

## 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(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	7 October 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The approved programme has been relocated to a new wing on the existing Faculty of Health's City South Campus. The programme resources have been relocated in their entirety, including the resources for students. The facilities that have been transferred and resources are matched and in some cases enhanced. The access for staff and students is easier, and the facilities including IT support and occupational health, disability support, student support and student union staff who deal only with Faculty of Health students are more accessible.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Education provider skills suite facilities
- Campus: Self-guided tour
- Placement and work based learning standards
- Student course handbook (2011)
- Programme specification and module descriptors
- Learning and assessment mapping matrices
- Standards of proficiency mapping 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 visitor(s)**

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. 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(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	7 October 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The approved programme has been relocated to a new wing on the existing Faculty of Health's City South Campus. The programme resources have been relocated in their entirety, including the resources for students. The facilities that have been transferred and resources are matched and in some cases enhanced. The access for staff and students is easier, and the facilities including IT support and occupational health, disability support, student support and student union staff who deal only with Faculty of Health students are more accessible.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Education provider Skills suite facilities
- Campus: Self- guided Tour
- Placement and work based learning standards
- Student course handbook (2011)
- Programme specification and module descriptors
- Learning and assessment mapping matrices
- Standards of proficiency mapping 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 visitor(s)**

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. 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(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	18 October 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist) Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

#### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The approved programme has been relocated to a new wing on the existing Faculty of Health's City South Campus. The programme resources have been relocated in their entirety, including the resources for students. The facilities that have been transferred and resources are matched and in some cases enhanced. The access for staff and students is easier, and the facilities including IT support and occupational health, disability support, student support and student union staff who deal only with Faculty of Health students are more accessible.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Student learning resources for the previous and new campus
- Detailed floor plans for the new campus

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

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

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

The 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(s).....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiography
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiotherapy
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	29 July 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiotherapy) Richard Price (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

The education provider is proposing that the current modular structure within the second year of study is altered to reduce the assessment burden on students. The education provider is proposing splitting two 40 credit modules into four 20 credit modules. The education provider has also stated that module content will be updated in order to reflect current clinical practice.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form

- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- 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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

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

**Reason:** The visitors note that the education provider has provided the new module descriptors and a SETs mapping document to support the major change submission. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine if the new modules continue to ensure that the standards of proficiency are met. The visitors note that the education has stated that module content has been updated. The visitors therefore require mapping that highlights how the learning outcomes of the new modules ensure the standards of proficiency are met, comparing the new modules with the modules that it is proposed to replace.

**Suggested documentation:** Mapping that highlights how the learning outcomes of the new modules ensure the standards of proficiency are met, comparing the new modules with the modules that it is proposed to replace.

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

**Reason:** The visitors note that the education provider has provided the new module descriptors and a SETs mapping document to support the major change submission. The visitors also noted that whilst the module descriptors define the types of assessment to be utilised for each new module, it has not been possible to ensure that the proposed assessment strategy demonstrates continuation of meeting the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require mapping that highlights how the assessment strategy and design of the new modules ensure the standards of proficiency are met, comparing the new modules with the modules that it is proposed to replace.

**Suggested documentation:** Mapping that highlights how the assessment strategy and design of the new modules ensure the standards of proficiency are met, comparing the new modules with the modules that it is proposed to replace.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

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

The 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(s).....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiography
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiotherapy
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	29 July 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiotherapy) Richard Price (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

The education provider is proposing that the current modular structure within the second year of study is altered to reduce the assessment burden on students. The education provider is proposing splitting two 40 credit modules into four 20 credit modules. The education provider has also stated that module content will be updated in order to reflect current clinical practice.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form

- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- 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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

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

**Reason:** The visitors note that the education provider has provided the new module descriptors and a SETs mapping document to support the major change submission. However, from the information provided the visitors were unable to determine if the new modules continue to ensure that the standards of proficiency are met. The visitors note that the education has stated that module content has been updated. The visitors therefore require mapping that highlights how the learning outcomes of the new modules ensure the standards of proficiency are met, comparing the new modules with the modules that it is proposed to replace.

**Suggested documentation:** Mapping that highlights how the learning outcomes of the new modules ensure the standards of proficiency are met, comparing the new modules with the modules that it is proposed to replace.

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

**Reason:** The visitors note that the education provider has provided the new module descriptors and a SETs mapping document to support the major change submission. The visitors also noted that whilst the module descriptors define the types of assessment to be utilised for each new module, it has not been possible to ensure that the proposed assessment strategy demonstrates continuation of meeting the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require mapping that highlights how the assessment strategy and design of the new modules ensure the standards of proficiency are met, comparing the new modules with the modules that it is proposed to replace.

**Suggested documentation:** Mapping that highlights how the assessment strategy and design of the new modules ensure the standards of proficiency are met, comparing the new modules with the modules that it is proposed to replace.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

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

The 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(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	01 November 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Victoria Adenugba

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Programme leader change. The new programme leader is not from the relevant part of the register but is supported by a team of staff who are.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV for new course 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 visitor(s)**

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Human Communication - Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	13 October 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitor</b>	Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has appointed a new programme leader. The new programme leader is experienced in clinical and higher education contexts and is from the relevant part of HPC register. The previous programme leader has stepped down from the role but remains within the teaching team.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Queen's University of Belfast
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	24 October 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitor</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

#### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has submitted documentation regarding the temporary change of programme leader for six months to cover the sabbatical leave of the permanent programme lead. The programme leader role will be covered by two members of staff during this period.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CVs for temporary programme leaders

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

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

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

The visitor 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

<b>Section one: Programme details</b> .....	1
<b>Section two: Submission details</b> .....	1
<b>Section three: Additional documentation</b> .....	2
<b>Section four: Recommendation of the visitor</b> .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Sheffield Hallam University
<b>Programme title</b>	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	14 September 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitor</b>	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has informed the HPC of a change in programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV
- Paramedic handbook 2011-12

### 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.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitor made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted to support the major change the visitor noted that the new programme leader has been promoted from the existing programme team. The visitor is satisfied that the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced and is on the relevant part of the Register.

However, from a review of the programme handbook the visitor noted that with the promotion of the new programme leader the structure of the programme team has changed. The visitor requires clarification of the arrangements that have been put in place to cover the new programme leaders' previous role. The visitor noted that any reduction in staffing level may impact on the new programme leaders' ability to undertake the new role. The visitor therefore requires clarification of the staffing arrangements that are in place that demonstrates that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Suggested Documentation:** Clarification of the staffing arrangements that are in place since the change in programme leader that demonstrates that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is in place to deliver an effective programme.

#### **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 .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Teesside University
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full Time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	7 September 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Jim Petter (Paramedic) Bob Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood

### 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 is making changes to modules and assessments. This includes the moving of indicative content, learning outcomes and related assessments between modules. There are to be changes to placements, in particular the combining of competencies to be reached in the placement portfolio and a change to the assessment methods. Additional changes to placements include the removal of tripartite meetings between the students, clinical mentors and academic mentors for individual meetings.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack

- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Module descriptors – original and amended
- Competencies for module AHH2033-N – original and amended
- Programme handbook
- Student essential guide (School handbook)
- Major change supporting documentation
- Collaborative provision operation manual June 2011

### **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.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

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

**Reason:** The visitors have noted the education provider has outlined plans to use objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) as part of the assessment of year 2 competencies for module AHH2033-N. The visitors expressed concerns this assessment strategy may require a resource intensive approach. When considering the programme has a cohort size of 20 students and the diverse range of skills assessed by the OSCEs, it is unclear how this volume of work will be managed to ensure that each student can complete the examination adequately. The visitors therefore require further information about these examinations in particular how the workload will be managed to ensure the assessment effectively measures how students are meeting the relevant standards of proficiency.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about the OSCE assessments including what skills will be tested, the timings of the assessment period, how long OSCEs will take for any given student at any one time and individuals involved with assessment.

#### **6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Reason:** The visitors have noted the education provider has outlined plans to use OSCEs as part of the assessment of year 2 competencies for module AHH2033-N. The visitors expressed concerns this assessment strategy may require a resource intensive approach. When considering the programme has a cohort size of 20 students and the diverse range of skills assessed by the OSCEs, the volume of work involved may lead to variable standards being

applied to the assessments. The visitors therefore require further information about these examinations and how they will be managed, monitored and evaluated to ensure that appropriate standards in assessment are being applied in all of these examinations.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about the OSCE assessments including what skills will be tested, the timings of the assessment period, how long OSCEs will take for any given student at any one time and individuals involved with assessment.

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

**Reason:** The visitors have noted the education provider has outlined plans to use OSCEs as part of the assessment of year 2 competencies for module AHH2033-N. The visitors expressed concerns this assessment strategy may require a resource intensive approach. From the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how assessment regulations clearly specified the requirements for student progression and achievement for the assessing staff. When considering the programme has a cohort size of 20 students and the diverse range of skills assessed by the OSCEs, the visitors were unclear as to how the programme would ensure staff can apply assessment criteria consistently to students work. The visitors therefore require further information about these examinations and how they will be managed to ensure the education provider has clearly outlined requirements of assessments for the assessing staff.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about the OSCE assessments including what skills will be tested, the timings of the assessment period, how long OSCEs will take for any given student at any one time and individuals involved with assessment.

#### **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(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full Time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	21 September 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Bob Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

#### SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has appointed new staff to support and deliver the curriculum.

#### SET 4 Curriculum

A new module sets out to enhance the students' ability to make the transition from student to qualified practitioner and places greater emphasis on clinical leadership.

The curriculum has also been updated to ensure that the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are threaded through the programme and evidence based practice is given a greater focus through a dedicated module.

## SET 5 Practice placements

The education provider has widened its range of practice placements to support the learning outcomes.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Previously approved module descriptor and proposed new module descriptor
- Letter from the programme leader explaining the changes and the new staffing now in place

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

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

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

The 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(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	20 October 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Nicola Spalding (Occupational therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

There has been a programme leader change to the programme. There are no other changes to the staffing for the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV for new programme leader
- Faculty of health and wellbeing structure
- Occupational therapy structure

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

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

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

The 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(s) .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hertfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	22 September 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

There have been changes to the curriculum to include skills required to ensure that the content remains appropriate and includes relevant profession-specific information. Changes have made it necessary to reorganise and update some modules, learning outcomes and assessment.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Standards of proficiency mapping document
- SWOT analysis of the programme
- Definitive module document 2011
- Periodic Review document
- Programme Specification
- Placement Learning 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 visitor(s)**

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. 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(s).....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hertfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic Radiographer
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	23 September 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum  
SET 6 Assessment

The curriculum has been updated to include skills required for the application of practice and to enhance employability for example in competency in CT head scanning, image interpretation, participation in audit/service evaluation and research activities. The changes have made it necessary to update some modules, learning outcomes and assessment.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Standard proficiency mapping document
- SWOT analysis of the programme
- Definitive module document 2011-2012
- Draft Definitive module document 2012-2013
- 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.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

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

The 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(s) .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
<b>Programme title</b>	Pharmacology (PR)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Prescription only medicine
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	3 November 2011
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	James Pickard (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood

### Section two: Submission details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

There has been a change to the programme leader for the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Change notification form
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- CV for 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 visitor(s)**

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

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

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