

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has appointed a new programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	British Psychological Society
Programme title	Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	30 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Packwood (Counselling psychologist) Sandra Wolfson (Sport and exercise psychologist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider flagged a prospective change in the limit of students enrolled on the Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2) from a maximum of 75 students enrolled on the course at any given time to a maximum of 125 students. This could impact the standards within standards of education (SETs) 3 and 5.

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)

- Annual Review Forms
- Candidate Handbook
- Society's code of ethics and conduct
- Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology Supervisors Handbook
- List of assessors
- Registry of attendance for training
- External Examiner's report 2015
- Appraisal Forms
- Web link to Continuing professional development (CPD) courses
- Web link to an annual general conference for supervisors
- Enrolment form
- Plan of training update
- Module descriptors
- Web link to the Register of Applied Psychology Practice supervisors

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	British Psychological Society
Programme title	Qualification in Forensic Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	24 May 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources.

Change of programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- New programme leader curriculum vitae
- Document concerning support for the role
- Personal statement from new programme leader

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	MSc in mental health and approved mental health professional practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Approved mental health professional) Dorothy Smith (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 June 2016

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

Criteria A: Programme admissions

Criteria B: Programme management and resources

The education provider has made changes to the structure and design of the programme, in addition 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 criteria for AMHP programmes mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Student handbook
- MSc Mental Health sign off sheet

### 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

**Reason:** From the evidence provided, the visitors noted that the education provider has appointed Debbie Divine as the new programme leader. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to demonstrate that Debbie Divine is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of appropriate professional register and therefore whether this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence, such as a curriculum vitae, which demonstrates that Debbie Divine is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of an appropriate professional 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Mental Health and Approved Mental Health Professional Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Approved mental health professional) Dorothy Smith (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 June 2016

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

Criteria A: Programme admissions

Criteria B: Programme management and resources

The education provider has made changes to the structure and design of the programme, in addition 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 criteria for AMHP programmes mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Student handbook
- Mental Health sign off sheet

### 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

**Reason:** From the evidence provided, the visitors noted that the education provider has appointed Debbie Divine as the new programme leader. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to demonstrate that Debbie Divine is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of appropriate professional register and therefore whether this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence, such as a curriculum vitae, which demonstrates that Debbie Divine is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of an appropriate professional 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	13 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	Doctorate in Health Psychology (Dpsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	22 April 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

### 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 highlighted that this programme has move from the School of Arts and Social Science to the School of Health Sciences. In addition, the education provider has also changed the current programme management and resources arrangements in place, along with changes to practice placements and assessment. Also a change in the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme has been highlighted by the education provider.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Appendix 1 Supporting job roles job description
- Appendix 2 Staff CVs
- Appendix 3 Staff biographies
- Appendix 4 DPsych Workshop timetable 2016-17
- Appendix 5 DPsych Health Psychology programme handbook
- Appendix 6 Placement provider supervisor handbook

### 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.

#### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors noted that due to strong clinical links with a number of NHS Trusts, there will be opportunities for clinical staff to support students on voluntary placements in order to fulfil their competencies. In addition, the Placement Provider and Supervisor Handbook (page 9) states that 'A visit by a member of the Health Psychology team to the Trainee's workplace will normally be made during the first year of training'. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine how the practice placement element of the programme will be effectively managed. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how this standard will be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Further evidence on how the practice placement element of the programme is effectively managed.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors noted that due to strong clinical links with a number of NHS Trusts, there will be opportunities for clinical staff to support students on voluntary placements in order to fulfil their competencies. In the Placement Provider and Supervisor Handbook (page 9) it states that 'Work place supervisors are asked to provide written confirmation that a piece of work in relation to any given competency has been completed satisfactorily'. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine whether the clinical staff who are volunteering will also be the work place supervisor that will sign off competences. As such, the visitors were unclear as to who the practice educators were for this programme and the process in place for ensuring that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to sign off competencies.

**Suggested documentation:** Clarification on the role of practice educator and who can sign off competencies. In addition, how the education provider ensures that

practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to sign off competencies.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	12 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Anthony Ward (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The programme leadership for the programme has changed.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	4

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry 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	24 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Roger (Social worker in England) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

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

The education provider intends to add an exit point of a Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work route to the existing approved MA Social Work programme. The Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work will be directly based on the MA Social Work programme with the exception of the research method and dissertation modules.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

- Draft amendment MA Social Work Programme Specification Step Up
- PG Student Handbook
- Faculty Resource Document
- Course Director Role
- Staff CVs
- Course Administrator

### 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 a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that students on the PG Dip programme will not undertake the module 'M23SW readiness to Practice Social Work' as is currently the case for the MA Social Work programme. Instead students will be expected to undertake '30 days of practical skills development' within their employment settings. The visitors noted that this could be an appropriate way to deliver the readiness to practice module, however, they were not provided with any information regarding the content of the development days or how these days will be managed and delivered at employment settings. The visitors note that without seeing the content and delivery for the development of the practice skills days, they cannot make a judgement on these days being appropriate to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. As such, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that the content and delivery of the '30 days of practical skills development' is appropriate to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England.

In addition, the visitors noted that the education provider has introduced module MXXSW 'Safeguarding Children and Assessment of Risk' for the PG Dip route. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that there appears to be no inclusion of content in relation to risk and safeguarding for adults. The visitors were therefore unable to determine from the evidence how a student completing this programme meets the SOPs for social workers in England. As such the visitors require further evidence demonstrating how the programme content ensures that students are taught an appropriate range of skills, including safeguarding in adult services, to ensure that this standard is met.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information on the 30 days of practical skill development, how this module is embedded into the placement programme and how the content is delivered. In addition, further evidence on module MXXSW 'Safeguarding Children and Assessment of Risk' and how the education provider

ensures that students completing this programme met the SOPs for social workers in England.

#### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, in particular the draft programme specification, the visitors noted that module M22SW 'transformative social work' is a 10 credit module on the MA programme structure. However, for the PG Dip programme structure this module has been revised to 'blended online learning'. From the evidence provided the visitors were unable to determine what blended learning constituted for this module. In addition, the visitors were unable to determine whether changes have been made to the delivery and assessment of this module. The visitors therefore, require further evidence on the content of this module and its delivery to ensure that the range of learning and teaching approaches remain appropriate to the curriculum.

**Suggested documentation:** Further evidence on the content and delivery of module M22SW 'transformative social work'.

#### **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 a review of the documentation, specifically page 13 of the draft programme specification, the visitors noted that students on the PG Dip readiness for practice will be assessed at their employment settings. The visitors also noted, that for the MA programme structure readiness for practice is contained in module M23SW, whereas, for the PG Dip there is no specific module for readiness for practice. The visitors were not provided with evidence on how the education provider intends to manage and assess readiness for practice at employment settings to ensure that students completing this programme meet the Standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

In addition, the visitors noted that the PG Dip programme structure does not include module M25SW 'law adults' and has been replaced with module M24SW 'law for children and families'. In assessing the evidence, the visitors noted that there is no inclusion of content in relation to risk and safeguarding for adults. With these changes in mind, the visitors require further evidence on how the content for M24SW 'law for children and families' and how the assessment strategy ensures that students completing this programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information on how readiness for practice will be assessed at employment settings. In addition, further evidence on M24SW 'law for children and families' and how the education provider's assessment strategy ensures that those who complete this programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, in particular the draft programme specification, the visitors noted that module M22SW 'transformative social work' is a 10 credit module on the MA programme structure. However, for the PG Dip programme structure this module has been revised to 'blended online learning'. From the evidence provided the visitors were unable to determine what blended learning constituted for this module. In addition, the visitors were unable to determine whether changes have been made to the delivery and assessment of this module. The visitors therefore, require further evidence on the content of this module and the assessment methods employed to ensure that the necessary learning outcomes are met.

**Suggested documentation:** Further evidence on the content and assessment of module M22SW 'transformative social work'.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016

### 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

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend their practice certificate in Independent prescribing programme to include dieticians.

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)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Resource document 2016

- Application for practice certificate in independent prescribing.
- Application process
- Practice certificate in Independent Prescribing (Masters) – M41CPD and M42CPD
- Designated Medical Supervisors handbook.
- Programme specification
- Student handbook for practice certificate in IP

### **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:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted in the application form that reference was made regarding applicants needing an enhanced disclosure check (DBS) as part of the entry requirements for this programme. However, in securitising the evidence, in particular the admissions documentation, the visitors were unable to locate where applicants would be told of this requirement. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate that applicants are given the full information required in order to make an informed choice as to whether to apply to the programme.

**Additional evidence:** Further evidence that DBS requirements are clearly communicated to applicants through the admissions procedures.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted reference to an HCPC requirement of a minimum of 90 hours of direct supervised practice within students existing work area (course specification, page 8). The HCPC does not state a minimum requirement for placement hours, and therefore all programme documentation must be revised to ensure that the requirements of the HCPC are accurately reflected.

**Suggested documentation:** Revision to the programme documentation to ensure that it is updated and reflective of the HCPC's requirements.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing (M Level)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016

### 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

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend their practice certificate in Independent prescribing programme to include dieticians.

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)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Resource document 2016

- Application for practice certificate in independent prescribing.
- Application process
- Practice certificate in Independent Prescribing (Masters) – M41CPD and M42CPD
- Designated Medical Supervisors handbook.
- Programme specification
- Student handbook for practice certificate in IP

### **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:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted in the application form that reference was made regarding applicants needing an enhanced disclosure check (DBS) as part of the entry requirements for this programme. However, in securitising the evidence, in particular the admissions documentation, the visitors were unable to locate where applicants would be told of this requirement. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate that applicants are given the full information required in order to make an informed choice as to whether to apply to the programme.

**Additional evidence:** Further evidence that DBS requirements are clearly communicated to applicants through the admissions procedures.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted reference to an HCPC requirement of a minimum of 90 hours of direct supervised practice within students existing work area (course specification, page 8). The HCPC does not state a minimum requirement for placement hours, and therefore all programme documentation must be revised to ensure that the requirements of the HCPC are accurately reflected.

**Suggested documentation:** Revision to the programme documentation to ensure that it is updated and reflective of the HCPC's requirements.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Conversion Course From Supplementary to Independent Non-Medical Prescribing (Non-Accredited)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016

### 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

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend the programme to include radiographers.

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)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Resource document 2016
- Handbook for conversion course
- Conversion course application form
- Conversion programme specification
- Supervisor handbook conversion course
- Application for practice certificate in independent prescribing.
- Application process
- Practice certificate in Independent Prescribing (Masters) – M41CPD and M42CPD
- Designated Medical Supervisors handbook.
- Programme specification
- Student handbook for practice certificate in IP

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016

### 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

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend their practice certificate in Independent prescribing programme to include dietitians and their conversion from supplementary to independent programmes to include radiographers.

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)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Resource document 2016
- Application for practice certificate in independent prescribing.
- Application process
- Practice certificate in Independent Prescribing (Masters) – M41CPD and M42CPD
- Designated Medical Supervisors handbook.
- Programme specification
- Student handbook for practice certificate in IP

### 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:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted in the application form that reference was made regarding applicants needing an enhanced disclosure check (DBS) as part of the entry requirements for this programme. However, in securitising the evidence, in particular the admissions documentation, the visitors were unable to locate where applicants would be told of this requirement. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate that applicants are given the full information required in order to make an informed choice as to whether to apply to the programme.

**Additional evidence:** Further evidence that DBS requirements are clearly communicated to applicants through the admissions procedures.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted reference to an HCPC requirement of a minimum of 90 hours of direct supervised practice within students existing work area (course specification, page 8). The HCPC does not state a minimum requirement for placement hours, and therefore all programme documentation must be revised to ensure that the requirements of the HCPC are accurately reflected.

**Suggested documentation:** Revision to the programme documentation to ensure that it is updated and reflective of the HCPC's requirements.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing (M Level)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016

### 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

The education provider has highlighted that they wish to extend their practice certificate in Independent prescribing programme to include dieticians.

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)

- Staff curriculum vitae
- Resource document 2016
- Application for practice certificate in independent prescribing.
- Application process
- Practice certificate in Independent Prescribing (Masters) – M41CPD and M42CPD
- Designated Medical Supervisors handbook.
- Programme specification
- Student handbook for practice certificate in IP

### 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:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted in the application form that reference was made regarding applicants needing an enhanced disclosure check (DBS) as part of the entry requirements for this programme. However, in securitising the evidence, in particular the admissions documentation, the visitors were unable to locate where applicants would be told of this requirement. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate that applicants are given the full information required in order to make an informed choice as to whether to apply to the programme.

**Additional evidence:** Further evidence that DBS requirements are clearly communicated to applicants through the admissions procedures.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the evidence submitted, the visitors noted reference to an HCPC requirement of a minimum of 90 hours of direct supervised practice within students existing work area (course specification, page 8). The HCPC does not state a minimum requirement for placement hours, and therefore all programme documentation must be revised to ensure that the requirements of the HCPC are accurately reflected.

**Suggested documentation:** Revision to the programme documentation to ensure that it is updated and reflective of the HCPC's requirements.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 7) (Conversion)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 June 2016

### 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

The education provider has flagged changes to the programme, namely therapeutic radiographers will be admitted to the programme to prepare supplementary prescribers as independent prescribers. The education provider also flagged a change to the criminal convictions check process. These changes affect a number of the standards for prescribing, as listed above.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Mapping of learning outcomes
- Screenshot of Conversion Modules Virtual Learning (Blackboard) site
- Conversion Portfolio Activities
- Competency Profile
- Conversion Module Guide
- Staff curricula vitae
- Draft text for university web page with programme information
- Application form
- 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.

### **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.

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted in the documentation that there was a reference to the NPC competency framework (2012). The NPC competency framework was updated in July 2016 so the visitors would like this reference in the documentation to be updated.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 6) (Conversion)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 June 2016

### 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

The education provider has flagged changes to the programme, namely therapeutic radiographers will be admitted to the programme to prepare supplementary prescribers as independent prescribers. The education provider also flagged a change to the criminal convictions check process. These changes affect a number of the standards for prescribing, as listed above.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Mapping of learning outcomes
- Screenshot of Conversion Modules Virtual Learning (Blackboard) site
- Conversion Portfolio Activities
- Competency Profile
- Conversion Module Guide
- Staff curricula vitae
- Draft text for university web page with programme information
- Application form
- 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.

### **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.

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted in the documentation that there was a reference to the NPC competency framework (2012). The NPC competency framework was updated in July 2016 so the visitors would like this reference in the documentation to be updated.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 6) (with SP pathway and IP pathway)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 June 2016

### 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

The education provider has flagged changes to the programme, namely therapeutic radiographers will be admitted to the programme to prepare supplementary prescribers as independent prescribers. The education provider also flagged a change to the criminal convictions check process. These changes affect a number of the standards for prescribing, as listed above.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Application form
- Programme specification
- Draft text for university web page with programme information
- Staff curricula vitae
- Programme handbook
- Competency profile
- Portfolio activities
- Screenshot of Virtual Learning (Blackboard) site
- Module descriptor forms

### **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.

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted in the documentation that there was a reference to the NPC competency framework (2012). The NPC competency framework was updated in July 2016 so the visitors would like this reference in the documentation to be updated.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 7) (with SP pathway and IP pathway)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 June 2016

### 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

The education provider has flagged changes to the programme, namely therapeutic radiographers will be admitted to the programme to prepare supplementary prescribers as independent prescribers. The education provider also flagged a change to the criminal convictions check process. These changes affect a number of the standards for prescribing, as listed above.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Application form
- Programme specification
- Draft text for university web page with programme information
- Staff curricula vitae
- Programme handbook
- Competency profile
- Portfolio activities
- Screenshot of Virtual Learning (Blackboard) site
- Module descriptor forms

### **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.

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted in the documentation that there was a reference to the NPC competency framework (2012). The NPC competency framework was updated in July 2016 so the visitors would like this reference in the documentation to be updated.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
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	7 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) David Childs (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has appointed a new programme leader and recruited additional members of teaching staff.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Management structure
- Programme handbook

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

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

The education provider has indicated a change to how students can access the programme, if they have previously undertaken a previous programme of study at the education provider. The programme team has stated that by taking the CertHE Supporting Pre-Hospital Care programme, this should exempt students from completing year one of this programme. In addition, due to additional workforce needs identified by Health Education North West, the education provider will be increasing the student cohort from 35 students per year to 70 students per year. Furthermore, the education provider has flagged a change in premises in Manchester.

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)
- CertHE Supporting Pre-Hospital Care programme specification
- Programme web page links
- Open Day presentation
- Admissions documents
- CertHE Supporting Pre-Hospital Care mapping document against Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice learning outcomes and indicative content
- Staff curricula vitae
- Staff contracts
- Letters of support for placement capacity
- Timetables
- Floor plan for the new campus
- Business case for increased clinical skills equipment
- Student services and learning services web links
- Programme handbook
- CertHE Supporting Pre-Hospital Care module specifications
- Information on paramedic/mentor numbers in clinical practice

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	30 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor(s)	Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has appointed a new programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	30 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor(s)	Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has appointed a new programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Dietitian
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicolls (Dietitian) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 5: Practice placements

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

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Student placement portfolios
- Narrative on changes
- Module descriptors

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Dietitian
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicolls (Dietitian) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 5: Practice placements

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

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Student placement portfolios
- Narrative on changes
- Module descriptors

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics (Pre-Registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Dietitian
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicolls (Dietitian) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 5: Practice placements

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

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Student placement portfolios
- Narrative on changes
- Module descriptors

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Leicester
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has moved building at the University of Leicester campus.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3
Section five: Visitors' comments .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	Conversion to Independent Prescribing for Physiotherapists and Podiatrist Supplementary Prescribers
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Hill (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 April 2016

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

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

With the change in the medicine legislation regarding prescribing rights the education provider has now added the diagnostic radiographers and dietitians to the list of professions able to take this programme with a view to annotation to the Register.

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)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Programme specification
- Programme guide
- Application form information
- Education provider corporate strategy
- Practice assessment guide
- Designated medical practitioner supporting documents
- Timetable
- Staff operational manual

### **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:** In their reading of the evidence provided the visitors noted that on page 7 of the course specification the education provider states that :-

“The professional bodies (NMC, GPhC and HCPC) recommend that students should complete the non-medical prescribing programme within one calendar year, unless extenuating circumstances approved by the University have been approved. Students failing to complete the programme within one calendar year are required to undertake the programme again.”

The HCPC is not a professional body but a regulatory body. Also the HCPC does not impose or recommend time frames on the duration of its approved programmes, the programme needs to meet the standards of prescribing for approval to be maintained. Therefore the visitors need to see revised evidence that clearly and accurately articulate the role and remit of the HCPC as a regulatory body.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence that demonstrates that statements that refer to the HCPC accurately reflect the role and remit of the HCPC as a regulatory body.

#### **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.

#### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors would like the education provider to note that there are number of instances where the HCPC is referenced which are not correct. In particular the HCPC is referred to as specifying the length of programme delivery (programme specification) as and specifying that it must be taught as three integrated modules (prescribing for clinical practice module guide). The HCPC does not specify the length of any programme and does not specify how any programme should be taught or delivered. Therefore the visitors recommend that these references are amended to ensure that there is no confusion over the role of the HCPC in regulating this programme.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3
Section five: Visitors' comments .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Hill (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 April 2016

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

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

With the change in the medicine legislation regarding prescribing rights the education provider has now added the diagnostic radiographers and dietitians to the list of professions able to take this programme with a view to annotation to the Register.

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)
- Staff curriculum vitae

- Programme specification
- Programme guide
- Application form information
- Education provider corporate strategy
- Practice assessment guide
- Designated medical practitioner supporting documents
- Timetable
- Staff operational manual

### **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:** In their reading of the evidence provided the visitors noted that on page 7 of the course specification the education provider states that :-

“The professional bodies (NMC, GPhC and HCPC) recommend that students should complete the non-medical prescribing programme within one calendar year, unless extenuating circumstances approved by the University have been approved. Students failing to complete the programme within one calendar year are required to undertake the programme again.”

The HCPC is not a professional body but a regulatory body. Also the HCPC does not impose or recommend time frames on the duration of its approved programmes, the programme needs to meet the standards of prescribing for approval to be maintained. Therefore the visitors need to see revised evidence that clearly and accurately articulate the role and remit of the HCPC as a regulatory body.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence that demonstrates that statements that refer to the HCPC accurately reflect the role and remit of the HCPC as a regulatory body.

#### **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.

#### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors would like the education provider to note that there are number of instances where the HCPC is referenced which are not correct. In particular the HCPC is referred to as specifying the length of programme delivery (programme specification) as and specifying that it must be taught as three integrated modules (prescribing for clinical practice module guide). The HCPC does not specify the length of any programme and does not specify how any programme should be taught or delivered. Therefore the visitors recommend that these references are amended to ensure that there is no confusion over the role of the HCPC in regulating this programme.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3
Section five: Visitors' comments .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Hill (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	27 April 2016

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

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

With the change in the medicine legislation regarding prescribing rights the education provider has now added the diagnostic radiographers and dietitians to the list of professions able to take this programme with a view to annotation to the Register.

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)
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Programme specification
- Programme guide
- Application form information
- Education provider corporate strategy
- Practice assessment guide
- Designated medical practitioner supporting documents
- Timetable
- Staff operational manual

### **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:** In their reading of the evidence provided the visitors noted that on page 7 of the course specification the education provider states that :-

“The professional bodies (NMC, GPhC and HCPC) recommend that students should complete the non-medical prescribing programme within one calendar year, unless extenuating circumstances approved by the University have been approved. Students failing to complete the programme within one calendar year are required to undertake the programme again.”

The HCPC is not a professional body but a regulatory body. Also the HCPC does not impose or recommend time frames on the duration of its approved programmes, the programme needs to meet the standards of prescribing for approval to be maintained. Therefore the visitors need to see revised evidence that clearly and accurately articulate the role and remit of the HCPC as a regulatory body.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence that demonstrates that statements that refer to the HCPC accurately reflect the role and remit of the HCPC as a regulatory body.

#### **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.

#### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors would like the education provider to note that there are number of instances where the HCPC is referenced which are not correct. In particular the HCPC is referred to as specifying the length of programme delivery (programme specification) as and specifying that it must be taught as three integrated modules (prescribing for clinical practice module guide). The HCPC does not specify the length of any programme and does not specify how any programme should be taught or delivered. Therefore the visitors recommend that these references are amended to ensure that there is no confusion over the role of the HCPC in regulating this programme.

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	Independent Prescribing (conversion course) for Allied Health Professions: (PG Level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016

### 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 has highlighted that they wish to extend their independent/supplementary prescribing and independent prescribing conversion programmes to include therapeutic radiographers.

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)

- Admissions process
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Admissions checklist for potential applicants
- Course handbook
- Module descriptors
- Practice placement handbook
- Practice placement educator handbook

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professions (v300) PG level 7
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016

### 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 has highlighted that they wish to extend their independent/supplementary prescribing and independent prescribing conversion programmes to include therapeutic radiographers.

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)

- Admissions process
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Admissions checklist for potential applicants
- Course handbook
- Module descriptors
- Practice placement handbook
- Practice placement educator handbook

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professions (v300) PG level 7
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 May 2016

### 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 has highlighted that they wish to extend their independent/supplementary prescribing and independent prescribing conversion programmes to include therapeutic radiographers.

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)

- Admissions process
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Admissions checklist for potential applicants
- Course handbook
- Module descriptors
- Practice placement handbook
- Practice placement educator handbook

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret 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	13 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanne Stead (Occupational therapist) Natalie Matchett (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions  
 SET 4: Curriculum  
 SET 5: Practice placements  
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has changed the awards for the programme, in addition there has been a change to the entry requirements and the application process.

The education provider has detailed a change to the credit framework, the total required credits has changed from 210 credits to 180 credits, as part of this change the education provider has revised the modules, learning outcomes and assessment strategy.

The education provider has detailed changes to the practice placements for the programme, there are currently two part time placements, these have been modified to be full time placements of six and eight week placement blocks.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme handbook
- Information for applicants
- Programme specification
- Interview day presentation
- Programme review
- Student handbook
- Practice education appendices
- Practice education handbook
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Programme review document

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	PgDip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	13 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanne Stead (Occupational therapist) Natalie Matchett (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions  
 SET 4: Curriculum  
 SET 5: Practice placements  
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has changed the awards for the programme, in addition there has been a change to the entry requirements and the application process.

The education provider has detailed a change to the credit framework, the total required credits has changed from 210 credits to 180 credits, as part of this change the education provider has revised the modules, learning outcomes and assessment strategy.

The education provider has detailed changes to the practice placements for the programme, there are currently two part time placements, these have been modified to be full time placements of six and eight week placement blocks.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme handbook
- Information for applicants
- Programme specification
- Interview day presentation
- Programme review
- Student handbook
- Practice education appendices
- Practice education handbook
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Programme review document

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	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	13 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanne Stead (Occupational therapist) Natalie Matchett (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions  
 SET 4: Curriculum  
 SET 5: Practice placements  
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has changed the awards for the programme, in addition there has been a change to the entry requirements and the application process.

The education provider has revised the modules, learning outcomes and assessment strategy.

The education provider has detailed changes to the practice placements for the programme, there are currently two part time placements, these have been modified to be full time placements of six and eight week placement blocks.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme handbook
- Information for applicants
- Programme specification
- Interview day presentation
- Programme review
- Student handbook
- Practice education appendices
- Practice education handbook
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Programme review document

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Dietitian
Date of submission to the HCPC	8 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 5: Practice placements

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

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- BDA Curriculum mapping
- Certificate of accreditation
- SOPs mapping document
- Narrative on changes
- Placement handbook
- Placement modules descriptors

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Dietitian
Date of submission to the HCPC	8 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 5: Practice placements

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

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- BDA Curriculum mapping
- Certificate of accreditation
- SOPs mapping document
- Narrative on changes

- Placement handbook
- Placement modules descriptors

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	PgDip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Dietitian
Date of submission to the HCPC	8 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 5: Practice placements

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

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- BDA Curriculum mapping
- Certificate of accreditation
- SOPs mapping document
- Narrative on changes

- Placement handbook
- Placement modules descriptors

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc Art Psychotherapy (International)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	11 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Jonathan Isserow (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen's University of Belfast
Programme title	Doctorate in Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DECAP)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	15 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Richards (Educational psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

#### SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has appointed a new programme leader and appointed a new member of staff.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae of new programme leader
- Appointment of post letter
- Staff Curriculum vitae
- DECAP meeting minutes

- Part time post details

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	MA in 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	2 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has highlighted a programme leader change from Suyria Nayak to Michaela Rogers.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Curriculum vitae for Dan Allen
- Curriculum vitae for Michaela Rogers

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Practice Based Learning)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	30 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### 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 to the learning resources available to students with the provision of new teaching facilities. The education provider has also made changes to the curriculum to better reflect current and evidence based practice.

The education provider has changed the required credits for practice placement modules. The education provider has made changes to the assessment procedures to ensure that the assessment procedures match the curriculum

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 handbook
- Assessment forms
- Occupational therapy definitive document

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Practice Based Learning)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	30 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### 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 to the learning resources available to students with the provision of new teaching facilities. The education provider has also made changes to the curriculum to better reflect current and evidence based practice.

The education provider has changed the required credits for practice placement modules. The education provider has made changes to the assessment procedures to ensure that the assessment procedures match the curriculum

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
- Definitive document
- Student consent
- Critical review
- Placement audit
- 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 of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

#### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** When reviewing the evidence the visitors noted references made about the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. The visitors also noted that the education provider had not mapped evidence against SET 3.17. Without the mapping for SET 3.17 the visitors could not determine where changes (if any) have been made to how service users and carers are involved in the programme. As such the visitors request additional evidence demonstrating where changes (if any) have been made to how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence that demonstrates where (if any) changes have been made to how service users and carers are involved in the programme, such as a revised SETs mapping document.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	Master of Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has reduced the duration of the programme from 26 months to 24 months. In addition the education provider has increased the pass mark from 40 per cent to 50 per cent.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Revised module descriptors
- Social work current course document

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	11 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 5: Practice placements

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has revised the structure of the programme to accommodate a semester delivery pattern. In addition the education provider has reduced the ambulance exposure in each year from 15 weeks to 10 weeks in line with College of Paramedic guidelines.

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)
- Practice assessment document
- Mentor handbook
- Placement mentor strategy

- BSc (Hons) review document
- Mentor update

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk (formerly University Campus Suffolk)
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Work-based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources  
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has been given full University status awarded by the Privy Council and has changed its name to the University of Suffolk on the 1 August 2016

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)
- Academic appeals regulations
- Stakeholder support document

- Assessment and feedback framework
- Assessment board procedure
- Assessment board moderation policy
- Course modification procedure
- Department of Business Innovation letter of confirmation of change to university name
- External examiners policy
- Extract from HEFCE designation application policy
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Framework regulations for undergraduate awards
- Governance structure
- Management of courses policy
- Quality committee terms of reference
- Senate terms of reference
- Student complaints policy

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk (formerly University Campus Suffolk)
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	John Donaghy (Paramedic) Joanne Thomas (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has been given full University status awarded by the Privy Council and has changed its name to the University of Suffolk on the 1 August 2016.

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)
- Academic appeals regulations
- Stakeholder support document
- Assessment and feedback framework

- Assessment board procedure
- Assessment board moderation policy
- Course modification procedure
- Department of Business Innovation letter of confirmation of change to university name
- External examiners policy
- Extract from HEFCE designation application policy
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Framework regulations for undergraduate awards
- Governance structure
- Management of courses policy
- Quality committee terms of reference
- Senate terms of reference
- Student complaints policy

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk (formerly University Campus Suffolk)
Programme title	Non-Medical Independent and/or Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	26 July 2016

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources  
Standard E: Assessment

The education provider has been given full University status awarded by the Privy Council and has changed its name to the University of Suffolk on the 1 August 2016.

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)
- Academic appeals regulations
- Stakeholder support document

- Assessment and feedback framework
- Assessment board procedure
- Assessment board moderation policy
- Course modification procedure
- Department of Business Innovation letter of confirmation of change to university name
- External examiners policy
- Extract from HEFCE designation application policy
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Framework regulations for undergraduate awards
- Governance structure
- Management of courses policy
- Quality committee terms of reference
- Senate terms of reference
- Student complaints policy

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk (formerly University Campus Suffolk)
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Ball (Therapeutic radiographer) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources  
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has been given full University status awarded by the Privy Council and has changed its name to the University of Suffolk on the 1 August 2016.

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)
- Academic appeals regulations
- Stakeholder support document
- Assessment and feedback framework

- Assessment board procedure
- Assessment board moderation policy
- Course modification procedure
- Department of Business Innovation letter of confirmation of change to university name
- External examiners policy
- Extract from HEFCE designation application policy
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Framework regulations for undergraduate awards
- Governance structure
- Management of courses policy
- Quality committee terms of reference
- Senate terms of reference
- Student complaints policy

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk (formerly University Campus Suffolk)
Programme title	Non-Medical Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	26 July 2016

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

Standard B: Programme management and resources  
Standard E: Assessment

The education provider has been given full University status awarded by the Privy Council and has changed its name to the University of Suffolk on the 1 August 2016.

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)
- Academic appeals regulations
- Stakeholder support document
- Assessment and feedback framework
- Assessment board procedure
- Assessment board moderation policy

- Course modification procedure
- Department of Business Innovation letter of confirmation of change to university name
- External examiners policy
- Extract from HEFCE designation application policy
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Framework regulations for undergraduate awards
- Governance structure
- Management of courses policy
- Quality committee terms of reference
- Senate terms of reference
- Student complaints policy

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk (formerly University Campus 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	25 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Beverley Ball (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has been given full University status awarded by the Privy Council and has changed its name to the University of Suffolk on the 1 August 2016.

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)
- Academic appeals regulations
- Stakeholder support document
- Assessment and feedback framework

- Assessment board procedure
- Assessment board moderation policy
- Course modification procedure
- Department of Business Innovation letter of confirmation of change to university name
- External examiners policy
- Extract from HEFCE designation application policy
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Framework regulations for undergraduate awards
- Governance structure
- Management of courses policy
- Quality committee terms of reference
- Senate terms of reference
- Student complaints policy

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk (formerly University Campus Suffolk)
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	25 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	John Donaghy (Paramedic) Joanne Thomas (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources  
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has been given full University status awarded by the Privy Council and has changed its name to the University of Suffolk on the 1 August 2016.

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)
- Academic appeals regulations
- Stakeholder support document

- Assessment and feedback framework
- Assessment board procedure
- Assessment board moderation policy
- Course modification procedure
- Department of Business Innovation letter of confirmation of change to university name
- External examiners policy
- Extract from HEFCE designation application policy
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Framework regulations for undergraduate awards
- Governance structure
- Management of courses policy
- Quality committee terms of reference
- Senate terms of reference
- Student complaints policy

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	6 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The programme leader for the programme has changed.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	5 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Westminster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	29 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has appointed a new programme leader. In addition the education provider has reviewed and revised some modules.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 July 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has revised the learning outcomes and assessment methods as a result of student feedback.

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
- SOPs mapping document
- Revised module specifications

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Major change visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	York St John University
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	1 June 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

### **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.