

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 December 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard E: Assessment

To meet the requirements of another regulator, the education provider has changed the marking and assessment criteria for the programme to ensure that the differences between level 6 and level 7 are clear.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Student handbook
- Module descriptors
- Objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) marking sheets
- Course module amendments list

Section three: Additional documentation

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

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From their reading of the marking criteria for the module descriptors for level 7, the visitors are unclear how the programme team will allocate the marks for the Objective structure clinical examination (OSCE) viva at level 7 marking sheet. The visitors could not see how the marks would be allocated to ensure that the assessment methods measure the learning outcomes appropriately. Also the visitors were unclear as to how those marking the OSCE will be trained to ensure that the marking is objective and consistent. Therefore the visitors could not determine if the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the marks for the viva will be allocated and evidence to demonstrate how the markers will be trained to ensure that there will be consistency in the marking for the OSCE viva at Level 7.

E.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective prescribing practice.

Reason: From their reading of the marking criteria for the module descriptors for level 7, the visitors are unclear how the programme team will allocate the marks for the Objective structure clinical examination (OSCE) viva at level 7 marking sheet. The visitors could not see how the marks would be allocated to ensure that the assessment methods measure the learning outcomes appropriately. Also the visitors were unclear as to how those marking the OSCE will be trained to ensure that the marking is objective and consistent. Without knowing if the assessment methods are objective the visitors could not determine if the marking scheme would ensure that those completing the programme would be safe and effective in practice.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the marks for the viva will be allocated and evidence to demonstrate how the markers will be trained to ensure that there will be consistency in the marking for the OSCE viva at Level 7.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 December 2015

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

Standard E: Assessment

To meet the requirements of another regulator, the education provider has changed the marking and assessment criteria for the programme to ensure that the differences between level 6 and level 7 are clear.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change standards for prescribing for education providers mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Student handbook
- Module descriptors
- Objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) marking sheets
- Course module amendments list

Section three: Additional documentation

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

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From their reading of the marking criteria for the module descriptors for level 7, the visitors are unclear how the programme team will allocate the marks for the Objective structure clinical examination (OSCE) viva at level 7 marking sheet. The visitors could not see how the marks would be allocated to ensure that the assessment methods measure the learning outcomes appropriately. Also the visitors were unclear as to how those marking the OSCE will be trained to ensure that the marking is objective and consistent. Therefore the visitors could not determine if the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the marks for the viva will be allocated and evidence to demonstrate how the markers will be trained to ensure that there will be consistency in the marking for the OSCE viva at Level 7.

E.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective prescribing practice.

Reason: From their reading of the marking criteria for the module descriptors for level 7, the visitors are unclear how the programme team will allocate the marks for the Objective structure clinical examination (OSCE) viva at level 7 marking sheet. The visitors could not see how the marks would be allocated to ensure that the assessment methods measure the learning outcomes appropriately. Also the visitors were unclear as to how those marking the OSCE will be trained to ensure that the marking is objective and consistent. Without knowing if the assessment methods are objective the visitors could not determine if the marking scheme would ensure that those completing the programme would be safe and effective in practice.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the marks for the viva will be allocated and evidence to demonstrate how the markers will be trained to ensure that there will be consistency in the marking for the OSCE viva at Level 7.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of submission to the HCPC	11 January 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

A change in programme leader.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Nordorff Robbins
Name of validating body	Goldsmiths, University of London (formerly validated by City University)
Programme title	Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	2 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jennifer French (Music therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has informed the HCPC of a change of validator for the programme.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

- Strategic plan
- Module descriptors
- Training guide
- Training presentation
- Programme handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	7 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change of programme leader

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	Post-Graduate Diploma Social Work (Step Up to Social Work)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	21 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Teri Rogers (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change of programme leader

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Winchester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	7 December 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Amanda Fitchett (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme management and resources

Change of programme leader

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

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

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.