

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	4 December 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 January 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 14 February 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 March 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 9 May 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Anthony Powers (Physiotherapist) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	48 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Derek Milligan (Brunel University)
Secretary	Sally McKinley (Brunel University)
Members of the joint panel	Misia Gervis (Internal Panel Member) Ian Kill (Internal Panel Member) Carolyn Mason (External Panel Member) Jill Wickham (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new and external examiners' reports have not been produced.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must submit the revised and finalised learning outcomes for the programme prior to final programme approval by HCPC.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. The visitors will need to review the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments to ensure that any changes made after the visit will not significantly affect the learning outcomes or affect how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the finalised learning outcomes, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The education provider must submit the revised and finalised learning outcomes for the programme prior to final programme approval by HCPC.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. The visitors will need to review the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments to ensure that any changes made after the visit will not significantly affect the learning outcomes or affect how the programme reflects relevant curriculum guidance. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the finalised learning outcomes and relevant programme documentation, to ensure the programme continues to reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of relevant curriculum guidance. In this way the visitors can be sure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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.

Condition: The education provider must submit the revised and finalised module descriptors for the programme prior to final programme approval by HCPC.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. The visitors will need to review the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments to ensure that any changes made after the visit will not significantly affect the assessment of the learning outcomes or affect how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the finalised programme module descriptors, to ensure that the assessment strategy and design guarantees that those

who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit the revised and finalised assessment methods that will be employed to measure the learning outcomes for the programme with the prior to final programme approval by HCPC.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. The visitors will need to review the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments to ensure that any changes made after the visit will not significantly affect the learning outcomes or affect how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the finalised assessment methods that will be employed to measure the learning outcomes, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider that if the programme recruits as anticipated the staffing levels for the programme are reviewed appropriately.

Reason: From the evidence provided in the programme documentation and the programme team meeting at the visit, the visitors were content that this standard was met. However, a suggestion in the programme team meeting highlighted that the programme may increase student numbers as the programme becomes established. The visitors would like to recommend that if this happens the education provider considers reviewing the staff numbers for the programme to ensure there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Also if the number of students on the programme increases significantly the visitors recommend that the programme team inform the HCPC through the major change process.

Joanna Jackson
Anthony Powers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	13 – 14 November 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 December 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 14 February 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 April 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 9 May 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Nick Clark (Operating department practitioner) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	28 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Gina Dalton (Oxford Brookes University)
Secretary	Nicola Kirk (Oxford Brookes University)
Members of the joint panel	David Hodges (Internal Panel Member) Judie Gannon (Internal Panel Member) Julia Winter (Internal Panel Member) Stephen Castleton (Internal Panel Member) Steven Brown (External Panel Member) Helen Booth (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the Dip HE Operating Department Practice, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must submit the revised and finalised learning outcomes for the programme prior to final programme approval by HCPC.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. The visitors will need to review the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the finalised learning outcomes, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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.

Condition: The education provider must submit the revised and finalised module descriptors for the programme prior to final programme approval by HCPC.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. The visitors will need to review the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments to ensure changes will not adversely affect the assessment of the learning outcomes or how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the finalised programme module descriptors, to ensure that the assessment strategy and design guarantees that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: The education provider must submit the revised and finalised module descriptors for the programme prior to final programme approval by HCPC.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. The visitors will need to review the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors, to ensure that the assessment methods are thorough and effective and meet external reference frameworks.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit the revised and finalised assessment methods that will be employed to measure the learning outcomes for the programme with the prior to final programme approval by HCPC.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. The visitors will need to review the module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the finalised assessment methods that will be employed to measure the learning outcomes, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: If, after review, the assessment regulations change the education provider should clearly articulate the changes to students.

Reason: Currently if a student has a 'mark below 30% in either the written or practical components of a practice related module assessment' they 'will incur an automatic fail of the relevant module' (student handbook p21). Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the programme assessment regulations to bring them in line with the wider education provider policy which would mean a student would have the chance of one re-sit of the relevant module instead of the automatic fail. The visitors were happy the current programme policy and the wider education provider policy were appropriate and would ensure that only students that have met the learning outcomes could progress through the programme. Therefore, if the programme team decides to amend their programme assessment regulation to bring it in line with the wider education provider policy the visitors suggest that they make students aware of this change.

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.

Recommendation: If a new external examiner is appointed for this programme the education provider should notify the HCPC of this change.

Reason: Currently it is envisaged that the external examiner for the Dip HE Operating Department Practice programme will be appointed as the external examiner for this programme. The visitors are happy that the external examiner for the Dip HE Operating Department Practice is appropriate to review this programme. However, if a different appointment is made the visitors advise that the programme team notifies the HCPC of this via the Major change process.

Nick Clark
Tony Scripps

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	St George's University of London
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	11 – 12 October 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 November 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 14 February 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 21 December 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 14 February 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
HCPC observer	Matthew Nelson
Proposed student numbers	25
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2013
Chair	Andy Kent (St George's University of London)
Secretary	Elaine Nutley (St George's University of London)
Members of the joint panel	Derek Baldwinson (Internal Panel Member) Janette Myers (Internal Panel Member) Ros Hilton (External Panel Member) Elizabeth Hancock (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The programme team need to clarify who the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is, and ensure that they are consistently referenced throughout the programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that the person who has overall professional responsibility was inconsistently referenced in the programme documentation. The visitors also felt that it was not made clear in discussion with the programme team who, when the programme commences, would have overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors therefore need a clear statement of who this person will be and require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to reflect this. In this way the visitors can determine that this person is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, is on the relevant part of the HCPC Register.

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

Condition: The education provider should provide additional evidence about the planning processes undertaken to ensure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff will be available to deliver the programme effectively.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and the senior team the visitors noted that the number of commissioned physiotherapy students at the institution has risen to meet the demands of the commissioning body. They also noted that the education provider intended to utilise the expertise of the staff who currently deliver other programmes at the institution to deliver this programme. However, the visitors were unclear as to the processes that the education provider had used to ensure that the staffing resource in place is sufficient for the MSc programme to be delivered effectively. It was also the case that in meeting with students the visitors were made aware that some students refrained from organising personal tutor meetings as the staff delivering the current physiotherapy programme appeared extremely busy. The visitors could also not determine how the workload associated with this new programme and the additional student numbers would be allocated to existing staff members to ensure that there was sufficient time available for staff to undertake the work required. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider has planned for the increase in student numbers and reassurance that the number of staff on the programme team is appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the relevant guidance issued by HCPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to students acquiring a 'license to practice' (e.g. Definitive Validation Document, p53; Student Handbook, p66), and that external examiners would be approved by the COP and HCPC joint validation committee (e.g. Student handbook, p74). The HCPC does not provide a 'license to practice' and the joint validation committee was a committee of the council for professions supplementary to medicine (CSPM) and was discontinued when the HCPC came into operation in 2003. The visitors also noted that as the draft programme documentation was produced prior to August 2012 it still referenced the previous name of the HCPC. The visitors considered the use of these instances of terminology potentially misleading to students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available support students' learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

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.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HCPC registered unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. This standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme states that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to monitor and develop the resources available to deliver the professional practice sessions to ensure that the quality of these sessions is maintained for this programme.

Reason: From the programme documentation provided and from the tour of resources the visitors were made aware of the variety and volume of resources available to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. They were therefore satisfied that this standard can be met. However, in discussion with the students it was highlighted that the number of students involved in the professional practice sessions sometimes led to a short amount of time being available for staff to observe students demonstrating the relevant skills. In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that the provision of information technology resources to the clinical skills laboratories was being reviewed to better aid staff in delivering these sessions. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team and the education provider continue to monitor and develop the resources available for staff to deliver these sessions. In this way the team may be best placed to utilise the resources available and continue to deliver these sessions at the current standard to an enlarged cohort of students across all physiotherapy programmes delivered by the education provider.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue their work to ensure that there is a standardised approach to all students' mid-placement visits.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the process for undertaking mid-placement visits had been formally agreed and written down for the programmes that are currently delivered at the education provider. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard can be met. However, in discussion with the students it was highlighted that students who were struggling on placement often received the time they required during their mid-placement visit in order to determine how best to resolve any issues they were experiencing. This had the impact that a small number of high achieving students did not feel they received a similar amount of time during their mid-placement visit to discuss how they were progressing. When raised with the programme team it was made clear that the process to be followed on each mid-placement visit was shortly to be reviewed to ensure that each student received a consistent visit in both time and scope. The visitors recommend that the programme team continue their work to ensure consistency across all mid-placement visits. In this way the programme team may be better placed to offer consistent mid-placement support to both struggling students and to those who wish to be stretched and develop their skills further.

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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team formalise the process undertaken by the clinical co-ordinators to ensure that students have met all of the required learning outcomes associated with the practice placement elements of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted, in discussion with the programme team, that the clinical co-ordinators for the programme will collate the feedback and reflections of students as they complete each stage of their practice placement experience. In this way the programme team can ensure that students are achieving all of the required learning outcomes associated with the practice placement elements of the programme. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard can be met. However, the visitors noted that no documentary evidence of this process was included as part of the submission provided prior to the visit. The visitors therefore recommend that the process undertaken by the clinical co-ordinators is formalised and provided to students in written format. In this way the programme team may be better placed to articulate how this process is undertaken and how the elements of the process ensure that each student completing the programme will have gained the required placement experience. By formalising this process the programme team may also be better placed to ensure that this process is undertaken clearly and consistently for each student and provide a useful record if any decision regarding placement experience is challenged.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that, if in the future there is the possibility for students to transfer between this programme and any programme with which it shares educational content, this is clearly articulated to students.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there was a clear indication of the requirements for students' progression through the programme. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that the programme meets this standard. The visitors also noted that there was no facility currently envisioned for students to transfer from this programme to any others at the education provider. However, due to the shared nature of many of the modules the visitors articulated there may be the option, in the future, for students to transfer to the programmes with which this programme shares modules, in particular the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy. The visitors therefore recommend that if this development occurs any requirements a student would need to satisfy in order to effect a transfer of this sort should be clearly delineated in the relevant programme documentation. In this way the programme team may be able to most effectively support students in any transfer and help students identify which education and training programme would allow them to best demonstrate how they meet the relevant SOPs.

Fleur Kitsell
Julia Cutforth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of visit	21 – 22 November 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'radiographer' or 'diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 7 January 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 14 February 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 February 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme management and resources, curriculum, and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider re-approved the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Helen Best (Diagnostic radiographer) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Matthew Nelson
Proposed student numbers	30
First approved intake	September 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Grant Maxwell (Robert Gordon University)
Secretary	Lucy Jack (Robert Gordon University)
Members of the joint panel	Thorsten Lauterbach (Internal Panel Member) Martin Hurst (External Panel Member) Maggie Summerlin (Society and College of Radiographers)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Institution-led subject review of school of health sciences: Reflective analysis and confirmed report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Course re-approval document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supplementary practice placement documentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Course flier	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review supplementary documentation around practice placements and the course flier prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, they did table it at the visit itself.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider should ensure potential applicants are made aware that membership of The Society and College of Radiographers, and associated costs, is an explicit requirement of maintaining a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted students must maintain membership of the Society and College of Radiographers whilst on the programme. Discussion with the programme team confirmed in order to maintain a place on the programme this was an explicit requirement of all students and they would be required to pay the membership fee themselves. The visitors noted this was not made explicitly clear anywhere in the programme admissions processes, such as in advertising materials. In order that applicants can make an informed choice about the programme and are fully aware of this requirement, the visitors require the education provider to suitably amend the programme advertising materials to include this information.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the relevant guidance issued by HCPC. For example, there are references to the programme being 'accredited by' the HCPC (Student handbook, p4 and Course specification, p1). Correct terminology in both these cases is that the programme would be 'approved by' the HCPC. There are also two instances where the Health and Care Professions Council has been referred to under its old name of the Health Professions Council (Student handbook p11 and p27). As it has been referred to as the Health and Care Professions Council in the rest of the documentation, the visitors felt it important that the name is referenced consistently throughout. This would avoid potential confusion to students. There is also one instance where the documentation states that graduates of the programme are "eligible for registration" (Course specification, p1). Successful graduates would be eligible to apply for registration only as they would need to meet the HCPC's health and character requirements at the point of registration. The visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that students will not be misled by the information provided.

Recommendations

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider give applicants more detailed criteria as to what professional entry standards are, in the context of the expected values and behaviours of a diagnostic radiographer.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation and website contained information about the required academic and professional entry standards for the programme. Alongside the academic requirements, the professional suitability of the applicant is considered through interviews, assessments and a requirement that the applicant has experience of a radiography setting. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the entry criteria are appropriate and the standard is met. However, the visitors suggest the programme team consider improving the information relating to professional suitability for applicants. Whilst applicants are clearly made aware that professional suitability is essential to a successful application, they felt more information could be provided relating to what professional suitability is in the context of the expected values and behaviours of a diagnostic radiographer. This would help applicants in deciding whether diagnostic radiography is suitable for them, and aid the preparation of candidates shortlisted for the half day selection visit.

Helen Best
Shaaron Pratt

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	11 – 12 Dec 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 February 2013 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 14 February 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 February 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2013

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their current provision for biomedical science. The education provider will continue to run the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme, which is approved by the HCPC. They will also offer a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programme and the new programmes, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science) and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science).

The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Houlston (Biomedical scientist) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	20 (includes all specialisms)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Mike Wyvill (University of Sunderland)
Secretary	Joanne White (University of Sunderland)
Members of the joint panel	Joanna Andrew (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Craig Donaldson (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction to education provider and healthcare science programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cross reference to IBMS and HCPC requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

A number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate, consistent and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted a number of instances where incorrect terminology was used. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that it is accurate, current and consistent. For example, the visitors noted a reference within the Practice Placement Handbook to the programme "...these objectives will relate to the PTP competencies relevant to your discipline and the HPC Standards of Proficiency for a Health Care Science Practitioner". The HCPC does not hold a Register for health care science practitioners; however it does hold a Register for biomedical scientists. On another occasion the 'audit tool' for quality control of clinical placement providers had included 'HCPC training certificate'. The HCPC do not provide formal practice placement educator training and therefore do not issue training certificates. The visitors therefore require all documents to be thoroughly checked and terminology corrected.

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.

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to make clear that upon successful completion of the programme the individual will be eligible to apply for registration as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors found inconsistent advice about registration with the HCPC in the programme documentation. For example, there were several references in the documentation to 'registration with the Health and Care Professions Council', but not specifically as a biomedical scientist. To an applicant, this may cause confusion as they may not have experience with professional regulation. The visitors require further explanation of what registration with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist entails, and why it is important in order to be satisfied that this condition has been met.

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 HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that they have regulations or policies in place that ensure none of the interim awards available provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration, and that the programme documentation clearly articulates this.

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Visitors also did not see documentation which defined the programme's

assessment regulations. The education provider stated in its SETs mapping document that 'The programme team cannot make programme specific regulations and have them approved by the DVC (Academic) unless the HCPC approve the programme. Assuming a successful outcome, these can only be done after the event in December 2012.' However, the visitors require evidence that final draft of programme specific assessment regulations is produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit did not state that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC (SETs mapping document SET 6.9). The visitors noted this was not clearly articulated anywhere in the programme documentation and were therefore not satisfied that this SET was met. This SET requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation (such as the programme specification document) to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

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.

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register or agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider, there were no procedures in place for the selection of an external examiner, and how education provider makes decisions about who is an appropriate appointment as an external examiner. The visitors will need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate this standard is met.

David Houliston
Peter Ruddy

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	11 – 12 Dec 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	2
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 February 2013 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 14 February 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 February 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2013

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their current provision for biomedical science. The education provider will continue to run the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme, which is approved by the HCPC. They will also offer a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programme and the new programmes, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science) and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science).

The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Houlston (Biomedical scientist) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	20 (includes all specialisms)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Mike Wyvill (University of Sunderland)
Secretary	Joanne White (University of Sunderland)
Members of the joint panel	Joanna Andrew (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Craig Donaldson (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction to education provider and healthcare science programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cross reference to IBMS and HCPC requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

A number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate, consistent and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulations.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted a number of instances where incorrect terminology was used. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that it is accurate, current and consistent. For example, the visitors noted a reference within the Practice Placement Handbook to the programme "...these objectives will relate to the PTP competencies relevant to your discipline and the HPC Standards of Proficiency for a Health Care Science Practitioner." The HCPC does not hold Register for health care science practitioners; however it does hold a Register for biomedical scientists. On another occasion the 'audit tool' for quality control of clinical placement providers had included 'HCPC training certificate'. The HCPC do not provide formal practice placement educator training and therefore do not issue training certificates. The visitors therefore require all documents to be thoroughly checked and terminology corrected.

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.

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to make clear that upon successful completion of the programme the individual will be eligible to apply for registration as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors found inconsistent advice about registration with the HCPC in the programme documentation. For example, there were several references in the documentation to 'registration with the Health and Care Professions Council', but not specifically as a biomedical scientist. To an applicant, this may cause confusion as they may not have experience with professional regulation. The visitors require further explanation of what registration with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist entails, and why it is important in order to be satisfied that this condition has been met.

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 HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that they have regulations or policies in place that ensure none of the interim awards available provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration, and that the programme documentation clearly articulates this.

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Visitors also did not see documentation which defined the programme's

assessment regulations. The education provider stated in its SETs mapping document that 'The programme team cannot make programme specific regulations and have them approved by the DVC (Academic) unless the HCPC approve the programme. Assuming a successful outcome, these can only be done after the event in December 2012.' However, the visitors require evidence that final draft of programme specific assessment regulations is produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit did not state that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC (SETs mapping document SET 6.9). The visitors noted this was not clearly articulated anywhere in the programme documentation and were therefore not satisfied that this SET was met. This SET requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation (such as the programme specification document) to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

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.

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register or agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider, there were no procedures in place for the selection of an external examiner, and how education provider makes decisions about who is an appropriate appointment as an external examiner. The visitors will need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate this standard is met.

David Houliston
Peter Ruddy

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	11 – 12 Dec 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	2
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 February 2013 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 14 February 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 February 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2013

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their current provision for biomedical science. The education provider will continue to run the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme, which is approved by the HCPC. They will also offer a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programme and the new programmes, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science) and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science).

The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Houlston (Biomedical scientist) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	20 (includes all specialisms)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Mike Wyvill (University of Sunderland)
Secretary	Joanne White (University of Sunderland)
Members of the joint panel	Joanna Andrew (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Craig Donaldson (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction to education provider and healthcare science programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cross reference to IBMS and HCPC requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

A number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate, consistent and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulations.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted a number of instances where incorrect terminology was used. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that it is accurate, current and consistent. For example, the visitors noted a reference within the Practice Placement Handbook to the programme "...these objectives will relate to the PTP competencies relevant to your discipline and the HPC Standards of Proficiency for a Health Care Science Practitioner". The HCPC does not hold Register for health care science practitioners; however it does hold a Register for biomedical scientists. On another occasion the 'Audit Tool' for quality control of clinical placement providers had included 'HCPC training certificate'. The HCPC do not provide formal practice placement educator training and therefore do not issue training certificates. The visitors therefore require all documents to be thoroughly checked and terminology corrected.

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.

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to make clear that upon successful completion of the programme the individual will be eligible to apply for registration as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors found inconsistent advice about registration with the HCPC in the programme documentation. For example, there were several references in the documentation to 'registration with the Health and Care Professions Council', but not specifically as a biomedical scientist. To an applicant, this may cause confusion as they may not have experience with professional regulation. The visitors require further explanation of what registration with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist entails, and why it is important in order to be satisfied that this condition has been met.

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 HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that they have regulations or policies in place that ensure none of the interim awards available provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration, and that the programme documentation clearly articulates this.

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Visitors also did not see documentation which defined the programme's

assessment regulations. The education provider stated in its SETs mapping document that 'The programme team cannot make programme specific regulations and have them approved by the DVC (Academic) unless the HCPC approve the programme. Assuming a successful outcome, these can only be done after the event in December 2012.' However, the visitors require evidence that final draft of programme specific assessment regulations is produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit did not state that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC (SETs mapping document SET 6.9). The visitors noted this was not clearly articulated anywhere in the programme documentation and were therefore not satisfied that this SET was met. This SET requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation (such as the programme specification document) to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

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.

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register or agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider, there were no procedures in place for the selection of an external examiner, and how education provider makes decisions about who is an appropriate appointment as an external examiner. The visitors will need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate this standard is met.

David Houliston
Peter Ruddy

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	11 – 12 Dec 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	2
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 February 2013 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 14 February 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 February 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2013

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their current provision for biomedical science. The education provider will continue to run the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme, which is approved by the HCPC. They will also offer a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programme and the new programmes, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science) and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science).

The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Houlston (Biomedical scientist) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	20 (includes all specialisms)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Mike Wyvill (University of Sunderland)
Secretary	Joanne White (University of Sunderland)
Members of the joint panel	Joanna Andrew (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Craig Donaldson (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction to education provider and healthcare science programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cross reference to IBMS and HCPC requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

A number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate, consistent and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulations.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted a number of instances where incorrect terminology was used. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that it is accurate, current and consistent. For example, the visitors noted a reference within the Practice Placement Handbook to the programme "...these objectives will relate to the PTP competencies relevant to your discipline and the HPC Standards of Proficiency for a Health Care Science Practitioner". The HCPC does not hold Register for health care science practitioners; however it does hold a Register for biomedical scientists. On another occasion the 'audit tool' for quality control of clinical placement providers had included 'HCPC training certificate'. The HCPC do not provide formal practice placement educator training and therefore do not issue training certificates. The visitors therefore require all documents to be thoroughly checked and terminology corrected.

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.

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to make clear that upon successful completion of the programme the individual will be eligible to apply for registration as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors found inconsistent advice about registration with the HCPC in the programme documentation. For example, there were several references in the documentation to 'registration with the Health and Care Professions Council', but not specifically as a biomedical scientist. To an applicant, this may cause confusion as they may not have experience with professional regulation. The visitors require further explanation of what registration with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist entails, and why it is important in order to be satisfied that this condition has been met.

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 HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that they have regulations or policies in place that ensure none of the interim awards available provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration, and that the programme documentation clearly articulates this.

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Visitors also did not see documentation which defined the programme's

assessment regulations. The education provider stated in its SETs mapping document that 'The programme team cannot make programme specific regulations and have them approved by the DVC (Academic) unless the HCPC approve the programme. Assuming a successful outcome, these can only be done after the event in December 2012.' However, the visitors require evidence that final draft of programme specific assessment regulations is produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit did not state that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC (SETs mapping document SET 6.9). The visitors noted this was not clearly articulated anywhere in the programme documentation and were therefore not satisfied that this SET was met. This SET requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation (such as the programme specification document) to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

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.

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register or agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider, there were no procedures in place for the selection of an external examiner, and how education provider makes decisions about who is an appropriate appointment as an external examiner. The visitors will need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate this standard is met.

David Houliston
Peter Ruddy