

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	1
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	1

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	The Central School of Speech & Drama
Awarding institution (if different from education provider)	The Central School of Speech & Drama
Programme name	MA Drama and Movement Therapy (Sesame)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Art Therapists
Relevant modality	Drama Therapy
Date of submission to HPC	17 February 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Di Gammage (Drama Therapist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum

Changes to the Masters framework and changes to the credit value of modules

SET 6 Assessment

Changes to the Masters framework and changes to the credit values of modules

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

<p>Course Specification and Units – February 2010 Major change visitors' Report – July 2009 Annual monitoring visitor's report – March 2010 Visitors Report 2005</p>

Major changes visitors' Report – July 2009
Annual Monitoring visitor's report – July 2010
Major change notification form – February 2010
Major Change standards of Education and Training Mapping
documentation – undated
Major Change SETs mapping template MADMT May
2010.doc)
Assessment Handbook 2009-2010 FINAL.pdf)

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 learning outcomes in the modules are not clearly linked to Masters Level terminology, in particular many learning outcomes include words such as develop skills / understand etc which do not demonstrate the critical analysis / evaluation / etc expected of Masters students. See following for examples

- Unit 1 Drama and Movement Therapy Practice
- Psychology – analytical and development
- Facilitation Practice

However, the assessments and assessment criteria do reflect Masters level learning and so there is some inconsistency between the two.

Suggestion Documentation: A mapping of module learning outcomes to SOPS and SETs

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

Reason: It is not always clear that students are being challenged through appropriate teaching methods

Suggested Documentation: A clear rationale for teaching methods used within the programme

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

Reason: There seems to be inconsistencies between the learning outcomes and the assessment criteria identified in the Module descriptors. Because of this the assessment criteria appears to be of higher expectation than learning outcomes.

Suggested Documentation: Mapping of module learning outcomes to SOPS and SETs

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

Reason: There seems to be inconsistencies between the learning outcomes and the assessment tool/criteria identified in the Module descriptors. Because of this the learning outcomes would appear to be of lower expectation than the assessment criteria. There is also confusion about how some assessments are measure the learning outcomes. In the Assessment Handbook the viva voce (p.33) seems to be at the discretion of the Exam Board and in exceptional cases where a student is considered borderline. In the MA programme it is automatically part of the final assessment and carries 30% of the SIPS unit, this needs clarification

Suggested Documentation: A mapping of module learning outcomes and assessment criteria to SOPS and SETs. Clear module descriptor documentation for assessments for SIPS unit and final mark the programme.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme name	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals (Level 3 and Level M)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Podiatrists/Chiropodists Radiographers Physiotherapists
Relevant modality	Supplementary Prescribing
Date of submission to HPC	8 July 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jim Pickard (Podiatrist) Bob Dobson (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 6 Assessment

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.

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

The education provider has detailed two changes to assessment type for this programme. The first is a change from three 1000 word studies to one 3000 word study. The second is a change to the number of attempts for numeracy assessments.

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

Curriculum Modification form Prescribing M & H level docs
Module outline
Major Change submission form
SETs 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 SETs for which additional documentation was requested is listed below with reasons for the request.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme name	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals (Level 3 and Level M)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Podiatrists/Chiropodists Radiographers Physiotherapists
Relevant modality	Supplementary Prescribing
Date of submission to HPC	8 July 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jim Pickard (Podiatrist) Bob Dobson (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 6 Assessment

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

There is a change of external Examiner from September 2009 – 2012. The new external examiner is not registered with the HPC.

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

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy
Date of submission to HPC	7 August 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The current programme leader Dr J. Jackson is to become Head of the School of Health and Human Sciences. She is to be replaced by Ms E. Easton. A new part time member of staff is to be appointed to cover Dr Jackson's previous duties with the programme

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

<p>Major change notification form and SET mapping template Curriculum vitae for Ms E Easton Staffing plan for the Physiotherapy teaching team</p>

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitors	2

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical Science
Date of submission to HPC	21 March 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Mary Macdonald (Biomedical Scientist) Bill Gilmore (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 2 Programme admissions

Entrance requirements for school leavers changed to a minimum BBC at higher grade or equivalent points. Recommended subjects: Two of Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, English at a minimum of higher grade. Essential subjects: Applicants must have Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics and English at a minimum of Credit Standard Grade.

SET 3 Programme management and resources

Change of programme title from Biomedical Science to Applied Biomedical Science. It is also the case Dr Geoffrey Bosson has been appointed as External Examiner. He replaces Dr Sue Parkin who has retired.

SET 4 Curriculum

Proposed changes to the degree structure around the laboratory provision in the biology based modules in year 1 and the clinical modules in year 2. The lab modules will be delivered as integrated modules instead of being embedded in separate modules. There is no change to overall curriculum content but some modules have required a change of module title. In year 2 of programme the

module Fundamental Pathophysiology has been replaced with the module Physiology B.

SET 6 Assessment

The changes affect the content delivered and the assessment methodology of the modules.

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

Major Change notification form
Dr Geoffrey Bosson's CV
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.

Section Four: Recommended outcome 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 overleaf. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Date of submission to HPC	7 May 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Fiona McCullough(Dietitian)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 2 Programme Admissions

Changes have been made for entry to the programme.

SET 4 Curriculum

Changes have been made to the curriculum to include the revised British Dietetic Association (BDA) curriculum guidance.

SET 6 Assessment

The changes to curriculum due to the BDA changes have lead to changes in the assessment for the programme.

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

University Covering letter for Major change process Major change notification form for BSc 2010 Major change SET mapping Core curriculum standards BSc Curriculum map BSc Overview of BSc programme Definitive programme document (180510) – programme re approval submission document Sections 1-9 &10
--

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

2.1 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 require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stated on several occasions that on completion of the programme the student will be eligible to register with the HPC. All students need to apply to register after they have completed the programme and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The education provider needs to make it clear to applicants and students that completion of the programme means they are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. Therefore the visitors require further evidence before this standard can be met.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section Two: Submission Details	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section Three: Additional Documentation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	3

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	Pg Dip Dietetics (Pre-Registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Date of submission to HPC	7 May 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 4 Curriculum

The change from Abnormal Psychology to Counselling Psychology to incorporate the required counselling skills for the new British Dietetics Association framework could change the learning outcomes required to meet the standards of proficiency.

SET 6 Assessment

The change from Abnormal Psychology to Counselling Psychology to incorporate the required counselling skills for the new British Dietetics Association framework could change the learning outcomes required to meet the standards of proficiency.

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

University Covering letter for Major change process Major change notification form for PgD 2010 Major change SET mapping PgD Core curriculum standards PgD Curriculum map PgD Overview of PgD programme Definitive programme document (180510) – programme re approval submission document Sections 1-9 &10
--

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

2.1 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 require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stated on several occasions that on completion of the programme the student will be eligible to register with the HPC. All students need to apply to register after they have completed the programme and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The education provider needs to make it clear to applicants and students that completion of the programme means they are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. Therefore the visitors require further evidence before this standard can be met.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational Therapy
Date of submission to HPC	18 June 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational Therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

There has been a change in the programme leader.

SET 6 Assessment

The methods of assessment for four of the modules (HFT 1011, HFT 1008, HIT 1005, HIT 1006) have been changed. The learning outcomes have not been changed for these modules.

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

<p>Staff CV Programme specification Module Descriptors SET's Mapping Document</p>

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	4

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre
Programme name	Masters in Music Therapy
Awarding institution	City University
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts Therapy
Relevant modality	Music Therapy
Date of submission to HPC	5 March 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	John Strange (Music Therapist) Liz Holey (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider proposes to deliver the programme at twin teaching bases (one in London and one in Manchester) which will involve modifications to existing management and governance structures

SET 4 Curriculum

The education provider has simplified the module structure, whilst incorporating elements previously developed for its Manchester programme when this was distinct from the London programme, with the aim of preparing students as fully as possible for the demands of the contemporary workplace

SET 5 Practice placements

The education provider has incorporated elements of the placement structure of the above-mentioned distinct Manchester course

SET 6 Assessment

The education provider has incorporated elements of the assessment strategy of the above-mentioned distinct Manchester course

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

Validation Document 2009 – 2011
Validation Document May 2010
SETs and SoPs Mapping
Placement Document
Additions/modifications to numbers 3 & 5 above at the request of the Visitors (see Section Three)

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The 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 programme documentation (programme specification) states that "...successful completion of which a student may apply to the HPC for registration as a music therapist". This should state that, on successful completion of the programme, the student is eligible to apply for HPC registration.

Suggested documentation: revised documentation given to applicants that uses the correct terminology for eligibility to apply for registration to the register.

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

Reason: HPC guidance states that applicants should undergo *enhanced* CRB checks and the documentation does not specify that the checks are enhanced.

Suggested documentation: Information issued to applicants for the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that in the flow chart for a Fitness to Practice Event, in the Validation Submission, the second box on p.108 states that students “are not yet expected to be working at the standard required of a professional individual”. This flexibility should only apply to knowledge and skills and not to conduct, ethics, health and character. The visitors therefore require additional documentation to clarify that the requirements in HPC (2009) *Guidance on conduct and ethics for students* and HPC (2009) *Guidance on health and character* apply to students at all stages of training.

Suggested documentation: Revised documentation to reflect the fact that the requirements in HPC (2009) *Guidance on conduct and ethics for students* and HPC (2009) *Guidance on health and character* apply to students at all stages of training.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The visitors were unable to find evidence of a formal system for approving and monitoring all placements in the documentation provided. This is particularly important in view of the impressively large number of potential placements cited, the fact that some have not to date offered placements, and the issue of how experienced the placement supervisors are for placement one (see note at SET 5.7 below). The visitors therefore require evidence that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

Suggested documentation: The visitors therefore require evidence that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: The visitors were unable to find evidence of a formal system for approving and monitoring all placements in the documentation provided. This is particularly important in view of the impressively large number of potential placements cited, the fact that some have not to date offered placements, and the issue of how experienced the placement supervisors are for placement one (see note at SET 5.7 below). The visitors therefore require evidence that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

Suggested documentation: The visitors therefore require evidence that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

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

Reason: In Placement 1 (Validation Submission p. 131) it is stated that the music therapist at the placement, who will provide clinical supervision will “usually have

two years' experience". This is not considered by the professional association to be adequate preparation for providing clinical supervision.

The education provider must provide evidence of a compensatory increase in the frequency of individual clinical supervision from the programme team when the placement therapist (in placement one) has less than the equivalent of three years full time clinical experience.

Suggested documentation: The visitors therefore require evidence that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: The visitors were unable to find details of specific training for the role of practice placement educator. This is particularly important in view of the fact that some potential placements have not to date offered placements, and the issue of how experienced the placement supervisors are for placement one (see note at SET 5.7 above). The visitors therefore require documentation describing the training and support provided to placement educators, especially those without prior experience of the role.

Suggested documentation: The visitors therefore require evidence that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	3

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	Northern Ireland Ambulance Service Health and Social Care Trust
Awarding institution	Institute of Health Care Development
Programme name	Paramedic-in-training
Mode of delivery	Full Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Date of submission to HPC	23 June 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Sue Boardman (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

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

<p>CV for newly appointed programme lead Major Change SETs mapping document Letter from education provider</p>
--

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.

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.

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

Christine Wilkinson (HPC registered Occupational Therapist) has been in post as Clinical Training and Programme Lead since February 2010. From a review of Christine Wilkinson's CV she demonstrates extensive experience in mental health and forensic Occupational Therapy. This standard does however state that the programmes lead must be appropriately qualified and experience and, unless other agreements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the register. From a review of the CV it is evident that the level of experience is limited in relation to paramedic education.

If a person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is registered with the HPC, but is not registered in the relevant profession, we will want to see how you provide information specific to the profession, and resources, to support them in the role. The visitor would therefore like to see additional documentation to evidence the provision that has been put in place to support the development of the programme lead with reference to profession specific information and also additional information outlining any other support mechanisms that has been put in to place.

Suggested documentation:

CV's of the course director and clinical training officers supporting the delivery of the programme

CV's of senior management supporting the Programme Lead

Management structure diagram

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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

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

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitors	2

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational Therapy
Date of submission to HPC	April 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational Therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission criteria will change from 180 UCAS points, to 240 UCAS points from the 2010/2011 intake

SET 3 Programme management and resources

There have been a number of staff changes within the programme, including the Professional and Academic Lead. A room has been refurbished to provide additional facilities for the use of creative activities.

SET 4 Curriculum

Two modules are being replaced. The year one module HEAA119 Health Care Bio Science is being replaced by OCT112 Biological Foundations of Occupation. The year 2 module HEAA220 Research 1 with be replaced by HEAA219 Project Studies. Both of the new modules will be taught on an interprofessional basis.

SET 5 Practice placements

Three members of staff are now deployed as the practice placement team, and all staff in the team have taken on locality duties within distinct geographical

areas. The practice placement handbook is being revised to reflect new staffing and administrative arrangements.

SET 6 Assessment

Two external examiners have reached the end of their term, and have been replaced by new external examiners, both of whom are from the appropriate part of the HPC register.

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

A Level Entry Requirements Nov 07 addendum admissions 3 for major change Cath Francis CV Lyn Westcott CV Patricia Eyres CV Rebecca Twinley CV Shaan Ellor CV Rosi Raine CV Revisedheaa219_dmr

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the 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 overleaf. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Major Change Visitors' Report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Relevant entitlement(s)	Local Anaesthetics, Prescription only Medicines
Date of submission to HPC	16 July 2010
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anne S H Wilson (Podiatrist) Paul Frowen (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section Two: Submission Details

Summary of change

SET 5 Practice placements

The requested change relates to SET 5.2 and SET 5.5. The educational provider seeks to change the balance of the number of weeks of clinical practice to the number of weeks devoted to practice reflection and assessment within the 20 week module devoted to POD208 (Podiatric Clinical Practice 2) from 16:4 to 14:6

The second year placement module, practice was originally delivered over 16 weeks and the assessment, self directed study and tutorial support utilised the remaining 4 weeks. The desired learning outcomes were demonstrated within the Stage two portfolio

It is the belief of mentors and students that an improvement in the integration of theory with practice and help develop more reflective practice. It is proposed that the reduction in the clinical element clinical will provide the students with additional time to seek tutorial support, access to study materials and facilities to support both their academic learning and rehearse practical skills, preparing

them for assessments and returning to practice and as a consequence enhance the learning experience.

The reduction in hours still provides the student with the opportunity to complete the minimum hours of practice set down by the professional body and it is the view of the programme team that this small reduction in practice hours will not be reflected in the practice standards of the students

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

Programme Overview Schematic 2009-2010 Programme Overview Schematic 2010 -2010 Visitors Report April 2008 (Web Version) Visitors Report April 2008, Clinical Placement Handbook Module Handbook POD208 (Podiatric Clinical Practice 2) Timeline for Module POD208 (Podiatric clinical Practice 2) Portfolio for Stage 2
--

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s)

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

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

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