

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Anglia Ruskin University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) incorporating DipHE Medical Imaging Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	28 July 2010
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Russell Hart (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Benjamin Potter

### Section Two: Submission Details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has highlighted a programme leader change from Sylvia Kittle to Jon Svensson

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

CV of the new programme leader, Jon Svensson
--

### **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 visitors .....	2

### Section One: Programme Details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Anglia Ruskin University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) incorporating FDS Radiotherapy and Oncology Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic Radiography
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	28 July 2010
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Russell Hart (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Benjamin Potter

### Section Two: Submission Details

#### Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources

The education provider has highlighted a programme leader change from Sylvia Kittle to Jon Svensson

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

CV of the new programme leader, Jon Svensson
--

### **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 .....	3
Section Four: Recommended outcome of the visitor(s) .....	3

### Section One: Programme Details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Liverpool John Moores University
<b>Programme name</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Supplementary Prescribing
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	20 August 2010
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood

### Section Two: Submission Details

#### Summary of change

##### SET 2

- 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.
- 2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.
- 2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.
- 2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.
- 2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.
- 2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

##### SET 3

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

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

#### SET 4

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.

#### SET 6

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.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

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

The currently HPC approved programme is the Level 6 programme which was approved in 2006. They currently also run the programme as a Level 7 programme which is not approved. This major change intends to seek approval for this Level 7 Programme – M Level. As an already approved programme the addition of the new level (which will use the existing processes and facilities) will have an impact on the standards indicated above only. The new level programme will need to be assessed to ensure it is advertised, taught and assessed at a level appropriate to the programme. The resources for the programme will need to be assessed to ensure there are enough resources to support the delivery of both programmes simultaneously at the different levels.

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

Major Change Standards of Education and Training Mapping Template  
Programme Specification  
Module Proforma  
Course Factfile  
LJMU Admissions Policy  
LJMU Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning and Credit Transfer  
LJMU Bullying and Harassment Policy  
LJMU Guidance on Religion and Belief Policy Statement  
Staff CVs  
Web-based Learning  
Critical Review Handbook  
Student Handbook  
Clinical Practice Assessment Document and Statement of Compliance  
Supervisor's Handbook  
A Practical Guide to Developing a Personal Prescribing Portfolio  
Comparator Level M and Level 3 Assessment

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

**Section One: Programme Details**

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full Time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Biomedical Scientist
<b>Date of submission to HPC</b>	3 September 2010
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Peter Ruddy (Biomedical Scientist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical Scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ben Potter

**Section Two: Submission Details**

**Summary of change**

SET 6 Assessment

With effect from September 2009, condonation has been introduced into the University's Academic Regulations and Procedures.

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

Major change notification form, Academic Registry – Examining Board notes of Guidance 2009/2010.
---



### **Section Three: Additional Documentation**

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

#### **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 change has potentially increased the risk of a graduate of the programme not attaining the Standards of Proficiency. We require evidence to show how a graduate to whom the condonement regulations have been applied will meet all the Standards of Proficiency. We recognise that changes in the criteria that exceeds the threshold standard may not compromise the ability of a graduate to practice safely and effectively, therefore we are particularly interested in the potential effects of the condonement regulations on the threshold. We would like to understand if the condonement regulations may be applied to any module or if certain modules are exempt from these regulations.

**Suggested Documentation:** Minutes of the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010.

#### **6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.**

**Reason:** The change has potentially increased the risk of a graduate of the programme not attaining the Standards of Proficiency. We would like to understand if the condonement regulations may be applied to modules containing within them professional aspects of practice in both the education and practice placement setting.

**Suggested Documentation:** Minutes of the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010

#### **6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Reason:** The documentation submitted within the major change notification form at page 4 states that the condonement process would be used in extreme circumstances only and that cases would be considered on an individual basis. We would like to understand the process to be applied to ensure objectivity.

**Suggested Documentation:** Minutes of the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010 and minutes of discussion referenced in the document between senior academic and management staff from the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Chaired by Julie McLeod.

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

**Reason:** The change has potentially increased the risk of a student of the programme not attaining the Standards of Proficiency as they progress. We require evidence to show how a graduate to whom the condonement regulations have been applied will meet all the Standards of Proficiency at the point of graduation from the programme

**Suggested Documentation:** Minutes of the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010

### **6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.**

**Reason:** We wish to understand if the new condonement regulations are applied to a student could they potentially graduate from the programme but not have reached all the Standards of Proficiency. If this is possible how would the programme continue to meet this SET?

**Suggested Documentation:** Minutes of the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010 and minutes of discussion referenced in the document between senior academic and management staff from the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Chaired by Julie McLeod.

## **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.