Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Awarding institution (if different from education provider)	Institute of Health Care Development
Programme name	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Block Release
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Date of submission to HPC	15 April 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 2 Programme admissions

Changes have taken place to the rules of the awarding body Edexcel in relation to the accumulation of clinical hours and how they are monitored. This change has triggered some changes to the approved IHCD paramedic award programme. Changes to the timetable impact the programme in a number of ways. The programme is now spread over a greater period of time. Applicants must be given this information before they apply to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has introduced e-learning into the programme. Learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

SET 4 Curriculum

The education provider has introduced e-learning into the programme. The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

SET 5 Practice placements

The U module has been moved to the front of the programme. The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

Student handbook
Module descriptors
Placement log
programme specification
practice placement information
paramedic assessment log

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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

No evidence of revised Paramedic Pre-entry procedure seen. Mapping to student handbook is insufficient to identify evidence.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

No evidence of how changes to management structure effect programme. Mapping to student handbook is insufficient to identify evidence.

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

No evidence of how changes to learning resources effect programme. Mapping to student handbook is insufficient to identify evidence.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

No evidence of how this SET is met. The mapping to the student handbook identifies student complaints procedures.

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.

The visitors were unable to find 'Section C- Certificate in Developing Professionally in the Out of Hospital Environment' in the programme specification.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

☐ there is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed overleaf. 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 Campus Suffolk
Awarding institution (if different from education provider)	University of East Anglia
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiography
Relevant modality	Diagnostic
Date of submission to HPC	17 May 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Dr Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HPC executive	Ben Potter

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum

Change in the assessment regulations to allow students to progress with 40 credits deferred. Previously 20 credits was the maximum deferral.

Change in method of assessment for 'Physics and Information Technology' module from a 2,500 word written assignment to a 2 part assessment comprising a 60 minute written examination and a 4 hour electronic assignment interpreting raw data.

SET 6 Assessment

Change in the assessment regulations to allow students to progress with 40 credits deferred. Previously 20 credits was the maximum deferral.

Change in method of assessment for 'Physics and Information Technology' module from a 2,500 word written assignment to a 2 part assessment comprising a 60 minute written examination and a 4 hour electronic assignment interpreting raw data.

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

> 2006 HPC - SETs cross-referencing Suffolk College Radiography
> CAT3 Form - Radiography Assessment regs 4.1.10
> CAT3 Form - Radiography PIT Assessment Changes 25.2.10
> Major Change SETs mapping template UCS Radiography Programmes 29.4.10
> Physics and Information Technology - existing module
> Physics and Information Technology - proposed 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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

☐ there is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed overleaf. 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 Campus Suffolk
Awarding institution (if different from education provider)	University of East Anglia
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Oncology and Radiotherapy Technology
Mode of delivery	Full Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiography
Relevant modality	Therapeutic
Date of submission to HPC	17 May 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Russell Hart (Radiograper)
HPC executive	Ben Potter

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum

Change in the assessment regulations to allow students to progress with 40 credits deferred. Previously 20 credits was the maximum deferral.

Change in method of assessment for 'Physics and Information Technology' module from a 2,500 word written assignment to a 2 part assessment comprising a 60 minute written examination and a 4 hour electronic assignment interpreting raw data.

SET 6 Assessment

Change in the assessment regulations to allow students to progress with 40 credits deferred. Previously 20 credits was the maximum deferral.

Change in method of assessment for 'Physics and Information Technology' module from a 2,500 word written assignment to a 2 part assessment comprising a 60 minute written examination and a 4 hour electronic assignment interpreting raw data.

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

2006 HPC - SETs cross-referencing Suffolk College Radiography
CAT3 Form - Radiography Assessment regs 4.1.10
CAT3 Form - Radiography PIT Assessment Changes 25.2.10
Major Change SETs mapping template UCS Radiography Programmes 29.4.10
Physics and Information Technology - existing module
Physics and Information Technology - proposed 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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

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

![hpc health professions council logo]

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech & Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and Language Therapy
Date of submission to HPC	10 May 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech Language Therapist) Gillian Stevenson (Speech Language Therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum
SET 5 Practice placements
SET 6 Assessment

The education provider is making widespread changes to the clinical education components of the programme. They are reorganising the placements in years 2 and 3 – this includes the number, range, durations and the addition of a new placement in year 3. The content and assessment of these clinical education modules are being reorganised also leading to potential impacts in a number of standards of education and training in the above areas.

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

1. Major change SET's mapping doc 2. Updated Handbook

3. Variety of Placement information ,
4. Major Change information internal processes
5. Variety of Student information
6. Variety of Module information
7. Variety of Placement 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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

☐ there is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed overleaf. 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 name	Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Studies (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Date of submission to HPC	23 April 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Change to programme leader

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

Peter Allum CV
Programme Team Document

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

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

Section Four: Recommended outcome 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 overleaf. 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 name	Graduate Diploma Paramedic Practitioner (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Date of submission to HPC	23 April 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Change to programme leader

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

Peter Allum CV
Programme Team Document

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

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

Section Four: Recommended outcome 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 overleaf. 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 name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practitioner (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Date of submission to HPC	23 April 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Change to programme leader

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

Peter Allum CV
Programme Team Document

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

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

Section Four: Recommended outcome 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 overleaf. 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 name	MSc Language Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Date of submission to HPC	5 May 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Martin Duckworth (Speech & Language Therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The Degree Programme Director has changed from Deborah James to Julie Morris.

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

Curriculum Vitae for Dr Julie Morris Newcastle University: MSc Language Pathology Handbook 2009

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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

The visitor 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 overleaf. 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	Staffordshire University
Programme name	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropody/Podiatry Physiotherapy Radiography
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary Prescribing
Date of submission to HPC	13 May 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	David Whitmore (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 6 Assessment

The education provider proposed changes to the assessment of the supplementary prescribing for allied health professional's module. The education provider proposed integrating the clinical management plan (2000 word assessment) in to the portfolio (currently 5000 word assessment) to form a 6000 word assessment.

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- Major Change Context Pack in relation to Staffordshire University
- Major Change SETs Mapping Document in relation to the proposed Major Change

- AHP Module Handbook in relation to the NMP Programme at Staffordshire University
- Major Change Submission Form from Staffordshire University dated 21st May 2010

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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

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