Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	7 December 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gail Fairey (Diagnostic radiographer) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

As part of University wide changes to the structure of all modules from multiples of 15 credits to multiples of 20 credits, the modules for this programme have been repackaged to reflect the university requirements.

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
- Standards of proficiency mapping

- Clinical staff handbook
- Clinical student handbook
- Module descriptors
- Clinical portfolio
- Context document
- Design initiation event
- QAA descriptors
- Society and College of Radiographer Education and career framework

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of submission to the HCPC	7 December 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gail Fairey (Diagnostic radiographer) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
SET 6: Assessment

As part of University wide changes to the structure of all modules from multiples of 15 credits to multiples of 20 credits, the modules for this programme have been repackaged to reflect the university requirements.

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
- Standards of proficiency mapping

- Clinical staff handbook
- Clinical student handbook
- Diagnostic radiography level 4 clinical progressive assessment handbook
- Diagnostic radiography level 5 clinical progressive assessment handbook
- Diagnostic radiography level 6 clinical progressive assessment handbook
- QAA descriptors
- Society and College of Radiographers Education and career handbook
- 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

Name of education provider	Glyndwr 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	25 November 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

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 reviewed the programme and updated the programme to ensure currency and to ensure the practice placements are current and appropriate.

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)
- Standards of proficiency mapping
- Programme specification
- External examiner reports
- Internal monitoring documents

- Timetable
- Local placement agreements
- Occupational therapy handbook
- Programme handbook
- QAA benchmark document
- Education provider business plan
- Admission procedure document
- Validation document
- Occupational therapy periodic 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that as part of the programme revalidation changes have been made to joint working with other professionals through interprofessional learning. However, it is not clear from the documentation provided how and where this learning occurs in the programme. Furthermore the visitors could not determine how the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group is adequately addressed from the information in the programme validation document. Therefore in order for the visitors to be assured that this standard continues to be met evidence is required that demonstrates the interprofessional learning and how the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group is addressed as part of interprofessional learning.

Additional documentation: documentation that demonstrates how interprofessional learning is delivered as part of the programme delivery, and how the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group will be adequately addressed.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the

programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	MA Art Therapy
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	10 January 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jonathan Isserow (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change of programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate Approved Mental Health Professional (PGCert AMHP) (Formerly Post Graduate Diploma Interprofessional Practice (Approved Mental Health Professional))
Mode of delivery	Full time (formerly recorded as Work based learning)
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Abrahart (Approved Mental Health Professional) Graham Noyce (Approved Mental Health Professional)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	12 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Criteria C: Curriculum
Criteria E: Assessment

The education provider has informed the HCPC that it has made changes to the curriculum and assessment for the programme. These changes are being made with the intention to strengthen the way the programme meets the AMHP competencies as defined in the HCPC AMHP criteria and a change of programme name.

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)
- Programme guide
- Programme internal mapping document
- Programme specification

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.

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

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan 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	12 December 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 visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	Post Graduate Certificate Approved Mental Health Professional
Mode of delivery	Part time
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	20 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Criteria B: 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 standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme handbooks
- Curriculum vitae of new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

☐   The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of submission to the HCPC	2 December 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of submission to the HCPC	2 December 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
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 January 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Curriculum changes and new opportunities for specialisation within programme.

SET 4: Curriculum

Changed learning outcomes for certain modules

SET 5: Practice placements

Possible changes to practice placements related to curriculum changes.

SET 6: Assessment

New methods of assessment and possible effects on progression.

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
- Minutes of programme team meeting
- Module specifications
- Student handbook
- Assessment map
- Guide to admissions
- Placement assessment form
- SOPs mapping

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	4 January 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for new programme leader
- Tutor role document
- Departmental structure document
- Faculty structure document
- Other staff curriculum vitae
- Annual programme monitoring report

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	4 January 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Programme leader change.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Curriculum vitae for new programme leader
- Tutor role document
- Departmental structure document
- Faculty structure document
- Other staff curriculum vitae
- Annual programme monitoring report

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	14 December 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) James McManus (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

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

The education provider will be making changes to their curriculum, practice placements and assessment strategy. The changes are being introduced following changes in local NHS provision.

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)
- Regulations for the Degree of Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
- Curriculum updates document

- Standards of proficiency mapping documents

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of South Wales
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Arts therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	13 December 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Philippa Brown (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change of programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	28 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider proposes to integrate the current BSc (Hons) programme with a foundation year, making the programme a four year programme. Upon completion of the integrated programme, the student will still graduate with a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood science). The education provider has also appointed a new programme leader for the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

- Programme webpages
- Curriculum vitae for the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider proposes to integrate the foundation year with the BSc (Hons) programme, allowing students to complete the foundation year and then transfer onto the beginning of the BSc (Hons) programme. The visitors reviewed the programme webpages, where information about the stages within the programme were stipulated, however the visitors could not determine how a student would progress onto the BSc (Hons) aspect upon completion of the foundation year, or how this will be communicated to potential applicants. In particular the visitors noted that for direct entry into the BSc (Hons) programme there is an interview, however for the foundation year, no requirement for an interview was evident, as such the visitors could not determine the requirements for progression onto stage one, such as an interview and how this may be communicated to potential applicants. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate how the admissions procedures provide applicants with the information they require about progression from the foundation year onto stage one.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the admissions procedures clearly stipulate any requirements for progression from the foundation year onto stage one.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the new programme leader is not registered with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist, as part of the evidence provided the visitors could not determine what support the new programme leader in their role to ensure that the arrangements for programme leadership were appropriate. As such the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates the arrangements in place for the programme leader, such as how the programme team will support the programme leader in their new role.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the arrangements in place for the programme leader, such as how the programme team will support the programme leader in their new role.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider proposes to integrate the foundation year with the BSc (Hons) programme, allowing students to complete the foundation year and then progress onto the BSc (Hons) programme. The visitors reviewed the programme webpages, where information about the stages within the programme were stipulated, however the visitors could not determine how a student would process onto the BSc (Hons) aspect upon completion of the foundation year. In particular the visitors noted that for direct entry into the BSc (Hons) programme there is an interview, however for the foundation year, no requirement for an interview was evident, as such the visitors could not determine the requirements for progression onto stage one, such as an interview. In addition the visitors could not determine at what point during the programme, a student will decide which modality to study, as throughout the programme structure there are separate modules for the different modalities. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate any requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme, in particular from the foundation year onto stage one of the programme.

Suggested documentation: evidence that demonstrated any requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular progression from the foundation year onto stage one of the programme, such as the university webpages of programme specification.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	28 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider proposes to integrate the current BSc (Hons) programme with a foundation year, making the programme a four year programme. Upon completion of the integrated programme, the student will still graduate with a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science). The education provider has also appointed a new programme leader for the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme webpages
- Curriculum vitae for the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider proposes to integrate the foundation year with the BSc (Hons) programme, allowing students to complete the foundation year and then transfer onto the beginning of the BSc (Hons) programme. The visitors reviewed the programme webpages, where information about the stages within the programme were stipulated, however the visitors could not determine how a student would progress onto the BSc (Hons) aspect upon completion of the foundation year, or how this will be communicated to potential applicants. In particular the visitors noted that for direct entry into the BSc (Hons) programme there is an interview, however for the foundation year, no requirement for an interview was evident, as such the visitors could not determine the requirements for progression onto stage one, such as an interview and how this may be communicated to potential applicants. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate how the admissions procedures provide applicants with the information they require about progression from the foundation year onto stage one.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the admissions procedures clearly stipulate any requirements for progression from the foundation year onto stage one.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the new programme leader is not registered with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist, as part of the evidence provided the visitors could not determine what support the new programme leader in their role to ensure that the arrangements for programme leadership were appropriate. As such the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates the arrangements in place for the programme leader, such as how the programme team will support the programme leader in their new role.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the arrangements in place for the programme leader, such as how the programme team will support the programme leader in their new role.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider proposes to integrate the foundation year with the BSc (Hons) programme, allowing students to complete the foundation year and then progress onto the BSc (Hons) programme. The visitors reviewed the programme webpages, where information about the stages within the programme were stipulated, however the visitors could not determine how a student would process onto the BSc (Hons) aspect upon completion of the foundation year. In particular the visitors noted that for direct entry into the BSc (Hons) programme there is an interview, however for the foundation year, no requirement for an interview was evident, as such the visitors could not determine the requirements for progression onto stage one, such as an interview. In addition the visitors could not determine at what point during the programme, a student will decide which modality to study, as throughout the programme structure there are separate modules for the different modalities. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate any requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme, in particular from the foundation year onto stage one of the programme.

Suggested documentation: evidence that demonstrated any requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular progression from the foundation year onto stage one of the programme, such as the university webpages of programme specification.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	28 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider proposes to integrate the current BSc (Hons) programme with a foundation year, making the programme a four year programme. Upon completion of the integrated programme, the student will still graduate with a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science). The education provider has also appointed a new programme leader for the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme webpages
- Curriculum vitae for the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider proposes to integrate the foundation year with the BSc (Hons) programme, allowing students to complete the foundation year and then transfer onto the beginning of the BSc (Hons) programme. The visitors reviewed the programme webpages, where information about the stages within the programme were stipulated, however the visitors could not determine how a student would progress onto the BSc (Hons) aspect upon completion of the foundation year, or how this will be communicated to potential applicants. In particular the visitors noted that for direct entry into the BSc (Hons) programme there is an interview, however for the foundation year, no requirement for an interview was evident, as such the visitors could not determine the requirements for progression onto stage one, such as an interview and how this may be communicated to potential applicants. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate how the admissions procedures provide applicants with the information they require about progression from the foundation year onto stage one.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the admissions procedures clearly stipulate any requirements for progression from the foundation year onto stage one.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the new programme leader is not registered with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist, as part of the evidence provided the visitors could not determine what support the new programme leader in their role to ensure that the arrangements for programme leadership were appropriate. As such the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates the arrangements in place for the programme leader, such as how the programme team will support the programme leader in their new role.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the arrangements in place for the programme leader, such as how the programme team will support the programme leader in their new role.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider proposes to integrate the foundation year with the BSc (Hons) programme, allowing students to complete the foundation year and then progress onto the BSc (Hons) programme. The visitors reviewed the programme webpages, where information about the stages within the programme were stipulated, however the visitors could not determine how a student would process onto the BSc (Hons) aspect upon completion of the foundation year. In particular the visitors noted that for direct entry into the BSc (Hons) programme there is an interview, however for the foundation year, no requirement for an interview was evident, as such the visitors could not determine the requirements for progression onto stage one, such as an interview. In addition the visitors could not determine at what point during the programme, a student will decide which modality to study, as throughout the programme structure there are separate modules for the different modalities. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate any requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme, in particular from the foundation year onto stage one of the programme.

Suggested documentation: evidence that demonstrated any requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular progression from the foundation year onto stage one of the programme, such as the university webpages of programme specification.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	28 September 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider proposes to integrate the current BSc (Hons) programme with a foundation year, making the programme a four year programme. Upon completion of the integrated programme, the student will still graduate with a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science). The education provider has also appointed a new programme leader for the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme webpages
- Curriculum vitae for the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider proposes to integrate the foundation year with the BSc (Hons) programme, allowing students to complete the foundation year and then transfer onto the beginning of the BSc (Hons) programme. The visitors reviewed the programme webpages, where information about the stages within the programme were stipulated, however the visitors could not determine how a student would progress onto the BSc (Hons) aspect upon completion of the foundation year, or how this will be communicated to potential applicants. In particular the visitors noted that for direct entry into the BSc (Hons) programme there is an interview, however for the foundation year, no requirement for an interview was evident, as such the visitors could not determine the requirements for progression onto stage one, such as an interview and how this may be communicated to potential applicants. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate how the admissions procedures provide applicants with the information they require about progression from the foundation year onto stage one.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the admissions procedures clearly stipulate any requirements for progression from the foundation year onto stage one.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the new programme leader is not registered with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist, as part of the evidence provided the visitors could not determine what support the new programme leader in their role to ensure that the arrangements for programme leadership were appropriate. As such the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates the arrangements in place for the programme leader, such as how the programme team will support the programme leader in their new role.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the arrangements in place for the programme leader, such as how the programme team will support the programme leader in their new role.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider proposes to integrate the foundation year with the BSc (Hons) programme, allowing students to complete the foundation year and then progress onto the BSc (Hons) programme. The visitors reviewed the programme webpages, where information about the stages within the programme were stipulated, however the visitors could not determine how a student would process onto the BSc (Hons) aspect upon completion of the foundation year. In particular the visitors noted that for direct entry into the BSc (Hons) programme there is an interview, however for the foundation year, no requirement for an interview was evident, as such the visitors could not determine the requirements for progression onto stage one, such as an interview. In addition the visitors could not determine at what point during the programme, a student will decide which modality to study, as throughout the programme structure there are separate modules for the different modalities. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate any requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme, in particular from the foundation year onto stage one of the programme.

Suggested documentation: evidence that demonstrated any requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular progression from the foundation year onto stage one of the programme, such as the university webpages of programme specification.

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.