information
- Programme hand books
- Mapping document for competency framework
- Overarching information document
- Portfolio of prescribing practice
- Application form
- Student handbooks
- Student profile for website

Section three: Additional documentation

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

☒ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider submitted information that referred to the independent prescribing programme. There was no clear indication from the documentation that the changes would also apply to the Supplementary Prescriber to Independent Prescriber Conversion Programme. This programme was included on the major change notification form but the evidence does not relate to this programme. Therefore the visitors were unclear how the changes would impact on this programme too. As such the visitors need further evidence that demonstrates if the changes are going to impact on this programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates whether the changes proposed will impact the Supplementary Prescriber to Independent Prescriber Conversion Programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete

the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Programme title	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 February 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kevin Browne (Forensic psychologist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC that they intend to change the credit structuring of their approved practitioner psychologist programmes.

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 to support the change in credit rating for the programme
- Doctorate programme handbook
- PG Dip programme handbook
- Supervisory logs

- PG Dip module descriptors
- Advanced research doctoral thesis descriptor

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.

6.2   All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Reason: From the visitors reading of the documentation they were unclear how the new credit rating for the doctorate meets the requirements for doctorate level study as set out in the external reference frameworks for doctoral level study. Therefore the visitors were unclear if this standard continues to be met with the revisions made to the programme structure. As such the visitors require further evidence that explains the rationale for the new credit rating and which demonstrates how the changes to the credit values and assessments meet the requirements for doctoral level study as set out in external-reference frameworks.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly sets out how the revised credit rating for the programme ensures that the assessments for the doctoral programme comply with external reference frameworks for the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 February 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kevin Browne (Forensic psychologist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC that they intend to change the credit structuring of their approved practitioner psychologist programmes.

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 to support the change in credit rating for the programme
- Doctorate programme handbook

- PG Dip programme handbook
- Supervisory logs
- PG Dip module descriptors
- Advanced research doctoral thesis descriptor

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.

6.2   All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Reason: From the visitors reading of the documentation they were unclear how the new credit rating for the doctorate meets the requirements for doctorate level study as set out in the external reference frameworks for doctoral level study. Therefore the visitors were unclear if this standard continues to be met with the revisions made to the programme structure. As such the visitors require further evidence that explains the rationale for the new credit rating and which demonstrates how the changes to the credit values and assessments meet the requirements for doctoral level study as set out in external-reference frameworks.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly sets out how the revised credit rating for the programme ensures that the assessments for the doctoral programme comply with external reference frameworks for the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
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	5 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has made changes across several standards of education and training as a result of an internal review and staffing changes, including a 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

- Critical review
- Practice placements proforma
- Practice placements handbook
- Module descriptors
- Programme leader curriculum vitae

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	14 July 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Angela Ariu
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A new programme leader has been appointed.

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 Lisa Forrest

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

The 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	Leeds Beckett University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicholas Haddington (Independent prescriber) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	15 June 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard A: Programme admissions
Standard B: Programme management and resources
Standard C: Curriculum
Standard D: Practice placements
Standard E: Assessment

Due to changes in legislation the education provider has highlighted that they want to include Dietitians as supplementary prescribers on their non-medical prescribing 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)
- Assessment regulations for the programme

- Practice placement educator meetings minutes
- Placements tool
- Investment planning commissioning document
- Programme specification
- Admissions flyer
- Admissions criteria
- Module specifications
- Programme handbook
- Portfolio handbook
- Practice placement handbook
- Programme team structure
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module presentations

Section three: Additional documentation

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

☐ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Beckett 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	5 July 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change to 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 SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- New programme leader curriculum vitae
- Staff changes document
- Team structure document

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	Leeds Beckett University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 July 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Patricia Cartney
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A new programme leader, Melanie Watts, had been appointed.

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 Melanie Watts
- Other supporting evidence regarding programme staff

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC that there have been various changes to the modules for the programmes and how the learning outcomes for the modules have been changed. There have also been credit changes to the curriculum framework for the programmes as part of the education provider review. These changes include breaking down thirty credit modules into 15 credit modules where possible.

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 for practice placement educators document
- Module descriptors
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Rationale for changes

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC that there have been various changes to the modules for the programmes and how the learning outcomes for the modules have been changed. There have also been credit changes to the curriculum framework for the programmes as part of the education provider review. These changes include breaking down thirty credit modules into 15 credit modules where possible.

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 for practice placement educators document
- Module descriptors
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Rationale for changes

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC that there have been various changes to the modules for the programmes and how the learning outcomes for the modules have been changed. There have also been credit changes to the curriculum framework for the programmes as part of the education provider review. These changes include breaking down thirty credit modules into 15 credit modules where possible.

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 for practice placement educators document
- Module descriptors
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Rationale for changes

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC that there have been various changes to the modules for the programmes and how the learning outcomes for the modules have been changed. There have also been credit changes to the curriculum framework for the programmes as part of the education provider review. These changes include breaking down thirty credit modules into 15 credit modules where possible.

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 for practice placement educators document
- Module descriptors
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Rationale for changes

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Edinburgh Napier University
Programme title	Non Medical Prescribing for Nurses Midwives and Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of submission to the HCPC	19 May 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources
Standard C: Curriculum
Standard E: Assessment

Due to changes in legislation the education provider is proposing to include dietitians as supplementary prescribers and therapeutic radiographers as independent prescribers in their non-medical prescribing 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)
- Standards for prescribers mapping document
- Programme specification

- Staff curriculum vitae
- 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Reason: From the major change notification form the HCPC were made aware that the education provider is intending to include dietitians as supplementary prescribers and therapeutic radiographers as independent prescribers on the currently approved nonmedical prescribing programme. To support the changes the education provider submitted various documents including the programme specification. The visitors noted that the education provider has made changes to the programme specification to include radiographers as independent prescribers on the non-medical prescribing programme. However, from the evidence provided the visitors noted that there was no distinction made between diagnostic and therapeutic radiographers. The visitors are unclear on how the education provider will communicate to diagnostic radiographers that they can have supplementary prescribing rights and therapeutic radiographers can now independently prescribe. Furthermore, from a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that there was no mention of dietitians as a professional group. The visitors noted that there were several amendments to the programme specification to include radiographers, however they did not see how dietitians are included in this programme.

Additional evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will tell students about the difference in prescribing rights for therapeutic and diagnostic radiographers as well as the inclusion of dietitians in the programme documentation.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	23 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

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 leaders

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

3.2   The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitor noted from a review of the evidence provided to support the change of programme leader that the responsibility for programme leadership is to be shared between two people. The visitor could not determine the differentiation of the programme leadership roles and how the programme would be managed. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence that clearly distinguishes the roles and responsibilities for the programme leadership responsibility.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how under the new arrangements for the programme leadership, the programme will be effectively managed. Any evidence provided should clearly outline how the leadership of the programme is shared between the two programme leaders.

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 from a review of the evidence provided to support the change of programme leader that the responsibility for programme leadership is to be shared between two people. The visitor could not determine the differentiation of the programme leadership roles and who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence that clearly distinguishes the roles and responsibilities for the programme leadership responsibility.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates, under the new arrangements for the programme leadership, who has professional responsibility for the programme. Any evidence provided should clearly outline how responsibility is arranged between the two programme leaders.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Section five: Visitor's comments

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence, the visitor is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved. However, the visitor would like to encourage the education provider to keep under review the dual programme leadership post and to report on this change in the next annual monitoring audit.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
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	31 March 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Changes to responsibilities and roles of staff.

SET 4: Curriculum

Learning outcomes have been rewritten.

SET 5: Practice placements

Reduction in the number of placements.

SET 6: Assessment

Changes to the competency statements against which students on practice placements are assessed.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had provided weblinks to staff Curriculumvitae. However, the visitors were not able to access these weblinks. They were therefore unable to determine from the evidence provided the expertise and knowledge of the staff who would be taking on new responsibilities on the programme, and so unable to certain that the standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing that the programme staff have relevant expertise and knowledge for their new responsibilities, such as Curriculum vitae.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had submitted evidence concerning the new learning outcomes for the programme. However, they were not able to determine from the evidence provided how these learning outcomes were mapped to the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists, and so they were unable to be certain the standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing that the learning outcomes on all modules are mapped appropriately to the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists.

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

Reason: The visitors were able to review evidence concerning the education provider's intention to "streamline practice competencies". However, they were not able to determine from the evidence provided what effect this streamlining might have

on assessment of students on practice placements, and whether the new methods for assessment of practice competencies will be appropriate for the relevant learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing that, if there are changes to assessment of students on placement, these will be appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes.

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	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	MSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	31 March 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Changes to responsibilities and roles of staff. Programme moving to a January start date from a March one.

SET 4: Curriculum

Learning outcomes have been rewritten. There will now be a dedicated Research Methods module in Year 1

SET 6: Assessment

Changes to the competency statements against which students on practice placements are assessed.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Staff Curriculum vitae
- Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted from documentary evidence that the education provider was moving from a March start date to a January start date. However, they were not able to see how this change would be communicated to prospective students, and were therefore unable to be certain that this standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing how programme materials for applicants and prospective applicants will be updated to show the new start date.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors noted from documentary evidence that the education provider was moving from a March start date to a January start date, and that there will therefore be a brief period of overlap when the last March intake overlaps with a January intake. However, they were not able to determine from the evidence provided what plans were in place to manage this transition to the new intake date.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing how programme staff intend to manage the period when there will be an extra cohort of students on the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had provided weblinks to staff Curriculum vitae. However, the visitors were not able to access these weblinks. They were therefore unable to determine from the evidence provided the expertise and knowledge of the staff who would be taking on new responsibilities on the programme, and so unable to certain that the standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing that the programme staff have relevant expertise and knowledge for their new responsibilities, such as Curriculum vitae.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had submitted evidence concerning the new learning outcomes for the programme. However, they were not able to determine from the evidence provided how these learning outcomes were mapped to the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists, and so they were unable to be certain the standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing that the learning outcomes on all modules are mapped appropriately to the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists.

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

Reason: The visitors were able to review evidence concerning the education provider's intention to "streamline practice competencies". However, they were not able to determine from the evidence provided what effect this streamlining might have on assessment of students on practice placements, and whether the new methods for assessment of practice competencies will be appropriate for the relevant learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing that, if there are changes to assessment of students on placement, these will be appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes.

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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	23 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

The education provider has informed the HCPC that it intends to change how the interprofessional learning for the programme will be taught. The education provider has said that the change has been made as the previous arrangements for interprofessional learning resulted in the module having to be delivered twice during the year.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors were content that the HCPC standards continue to be met having reviewed the evidence provided by the education provider. The visitors did note that the programme specification did not include the current standards of proficiency for Physiotherapists. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that it should ensure that all documentation provided to students on the programme should have the correct version of the HCPC standards.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Date of submission to the HCPC	23 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Emma Supple (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) Wendy Smith (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change
SET 4: Curriculum
SET 5: Practice placements
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider is working towards providing more inter professional learning (IPL) which offers an excellent opportunity for students from different disciplines to learn together and work collaboratively. The education provider is proposing that through partnerships in learning students will share goals whilst gaining insight and understanding regarding other profession-specific expertise. The changes proposed are required to align the placement timing across the programmes in order to facilitate IPL module provision has provided an opportunity to review the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme and make adjustments which reflect the recent development within the podiatry profession.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack

- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Module descriptors
- Stage three portfolio

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From their reading of the new and old module descriptors the visitors were unclear how changes to the learning outcomes and the assessment for the new modules ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the Chiropodist / podiatrist part will continue to be met by students. Specifically a 20 credit module has been discontinued and two 10 credit modules have been added. The visitors cannot see how learning outcomes from the discontinued module have been re-created in the new modules, and mapped to the relevant SOPs. As such the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how this standard continues to be met.

Evidence required: Evidence that demonstrates how the changes from the 20 credit to 10 credit modules ensure that the relevant SOPs continue to be met.

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

Reason: Whilst the visitors were able to review the module descriptor for the revised inter-professional learning module, it is not clear from the evidence provided that the profession-specific skills and knowledge for the BSc (Hons) Podiatry will continue to be provided for in the revised delivery of the module. The visitors were unclear as to whether the module descriptor was specific for this programme or that it was written for all of the programmes of which it would be a part, with profession specific aspects defined elsewhere in the curriculum. Therefore the visitors need further evidence that demonstrates that the profession specific skills for students on this programme are continuing to be adequately addressed.

Evidence required: Evidence to show how the profession specific skills for podiatry are continuing to be addressed.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason: The visitors have noted that the early four week placement in the final year will now be discontinued. It is stated that this is now intended to run concurrently with the final practice placement, however the visitors were unclear as to whether the

placements will be consecutive rather than concurrent. The visitors were also unclear whether this single placement will meet all of the requirements achieved by the previous placements. Therefore the visitors require evidence of how the achievement of the learning outcomes will be met within the revised placements for the programme and how the assessments address the learning outcomes for the practice placements.

Evidence required: Evidence that details how the change in the placements still ensures that the learning outcomes for the placements are assessed to ensure that the practice placement modules are met.

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

Reason: From their reading of the new and old module descriptors the visitors were unclear how changes to the learning outcomes and the assessment for the new modules ensure that the SOPs for the Chiropodist / podiatrists will continue to be met by students. Specifically a 20 credit module has been discontinued and two 10 credit modules have been added. The visitors cannot see how learning outcomes from the discontinued module are clear within the new modules. As such the visitors require evidence of how the assessment strategy and design have been affected by this change. In particular this evidence should cover how the two new modules will continue to ensure that any student who successfully completes the programme has met the SOPs for their part of the Register.

Evidence required: Evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes and assessments in the new modules evidence that any successful student has met the SOPs for the relevant part of the Register.

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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practitioner
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	23 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic) Simon Dykes (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has reviewed how their interprofessional learning approach, across several programmes, has worked and how they would like to see it work in future. This had led to the replacement of the interprofessional learning module form this (and other programmes) with a new module. The change in curriculum has led the education provider the opportunity to review other modules on this programme to ensure they remain current.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The Visitors noted that the previous module (Preparation for Professional Practice) learning outcomes which contributed to how successful graduates of the programme will have learned about, and understood how they were meeting HCPC standards. This included elements of the standards of proficiency for paramedics and the standards of conduct performance and ethics. This module has been replaced with a new module (SOHP602, Inter-professional Working in Health and Social Care) from which the learning outcomes relating to the relevant HCPC standards have been removed. Therefore the visitors were unclear how and where other learning outcomes in the curriculum where ensuring that the standards were now being taught. As a result the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, if this standard continues to be met. As such the visitors require evidence that demonstrates that the relevant HCPC standards including the standards of proficiency for the paramedic part of the Register are now taught to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Additional evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how the HCPC standards of proficiency for the Paramedic part of the Register are now taught to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Patricia McClure (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources
Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the 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 Suffolk
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	31 May 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Gail Fairey (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change to 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)
- New programme leader curriculum vitae
- Approval document

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 Suffolk
Programme title	Non-Medical Independent and/or Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 July 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

Due to changes in prescribing legislation the education provider has informed the HCPC that they want to include therapeutic radiographers as independent prescribers on their non-medical prescribing programme. The change proposed needed scrutiny to ensure that the approved programme continued to meet the standards of prescribing.

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)
- Application form to the programme
- Course information document
- Designated medical practitioner (DMP) handbook
- Staff curriculum vitae

Section three: Additional documentation

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

☐ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	Non-Medical Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber) Fiona McCullough (Dietitican)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	11 July 2017

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard A: Programme admissions
Standard B: Programme management and resources
Standard C: Curriculum
Standard D: Practice placements
Standard E: Assessment

Due to changes in legislation the education provider has highlighted that they want to include Dietitians as supplementary prescribers on their non-medical prescribing 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)
- Designated medical practitioner handbook
- Programme admissions documentation

- Programme handbook
- Staff curriculum vitae

Section three: Additional documentation

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

☐   The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

☒   There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
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	4 July 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor(s)	Anne Mackay (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has noted that changes will be made to their existing BA (Hons) programmes as a result of successfully obtaining funding for the Social Work Teaching Partnership with Norfolk and Suffolk Local Authority. Programme admissions and practice placements are impacted by the changes.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Norfolk and Suffolk teaching partnership application form
- Student handbook appendix

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.

HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, University of the West of England, Bristol, FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Social Work, University of the West of England, Bristol, PT (Part time)
Date submission received	20 June 2017
Case reference	CAS-12139-Y6T3H5

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards
We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view on our website.

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Paula Sobiechowska	Social worker
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum student cohort	Up to 29
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03369

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider informed us of a change of programme leader to Tillie Curran.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum student cohort	Up to 29
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03370

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes
Curriculum vitae for Tillie Curran	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 August 2017 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Winchester
Programme title	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	9 May 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Amanda Fitchett (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has informed the HCPC that it intends to make changes to the programme in the way it is taught and assessed to "enhance the student experience". The education provider also proposes to introduce a part time route for the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Welcome pack
- MSc Social work programme handbook

- MSc revalidation slides
- Draft report MSc Social work
- Additional information

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the welcome pack provided and they reviewed the education provider website but could find no mention of the proposed part time route for the programme. The visitors are unclear as to what information has been provided to applicants to the proposed part time route. The visitors could not see from the evidence provided how an applicant makes an informed choice as to whether to take up a place on the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider provides the relevant information for any part time student to make a decision as to whether to take up a place on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly defines the application process and information for part time students to the programme to ensure that the application process gives applicants the choice to take up a place on the programme.

3.2   The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided to evidence the major change. The visitors were unclear from the evidence how many students would be on the proposed part time route. The documentation did not indicate if the numbers provided were for both the full time and part time route. Therefore the visitors were unclear how the programme will be managed going forward. The visitors could not see how the programme would be managed in areas such as staff responsibilities with the possible increase in student numbers with the proposed part time route and additional students undertaking the dissertation module. As such the visitors want further evidence that gives full details of student numbers on both routes and how the part time route will be taught alongside the full time route to ensure that the programme is managed effectively.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clearly demonstrates how the programme will be managed with the addition of a part time route additional students undertaking the dissertation module.

3.2   The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided to evidence the major change. They noted that the education provider intends to offer the dissertation module to other students holding a PG Dip. The visitors were unclear from the evidence they reviewed how this will be managed in terms of staffing and resources along with the addition of the proposed part time route additional students undertaking the dissertation module. As such the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how the offering of the dissertation module to PG Dip students will impact on how the programme is managed.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clearly demonstrates how the programme will be managed with the dissertation module to the PG Dip students.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this major change. As the visitors were unable to determine student numbers for the part time route or the additional dissertation students and how this could impact on teaching on the full time route too, they could not determine whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme for both modes of study. As such the visitors require evidence that demonstrates that there are sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrate there are sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme to both the full time and proposed part time routes and additional dissertation students.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this major change. As the visitors were unable to determine student numbers for the part time route and additional dissertation module and how this could impact on teaching on the full time route too, they could not determine whether the programme has sufficient staff with the relevant expertise and knowledge to teach on the programme. The visitors want to see further evidence that demonstrates that there are sufficient staff with the relevant expertise and knowledge to deliver the programme to full time and part time routes to the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrate there are staff with the relevant knowledge and expertise to deliver the programme to the full and part time modes, along with additional dissertation students for the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this major change. As the visitors were unable to determine student numbers for the part time route and how this could impact on teaching on the full time route too. The visitors were unclear from documentation whether the resources for the programme for teaching and learning

across all settings would be increased with the proposed part time route and the additional dissertation students being added to the programme. It was unclear if for example additional library and IT resources had been put in place to service the programme. As such the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how the resources for the programme would be available to meet the needs of the proposed part time route.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates that the resources to support the students on the programme are in place.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors having reviewed the documentation regarding the revisions to the assessments for the programme, they noted that there have been changes to the credit ratings for the programme. However apart from mention that the length of assignments had been adjusted, the visitors could not find any information as to how the changes will impact on how the programme is taught through the curriculum. Also with the proposed part time route there is no evidence regarding how the part time route will be taught and assessed. The visitors were also unsure about the wording length for dissertation module. As such the visitors require further evidence and a rationale for the teaching and assessment for the programme and how the proposed part time route will be taught and assessed to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the Social worker part of the Register.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the programme is taught and assessed through the modules within the programme to ensure those completing the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the Social worker part of the Register.

5.1   Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason: The visitors could not see from the evidence provided how the proposed part time route will be provided with practice placements or whether the part time students will come from employment. It was unclear if there would be specific placements outside of the part time students' employment. As such the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how the placements will work for the proposed part time route.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the practice placements will operate for the proposed part time route for the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors could not see from the evidence provided how the proposed part time route will be provided with practice placements or whether the part time students will come from employment or how many students will be on the programme. Therefore the visitors were unclear if there will be the appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement areas to ensure that the students will have

appropriate placement settings. As such the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that there are sufficient staff in place to deliver practice placements for the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that there are sufficient appropriately qualified and experienced staff in the practice placement settings for the proposed part time route to the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors having reviewed the documentation regarding the revisions to the assessments for the programme, they noted that there have been changes to the credit ratings for the modules on the programme. However apart from mention that the length of assignments had been adjusted, the visitors could not find any information as to how the changes will impact on how the programme is taught and assessed. Also with the proposed part time route there is no evidence regarding how the part time route will be taught and assessed. The visitors were also unsure about the wording length for dissertation module. As such the visitors require further evidence and a rationale for the teaching and assessment for the programme and how the proposed part time route will be taught and assessed to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the Social worker part of the Register.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the programme is taught and assessed through the modules within the programme to ensure those completing the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the Social worker part of the Register.

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

Reason: The visitors having reviewed the documentation regarding the revisions to the assessments for the programme, they noted that there have been changes to the credit ratings for the programme. However apart from mention that the length of assignments had been adjusted, the visitors could not find any information as to how the changes will impact on how the programme is taught and assessed. Also with the proposed part time route there is no evidence regarding how the part time route will be taught and assessed. The visitors were also unsure what the wording length for the dissertation module was as there was conflicting information in the documentation provided.. Also the visitors did not receive any clear justification for the reduction in assessment lengths and how this was appropriate to the learning outcomes. The visitors were not clear from their reading that the assessment methods employed meet the relevant learning outcomes for the programme. As such the visitors require evidence that clearly demonstrates that the assessment methods for the programme measure the learning outcomes for the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the assessment methods for the modules measure the learning outcomes for the programme. For example module descriptors may help.

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

Reason: The visitors having reviewed the documentation regarding the revisions to the assessments for the programme, they noted that there have been changes to the credit ratings for the programme. However apart from mention that the length of assignments had been adjusted, the visitors could not find any information as to how the changes will impact on how the programme is taught and assessed. Also with the proposed part time route there is no evidence regarding how the part time route will be taught and assessed. Therefore the visitors are unsure how the students are made aware about progression and achievement for the full time and proposed part time programme. Therefore the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how students are informed about progression and achievement from the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly outlines how students for the full time and proposed part time programme will be informed as to how they will progress and achieve through this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 May 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change to 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.

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 received the curriculum vitae for the new programme leader and noted that he has previously taught on a sports therapy programme and has taught on the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme as a visiting lecturer. The visitor could not see from the evidence provided what experience the proposed programme leader had in terms of programme management or leadership skills. The visitor was also concerned that the new programme leader would need additional support in the pivotal role of programme leader as there was no evidence provided that the proposed programme leader had acted in a similar role before. Therefore, the visitor requires further evidence that demonstrates the previous experience attained by the proposed programme leader and to also demonstrate the support, training and mentoring that the new programme leader will receive in the role of programme leader.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the experience of the proposed leader in his previous roles and evidence of the support the programme leader will receive in carrying out their role.

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 York
Programme title	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Barker (Social worker in England) Patricia Cartney (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has noted that changes will be made to the BA (Hons) programme as a result of successful obtaining of funding for the Social Work Teaching Partnership (SWTP) with Kirklees Local Authority (LA). These changes have involved;

- Introducing a group exercise as part of the admissions process;
- Embedding the 'Knowledge and Skills Statements' in the curriculum;
- Some minimal changes to curriculum content for currency;
- Offering more statutory placement experience to students; and
- Changing the way the partner organisations collaborate.

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)
- Admissions process
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module information
- Definition of 'statutory experience'
- Template for student final placement report

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 York
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	1 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Barker (Social worker in England) Patricia Cartney (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has noted that changes will be made to the BA (Hons) programme as a result of successful obtaining of funding for the Social Work Teaching Partnership (SWTP) with Kirklees Local Authority (LA). These changes have involved;

- Introducing a group exercise as part of the admissions process;
- Embedding the 'Knowledge and Skills Statements' in the curriculum;
- Some minimal changes to curriculum content for currency;
- Offering more statutory placement experience to students; and
- Changing the way the partner organisations collaborate.

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)
- Admissions process
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module information
- Definition of 'statutory experience'
- Template for student final placement report

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 York
Programme title	Postgraduate 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	1 June 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Barker (Social worker in England) Patricia Cartney (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider has noted that changes will be made to the BA (Hons) programme as a result of successful obtaining of funding for the Social Work Teaching Partnership (SWTP) with Kirklees Local Authority (LA). These changes have involved;

- Introducing a group exercise as part of the admissions process;
- Embedding the 'Knowledge and Skills Statements' in the curriculum;
- Some minimal changes to curriculum content for currency;
- Offering more statutory placement experience to students; and
- Changing the way the partner organisations collaborate.

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)
- Admissions process
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module information
- Definition of 'statutory experience'
- Template for student final placement report

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.