

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	FDS <i>c</i> in Hearing Aid Audiology Audiology
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant part of HPC Register	Hearing aid dispensers
Date of visit	14 – 15 March 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Hearing aid dispenser' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 23 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 June 2011. 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 23 August 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in April 2010 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Timothy Pringle (Hearing Aid Audiologist) Richard Sykes (Hearing Aid Audiologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
HPC observer	David Christopher
Proposed student numbers	30
First approved intake	July 2008
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Les James (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Vicky McCormick (Anglia Ruskin University)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC 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	<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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 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 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 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

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the integration of theory and practice by revising programme documentation to reflect students' daily practice and provide a place for supervisors to feedback and sign off students' competencies.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a 'Clinical Skills Logbook' for each semester in which students detailed what core competencies they had achieved. Space was provided within the logbooks to detail the date a competency was observed, carried out under direct supervision and carried out with indirect supervision. The visitors were concerned that currently the logbook did not reflect the actual duration of hours or number of times a student practiced a procedure which could mean that while students received enough theory they may not receive enough practice which could hinder them of the opportunity to achieve the standards of proficiency. During discussions with students and the programme team the visitors learnt that placement supervisors did not sign off students competencies but they were assessed by the education provider via Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OCSEs). The visitors were concerned that if supervisors were not required to formally document their reflections and sign off students competencies at practice they could take a passive involvement in a students' learning. To ensure that theory and practice is integrated and supervisors take a proactive role in a students learning the visitors require further evidence.

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

Condition: The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for monitoring placements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that the programme has a thorough and effective system for approving placements however the visitors were unable to determine the robust nature of the ongoing monitoring of placements and placement supervisors. As the education provider has overall responsibility to ensure that there are thorough and effective systems in place to monitor all placements the visitors require further evidence of how placements will be regularly monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure there is a process in place for all supervisors to receive training before receiving students regardless of their date of appointment.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that if a supervisor could no longer oversee a students learning and a replacement supervisor would be sort and approved. The new supervisor would not be invited

to a training day held by the education provider if one had already passed instead they would be given slides from the training day and this may be followed up with a call from one member of the programme team before they received a student. The visitors considered that this was a good way of ensuring that practice placement educators were trained to ensure that they could be clear on learning outcomes and assessment procedures. The visitors were concerned that there was no formal policy in place to ensure that this process took place before a new supervisor received the student. The visitors were also concerned that without this policy there was a possibility of a new supervisor not receiving a call from a member of the programme team to discuss the slides to ensure the new supervisor understood their role and responsibilities. To ensure that all supervisors receive adequate training the visitors require the policy that will be put into place for supervisors who miss the supervisor training days.

Timothy Pringle
Richard Sykes

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Bangor University
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	21 – 22 February 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 26 March 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 10 May 2012. 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 30 April 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 10 May 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the Register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC'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 HPC visitors and profession	Annie Mitchell (Clinical psychologist) Harry Brick (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	9 per cohort
First approved intake	January 1991
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	David Wright (Bangor University)
Secretary	Karen Chidley (Bangor University)
Members of the joint panel	Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Geraldine Kavanagh (British Psychological Society) Mary O'Reilly (British Psychological Society) Steve Davies (British Psychological Society) Ioan Ap Dewi (Internal panel member) James Hardy (Internal panel member) Tony Elliott (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended 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

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 assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner to be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, this standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the 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. The visitors therefore require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the assessment regulations to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider consider formulating an appropriate strategic response should any changes occur to the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, discussions with the senior management team, programme team and commissioning representative, the visitors noted the potential implications of the 'Review of Non Medical Healthcare Education Provision in Wales'. The visitors noted that the review has the potential to impact on the education provider's business plan and constitutes a potential threat to the future security of the programme. The visitors noted that a potential outcome of the review could be a recommendation that pre-Registration clinical psychology training in Wales should be delivered by one education provider only.

The visitors were reassured by discussions with the commissioning representative where it was stated that any recommendations from the 'Review of Non Medical Healthcare Education Provision in Wales' would be based on a detailed impact analysis with key stakeholders engaged. The visitors were also reassured by the commissioning representative where it was stated that should any changes occur to provision of pre-Registration clinical psychology training within Wales, funding for all current cohorts would be safeguarded and that an intake for 2012 is assured under current commissioning arrangements. The visitors finally noted from discussions with the senior management team that the education provider has a clear commitment to the future of the programme. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met.

However, the visitors also noted the potential risks associated with the current national review and recommend that, should any changes occur to the education provider's business plan as a result of the review, an appropriate strategic response should be formulated to mitigate against the potential impact of change.

Annie Mitchell
Harry Brick

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme name	Dip HE Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	1 – 2 February 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	12

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 22 March 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 10 May 2012. 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 17 April 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 12 June 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 and validating body validated the programme. The education provider and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	30
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Fiona Church (Birmingham City University)
Secretary	Barbara Nugent (Birmingham City University)
Members of the joint panel	Gareth Moran (External Panel Member) Dave Kerr (External Panel Member) Russell Thornhill (External Panel Member) Rachel Curzon (Internal Panel Member) Barbara Howard-Hunt (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new and therefore there are currently no external examiner reports. The visitors did review external examiners' reports for the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme.

During the visit the HPC 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 HPC spoke with students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science 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.

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 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 9 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

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, including reading lists for accuracy.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions during the visit a number of inaccuracies were identified within the programme documentation. The visitors note that on page 92 of the Practice Placement Handbook the table differentiates between 'supervised hours' and 'supernumerary accumulated hours'. The visitors noted that all practice placements should be both supervised and supernumerary, therefore require the table to be updated. The visitors also require the education provider to review the reading lists to ensure all references are accurate and up to date.

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 re-visit all programme documentation including web and paper advertising materials, to clearly highlight the range and duration of placements, the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional personal costs associated with attending placements.

Reason: During discussions the programme team stated that all students will undertake a range of core placements that include a placement in an ambulance, maternity, operating theatre and coronary-care setting. The programme team also stated that both direct entry and non-direct entry students (supported by an employer) can access the programme. The visitors noted that non-direct entry students may be based in locations throughout the UK and that the education provider may facilitate placements close to the students employer if requested. However, through discussions with non-direct entry students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme it was stated that in order to attend some placements significant travel or overnight accommodation was required.

The visitors recognise that the location of the placements can vary depending upon whether a student has accessed the programme directly or whether they are supported by their employer. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine where applicants and students would find out about the logistical arrangements associated with placements, including information about the range and duration of placements, the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional costs associated with attending placement.

This lack of information about placement range, likely placement locations and subsequent costs associated with attending placement may mean that students

cannot make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including all advertising material, to clearly highlight to potential applicants the range and duration of placements, the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional personal costs associated with attending placements.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could not determine the IELTS level for entry on to the programme. At the visit the programme team stated that the level was 6.5. As the education provider must clearly set out their English-language requirements in the information they make available to applicants the visitors require the IELTS entry level to the programme to be clarified and clearly stated in the programme documentation and advertising materials. If students enter the programme with an IELTS score of 6.5 the visitors also require evidence of how the programme team ensures at the point of registration that an applicant will attain a score of IELTS 7.0 with no element below 6.5 (Standard of Proficiency 1b.3).

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions documentation for non-direct entry students to ensure the entry criteria are clear and consistent.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that non-direct entry applicants to the programme must be employed in a trainee paramedic role (or equivalent), have the full support of their operational line manager and hold current IHCD ambulance technician award (or equivalent). The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to provide clarification of what constitutes equivalency within the non-direct entry criteria. The visitors require examples of equivalent employment roles and equivalent qualifications that the education provider would accept.

The visitors also noted from a review of the admissions information on the education providers website that it states that applicants should 'have access to an appropriately prepared Mentor'. The visitors note that this entry criterion differs to those outlined in the Programme Specification.

The visitors therefore require the education provider ensures that the entry criteria are clear and consistent within all admissions documentation, including advertising and potential non-direct entry applicants are able to access further information on what equivalent ambulance job role, qualifications, and scope of practice that the education provider will accept.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure paramedic specific resources are available to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities for a cohort of 30 students.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme, the visitors noted that the current provision of paramedic specific resources and equipment is appropriate to support the current required learning and teaching activities.

However, the visitors noted that the current provision of paramedic specific resources and equipment is based on a smaller cohort than the proposed 30 for the Dip HE Paramedic Science programme. The visitors also noted comments from students on the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science where it was stated that access to paramedic specific equipment was limited at times. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that the ambulance training vehicle is currently on loan from a placement partner. The visitors considered the ambulance training vehicle to be a key programme resource and therefore require formal confirmation that this resource will be in place throughout the duration of the programme. The visitors require further evidence of business and resource planning that demonstrates that the education provider will ensure paramedic specific resources and ambulance equipment are available to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities for a cohort of 30 student paramedics.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the number, duration and range of practice placements and outline where in the programme ambulance, maternity, operating theatre and coronary-care placements will be undertaken. The education provider must also demonstrate where the practical learning outcomes associated with the 'Paramedic Care of the Trauma Patient' module will be achieved.

Reason: During discussions the programme team stated that all students will undertake a range of core placements that include a placement in an ambulance, maternity, theatre and coronary-care setting. The visitors require clarification of where in the programme these core placements will be undertaken.

From a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted that successful completion of the 'Paramedic Care of the Trauma Patient' module requires students to achieve a number of learning outcomes in a practical setting. The visitors considered it most likely that students will be able to achieve these practical learning outcomes in an accident and emergency or trauma unit placement. The visitors expressed concern that the current core placements may not allow all students on the programme to achieve the learning outcomes associated with the 'Paramedic Care of the Trauma Patient' module.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to outline how students will achieve the learning outcomes associated with the 'Paramedic Care of the Trauma Patient' module given the range of core placements. The education provider must also clarify where in the programme the core placements will be undertaken to ensure they appropriately support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator refresher training.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators the visitors were satisfied that the education provider has mechanisms in place to ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate initial practice placement educator training. However, the visitors also expect the education provider to follow up initial training with regular refresher training and noted that all practice placement educators will require an update to articulate the changes associated with the introduction of the Dip HE Paramedic Science programme and any other developments that occur. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator refresher training and the mechanisms in place to update practice placement educators on important changes to the programme.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must clarify the mechanisms in place that ensure students and practice placement educators have a full understanding about the clinical competencies that will be achieved within each practice placement setting.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with practice placement educators and students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme where it was stated that on occasion they were uncertain about which clinical competencies should be achieved during each placement. The visitors noted from a review of the programme documentation that students are required to demonstrate defined clinical competencies whilst undertaking level 4 modules and defined clinical competencies whilst undertaking level 5 modules. However,

the visitors were not able to associate specific clinical competencies to specific practice placements that would demonstrate academic and clinical progression. The education provider must therefore clarify the mechanisms in place that ensure students and practice placement educators have an understanding about the clinical competencies that should be achieved within each practice placement. Evidence might include mapping of clinical competencies against specific practice placements.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure consistency and clearly differentiate between the roles and responsibilities of a Mentor and a Practice Placement Educator.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the role of Mentor and Practice Placement Educator. The visitors noted that the roles and responsibilities of a Mentor and a Practice Placement Educator are clearly defined on page 8 – 10 of the Practice Placement Handbook and that the diagram on page 8 clearly differentiates the roles. The education provider states that Practice Placement Educators will ‘lead on the facilitation of learning in the placement environment’ and that a Mentor will ‘provide an assessment of your achievement’.

The visitors noted that throughout the programme documentation the two roles are often cross referred (e.g. Page 15 of the Course Guide reference to ‘Practice Placement Educator / Mentor’). The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure consistency and, if it is considered that the roles are different, to clearly differentiate between the roles and responsibilities of a Mentor and a Practice Placement Educator. If it is decided that the terms are interchangeable, then the documentation must be updated to reflect this, to avoid potential confusion

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

Condition: The education provider must provide examples of the Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCE) that are used within the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors note that a number of modules utilise OSCE as the main form of summative assessment and that this assessment demonstrates that students meet a number of the standards of proficiency. The visitors were not presented with OSCE as part of the programme documentation. To ensure that the OSCE used within the

programme are in line with the relevant learning outcomes the visitors require examples of the OSCE that are used within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide an example of the 'Mentor Witness Statement' to demonstrate that the measurement of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practice.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine the mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the measurement of student performance in practice placements is objective and ensures fitness to practice. The visitors noted that practice placement educators undertake summative sign off of clinical competencies when a student has demonstrated the competency under supervision. During discussions with the programme team it was noted that practice placement educators formatively assess clinical competency throughout the duration of a placement and utilise a 'Mentor Witness Statement' to evidence fitness to practice and competency acquisition. However no example of the 'Mentor Witness Statement' was provided. The visitors require an example of the 'Mentor Witness Statement' to demonstrate that the measurement of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practice.

Recommendations

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider undertaking an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) mapping exercise for the IHCD ambulance technician award.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning (AP(E)L) Policy and Procedures document and are satisfied that this standard is met. However, from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted comments where it was anticipated that the course may attract a number of applicants who hold an IHCD ambulance technician award and that these applicants may be eligible to AP(E)L elements of the programme. The visitors were satisfied that the education provider will deal with these applicants on a case by case basis in line with the AP(E)L policy. From a review of the education provider's policy the visitors noted that the education provider had already conducted a mapping exercise for some other common entry pathways in other health professions. The visitors recommend that the education provider may want to undertake a similar exercise with the IHCD ambulance technician award and clearly define maximum credit allowance.

Bob Fellows
Vince Clarke

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	New School of Psychotherapy & Counselling & Middlesex University
Validating body / Awarding body	Middlesex University
Programme name	DPsych (Existential Counselling Psychology and Psychotherapy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Counselling psychologist
Date of visit	14 – 15 February 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	17

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Counselling psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 9 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 30 May 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 12 July 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychology)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	48 (3 intakes of 16 students)
First approved intake	January 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Tracey Cockerton (Middlesex University)
Members of the joint panel	Kimberley Wilson (British Psychological Society) Brian Sheenan (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC 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 36 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 21 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 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 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 must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that students may be expected to self-fund a number of additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme. The visitors noted that the course fees were stated on the programme website. However reference to other potential additional costs such as those associated with personal therapy, indemnity insurance, CRB checks, resources such as books and the internet, potential supervisor fees and costs associated with travel to placements were less clearly stated. The visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure that, as with the course fees, the potential additional costs associated with the programme are clearly stated to demonstrate that this standard has been met.

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 all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to clearly highlight to potential applicants that students on the programme are responsible for organising their own practice placements, in partnership with the education provider.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that students on the programme are responsible for choosing and identifying practice placements and ensuring they are appropriate. In particular the visitors noted page 5 of the 'Clinical Placement Handbook for Doctoral programmes', where the flowchart states that a "student chooses from [placement] list, or identifies [placement] independently" and a "student ensures placement is appropriate". The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that students are supported throughout this process and the education providers Placement Coordinator ensures placements meet the education provider's criteria. The visitors require the education provider to clearly highlight within the programme documentation and advertising materials that students on the programme will be responsible for organising practice placements in partnership with the education provider.

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 all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. The visitors noted that in the 'Programme Specification' and in the module outlines that HPC was referenced as 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors also noted that in the 'Programme Handbook' (p26) it was stated that completion of the programme will "entitle you to chartering with the BPS and registration as a counselling psychologist with the HPC". All students need to apply to the HPC Register after they have successfully completed the programme in order to use the protected titles. As such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this and ensure that applicants and students are clear that successful completion of the programme means they are only eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure consistency and avoid any potential confusion.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the visitors could not determine what evidence the programme team required to ensure that applicants had a good command of reading writing and spoken English. At the visit, and in discussions with the programme team, it was indicated that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria for entry to the programme is demonstration of competence at level 7 or higher. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions procedures to ensure that students entering the programme have undergone appropriate criminal convictions checks.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided and in discussion with the programme team the visitors ascertained that the education provider does not facilitate criminal convictions checks as part of the admissions process. The visitors noted in discussions with the programme team that the admissions procedures requires applicants to evidence an enhanced CRB check but that this is not normally undertaken by the education provider. The visitors noted in discussions that a number of students stated that they provided evidence of

criminal convictions checks undertaken by an employer before enrolling on the programme. However, some students stated that they had checks undertaken after they had enrolled on the programme, before the start of their first placement. The visitors highlighted that as criminal checks may not be undertaken at admission some students may not have disclosed any relevant convictions and that they may start the programme and possibly have to terminate study if a conviction was disclosed at a later point.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence that they run appropriate and relevant criminal conviction checks on all applicants as part of the admissions procedure. They also require evidence of what processes the education provider has in place for dealing with an applicant who discloses a criminal conviction or a situation where the CRB status of a student changes as they progress through the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions documentation to ensure the entry criteria are clear and consistent.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the programme entry criteria outline that applicants to the programme must have completed an introductory course in psychotherapy or counselling, such as the one offered by the education provider and have experience in caring work. However, the visitors were unclear as to the criteria used by the education provider to make a judgement on what an appropriate introductory course constitutes and what is acceptable in terms of experience of caring work. The visitors were also unclear as to how this set of criteria was communicated to potential applicants by the programme team. The visitors therefore require evidence of what any prior learning and teaching would need to cover in order to meet the programme's entry requirements and what criteria the education provider uses to assess applicants experience of caring work. The visitors also require further evidence of how this criterion is communicated to applicants and applied during the admissions procedures to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must provide formal clarification that all students enrolled on the programme will be supported by Middlesex University should the education provider's business plan become unsustainable.

Reason: In discussions with the senior management team the visitors noted that a representative from Middlesex University stated that should the education provider's business plan become unsustainable, Middlesex University would take responsibility for all students enrolled on the programme. The visitors noted evidence of an insurance policy provided by the education provider that would support this transfer should the education provider no longer be able to support students on the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current financial stability of the programme but noted that the education provider runs a range of

programmes and is a small independent education provider. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal agreement between Middlesex University and the education provider which clearly states that Middlesex University would support all students in the completion of the programme should the education providers business plan become unsustainable.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must outline the mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of specialist visiting lecturers teaching is guaranteed.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that specialist visiting lecturers are integral to the delivery of the curriculum. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that specialist visiting lecturers are interviewed and can be subject to peer review. The visitors also noted discussions with the students where it was stated that they provide feedback to the specialist visiting lecturers. However, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider guarantees the quality of this teaching, which is integral to the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider guarantees the quality of teaching delivered by visiting lecturers. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the policies or procedures the education provider uses to guarantee and safeguard the quality of the teaching of the specialist visiting lecturers.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that where students participate as service users in practical teaching, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

Reason: From discussions with the students the visitors noted that they participate as service users in practical teaching. However, the visitors were unable to determine any formal protocols for obtaining students consent within the documentation. From the discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that verbal consent is obtained during practical teaching and that participation is not mandatory. The programme team also discussed how they made applicants to the programme clear about what level of involvement was expected during the course of the programme.

The visitors highlighted as that there was no formal protocol in place to record that students' consent had been obtained this may have an impact on how the programme team are able to manage situations where students declined from participation. In light of this, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence of appropriate protocols used to gain informed consent from students or what processes are in place to manage situations where students declined to participate. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of appropriate formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements for time on placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Reason: The visitors noted that over the duration of the programme students are required to undertake a minimum of 450 hours of supervised clinical work in a placement setting. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence of the student attendance expectations whilst on placement or what monitoring mechanisms are in place to ensure that students complete this requirement. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that a supervisor report is completed at the end of each term and that any attendance issues would be highlighted.

However, from the evidence received the visitors could not identify how these minimum attendance requirements were being fully communicated to the students and placement providers. In addition the visitors were unable to identify any formal monitoring of students' attendance on placement. The visitors also noted that if all stakeholders were not fully aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the education provider to monitor and step in to take action to ensure absence does not affect a students learning and development on placement. The visitors highlighted that this could affect students' ability to meeting the learning outcomes associated with placement and therefore the relevant standards of proficiency.

The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that they communicate to students and placement providers, clearly identifies the minimum attendance requirements for time on placements. This should also include the threshold level at which the education provider would take action if attendance dropped and the associated monitoring mechanisms to record students' attendance.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a formal fitness to practice process to clearly and consistently deal with concerns regarding student's profession-related conduct.

Reason: From the documentation, and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors identified that there was no formal process in place for dealing with concerns about student's profession-related conduct. The discussions with the programme team highlighted verbally the process for dealing with any concerns about a student's profession-related conduct. It was noted that concerns could be raised about a student's conduct and that those concerns would be dealt with via various meetings to include the student, supervisor and education provider. Measures were then put in place to deal with the conduct of the student and these measures would be reviewed at the regular meetings, which the student would attend to allow them to reflect on the issues. If a student was deemed as

not fit to practice they would be asked to leave the programme. However, the visitors did not have any written evidence of this process and what formal procedures are implemented to ensure that any issues of this sort were dealt with clearly and consistently.

The visitors therefore require further evidence of a clear and open formal process which is implemented to deal with concerns regarding student's profession-related conduct, to ensure that this standard is met.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly highlight that students must undertake an appropriate range of placements to ensure a wide range of learning experiences and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that students must undertake more than one practice placement. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that students were encouraged to seek a range of practice placement experiences whilst on the programme but must always undertake a minimum of two different placements. The programme team stated that the Placement Co-ordinator monitored the range of placement experiences that students were undertaking to ensure that they are appropriate to support the learning outcomes. The visitors noted the importance of students gaining a wide range of learning experiences as a number of the standards of proficiency require breadth of experience. The visitors were unable to determine how the education provider communicates this requirement to students. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly highlight within the programme documentation that students must undertake practice placements that offer a range of learning experiences that are sufficient to support the achievement of the standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for approving and monitoring practice placements to ensure they are safe and supportive.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors could not find evidence of any formal mechanisms in place to check the quality of practice placements before they are used. The visitors noted the flowchart in the 'Clinical Placement Handbook for Doctoral programmes' (p5) that outlines the process for approving practice placements. However, from the evidence provided the visitors highlighted that the education provider's role in approving placements appear limited and that students are responsible for ensuring that their placements meet the education provider's requirements. The visitors noted that the education provider role in the placement approval process is to contact placements to discuss the placement agreement form and sign off the placement if it is deemed appropriate. The visitors also

noted in the 'Clinical Placement Handbook for Doctoral programmes' (p6) it states that "NSPC takes no responsibility for clinical governance in the placement sites".

The visitors therefore require further evidence of the auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether practice placements provide safe and supportive environments. The education provider must also provide evidence of guidelines which articulate what constitutes an inappropriate practice placement environment and demonstrate that they take ownership of the approval and monitoring of practice placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a thorough and effective system in place for approving and monitoring practice placements.

Reason: From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors were not able to clearly define the formal policies and processes that the education provider uses to approve and monitor placements. The visitors noted the flowchart in the 'Clinical Placement Handbook for Doctoral programmes' (p5) that outlines the process for approving practice placements. However, from the evidence provided the visitors highlighted that the education provider's role in approving placements appears limited and students are responsible for ensuring that their placements meet the education provider's requirements. The visitors noted the 'Development Plan for Doctoral Placements 2012/2013' that states that an objective is to "increase quality assurance with each current placement provider".

The visitors therefore require further evidence of the auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether practice placements are appropriate. The education provider must also provide evidence of guidelines which articulate what constitutes an inappropriate practice placement environment and demonstrate that they take ownership of the approval and monitoring of practice placements.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors were not able to clearly define the formal policies and processes that the education provider uses to approve and monitor placements. The visitors could therefore not determine what mechanisms are in place for the programme team to ensure that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and that they are implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence outlining how they ensure

equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence outlining how they ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is in place at the practice placement setting.

Reason: From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors were not able to clearly define the formal policies and processes that the education provider uses to approve and monitor placements. The visitors were made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit placements. However, the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team ensures that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place at each practice placement. As such the visitors could not determine what criteria is used to decide if a practice placement has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff or any process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria. The visitors therefore require further evidence of any formal approval and monitoring mechanisms to ensure that each practice placement meets the criteria for staffing as well as any process that will be implemented taken if this situation changes.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure supervisors have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included the placement agreement form, supervisors CV's and general information regarding selection of supervisors. The visitors considered these to be useful indicators that the education provider was aware of the need to monitor the knowledge, skills and experience of supervisors. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team that outlined a number of informal quality mechanisms that are in place. However, the visitors were not presented with formal policies and processes that support the approval and selection of supervisors. The visitors require further evidence of the selection process, details of selection criteria and details of threshold levels of skills and experience that the education provider require someone to have before becoming a supervisor. The visitors also require further information of the mechanisms in place to monitor the performance of supervisors.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms they use to ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training and are informed about the specifics of the programme in advance of receiving students.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider facilitates a yearly supervisor workshop. However, from discussion with the practice placement educators, the visitors noted that a number of practice placement educators present, had not received practice placement educator training prior to receiving students on placement. The visitors therefore require further evidence to articulate how the mechanisms used by the programme team ensures that practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. In this way the visitors can be sure that practice placement educators allied to the programme and are informed about the specifics of the programme in advance of receiving students and that this standard continues to be met.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must clarify the mechanisms in place that ensure students and supervisors have an understanding about the competencies that should be achieved within each practice placement.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the supervisors in which it was stated that on occasion they were uncertain about what competencies should be achieved during a placement. The visitors also noted in discussions with the programme team that the 'Supervisor Evaluation Form' and 'Practice Log' is a key mechanism to ensure that students demonstrate progression. The visitors highlighted that these documents are fairly general and do not provide a clear indication of the framework the programme uses to map a student's progression through the programme and from one placement to another. As such in reviewing the programme documentation the visitors were not able to associate specific competencies to specific practice placements and where students would be expected to meet certain competencies or learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of how the mechanisms in place ensure that students and supervisors have an understanding about the competencies that should be achieved within each practice placement.

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 demonstrate how the assessment strategy for practice placements ensures that competencies are assessed that a student meets them all to progress and successfully complete the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that the 'Supervisor Evaluation Form' and 'Practice Log' is a key mechanism to ensure that students demonstrate progression. The visitors considered these documents to be very general and do not provide a clear framework to map progression. As such in reviewing the programme documentation the visitors were not able to associate specific competencies to specific practice placements and where students would be expected to meet certain competencies or learning outcomes. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team expects a student to progress through the programme and meet all of the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of how the assessment strategy and design associated with practice placements ensures that all of the competencies are assessed. The visitors also require further evidence of how the assessment of these competencies ensures that a student who successfully progress through the programme can meet all of the relevant standards of proficiency..

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly specify the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme, providing clearer evidence of the criteria for failure of placement and what implications this has for student's progression through the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted page 44–47 of the programme handbook where details of assessment processes and student progression are outlined. The visitors were unable to find assessment processes associated with placement failure. The visitors therefore require further details outlining the criteria that would be used to fail a student on placement and details of the consequences of placement failure.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding aegrotat awards and that this is accessible to students.

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 clearly articulate that at least one external examiner appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy that the current external examiner meets the requirement of the HPC. However, this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme must state 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 HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the documentation, specifically in the programme regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending the admissions procedures relating to criminal conviction checks.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document the visitors noted that it states that “we cannot normally accept applicants whose enhanced CRB check shows that they have a criminal conviction”. The same document also states that should an applicant disclose a criminal offence “we cannot accept you on the programme unless the HPC has indicated that you would be eligible for registration as a counselling psychologist”. The HPC has processes in place for assessing an individual’s ability to meet the standards of conduct, performance and ethics when they apply to the HPC Register and all applications are dealt with on a case by case basis. However, the visitors noted that the education provider has a role in assessing applicants for the programme and not for registration.

The education provider may want to refer to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics when considering whether a criminal conviction might affect that person’s ability to meet those standards. The education provider may also want to review the HPC ‘Guidance on health and character’ publication to help inform any judgement. The education provider should therefore consider amending the criminal conviction processes in place for dealing with an applicant or student who has a criminal conviction to highlight that the education provider takes ownership of any judgement that is made during the programme admissions process.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to enhance the information about the support available and what reasonable adjustments can be made to support individuals with any health requirements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. The visitors noted that in the discussions with the programme team the policies and processes in place to support reasonable adjustments on the programme were clearly outlined. The visitors did, however, note an apparent discrepancy between the discussions with the programme team and the information made available within the programme documentation. The visitors highlighted that information on reasonable adjustments and support mechanisms that the programme team were operating could be made more explicit in the programme documentation to ensure that the options and services available to individuals with health requirements are more clearly and consistently referenced.

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider taking a more strategic approach in the monitoring and implementation of its equality and diversity policies.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. The visitors did however articulate that the programme team may consider taking a more strategic approach to the way it monitors and implements its equality and diversity policies. In this way the education provider may be better able to formulate an equality and diversity strategy at a programme level to ensure that the work that is currently being undertaken around equality and diversity is more easily conducted in a consistent, transparent and measured way.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider making a formal teaching qualification a professional development requirement for staff on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with a representative from Middlesex University where it was stated that all their staff have the opportunity to undertake a formal teaching qualification. The visitors noted that the education provider currently has no such arrangement in place and does not require teaching staff to hold a formal teaching qualification. The visitors recommend that the education provider may want to review the programme for staff development to further enhance and encourage the provision of formal teaching qualifications.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the provision of core texts that are available to students on the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students are able to access library facilities at both the education provider and the validating body. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However, the visitors noted discussions with students where it was stated that due to the specialist nature of the subject material it can often be difficult to access core texts. The students commented that copies of the core texts at the education provider can be limited and the library at the validating body does not always hold copies. The students also commented that because of this limited provision they often bought copies of the core texts. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the provision of core texts that are available to students on the programme to better support students in their teaching and learning.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the HPC if the range of e-learning and teaching approaches is further developed.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that e-learning and distance learning is central to the delivery of the curriculum. The visitors were satisfied that the current range of learning and teaching approaches is appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum. However, the visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that they intended to further develop e-learning within the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that should the learning and teaching approaches be further developed towards e-learning and distance learning the education provider inform the HPC through the major change or annual monitoring processes.

Ruth Baker
Allan Winthrop

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen's University of Belfast
Programme name	Doctorate in Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DECAP)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	6 – 7 March 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Educational psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 23 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 25 May 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 5 July 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Andrew Richards (Educational psychologist) Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	6
First approved intake	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Gerry Mulhern (Queens University of Belfast)
Secretary	Gail Crawford Queens University of Belfast)
Members of the joint panel	Pat Bennett (British Psychological Society) Frances Lee (British Psychological Society) Garry Squires (British Psychological Society) Tony Tarrant (British Psychological Society) Lauren Ison (British Psychological Society) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

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 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 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 must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. The visitors noted the education provider's website states the "course is approved by the British Psychological Society for the training of educational psychologists". The programme is approved by the HPC as the statutory regulator for educational psychologists and accredited by the British Psychological society as the professional body. The visitors also noted the 'Course Handbook' (p21) stated "the programme is subject to HPC Accreditation". The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure consistency and avoid any potential confusion.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme admissions documentation to include information regarding the programme policies for accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Reason: The admissions documentation provided prior to the visit made no mention of the procedures for accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms. Upon further discussion at the visit it became clear the education provider did not accept accreditation of (experiential) learning or use other inclusion mechanisms for potential applicants to the programme. For clarity for potential applicants the visitors require the programme admissions documentation to be revised to clearly include this information.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider should continue to monitor the breadth and experience of the programme team.

Reason: From discussions with the senior management team the visitors noted the planned reduction of student numbers on the programme. The visitors also noted it is likely the programme team will reduce in number to reflect the change in student numbers. The visitors considered the planned reduction of the programme team and were satisfied the staffing level would still allow an effective programme to be delivered. However, the visitors noted the breadth and experience within the current programme team and in particular noted the contribution of the academic and professional tutors. The visitors recommend the education provider should monitor the breadth and experience of the programme team and endeavour to maintain the current level of provision.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to further emphasise the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted several instances where reference is made to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated students received specific teaching on the professional standards, which included the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the documentation the visitors also noted several instances where the education provider only made reference to the British Psychological Society's (BPS) ethical standards, in particular within the 'Placement Handbook'. The visitors recommend the education provider should review the programme documentation and further emphasise the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors suggest this would strengthen the students' understanding of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics which they must abide by if they choose to Register with HPC and practise as an educational psychologist.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider incorporating an equality and diversity policy check into the placement audit documentation.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted the majority of practice placements are based within the five Education and Library

Boards in Northern Ireland. The education provider holds copies of the equality and diversity policies of the individual Education and Library Boards and the visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors also noted discussions where it was evident that some elective placements may not be within the Education and Library Board system and could, for example take place in the charity or independent sector. The visitors recommend the education provider consider incorporating an equality and diversity policy check into the placement audit documentation.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider continue to develop practice placement educator training and work towards ensuring all practice placement educators, including those from elective placements, have undertaken the training.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the education provider facilitates three day supervision training for practice placement educators. The EP has also put in place positive measures to develop the supervisory skills of practice placement educators.

However, from discussion the visitors noted not all practice placement educators, in particular those from elective placements, had undertaken the training.

The visitors recognise the challenges the education provider faces when ensuring practice placement educators are available for training and therefore recommend the education provider continue to develop practice placement educator training and work towards ensuring all practice placement educators, including those from elective placements, have undertaken the training.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing and further enhancing its collaborative role with practice placement providers to ensure that any gaps in students' clinical experience and professional conduct highlighted in a previous placement are consistently taken forward when students transfer to a new practice placement setting.

Reason: From discussion with the students, the programme team and the practice placement educators the visitors noted the process a student goes through when deciding upon areas for development when starting a new placement. The students stated that an updated CV is presented to the new practice placement educator to help identify areas for development and the education provider is available throughout to review the CV and speak with the practice placement educator if needed.

The visitors noted the education provider's role in the process but recognised that the current process puts the onus on the student to ensure that the CV is updated and any gaps in clinical experience and professional conduct highlighted in a previous placement are consistently taken forward. If any gaps in students'

clinical experience and professional conduct, highlighted in a previous placement were not addressed at the beginning of a placement the mid-placement review could be too late in the placement to address these gaps. The education provider should therefore consider reviewing and further enhancing its collaborative role with practice placement providers to ensure that any gaps in students' clinical experience and professional conduct highlighted in a previous placement are consistently taken forward when students transfer to a new practice placement setting.

Andrew Richards
Judith Bamford

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Royal Holloway, University of London
Validating body / Awarding body	University of London
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	6 – 7 March 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 11 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 11 April 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 10 May 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC'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 HPC visitors and profession	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sandy Wolfson (Sport and exercise psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
HPC observer	David Christopher
Proposed student numbers	28
First approved intake	January 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Rosemary Deem (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Secretary	Charlotte Verney (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Members of the joint panel	Malcom Adams (British Psychological Society) Carol Martin (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Geraldine Kavanagh (British Psychological Society) Marina Beck (Royal Holloway, University of London)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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 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 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 must ensure that applicants to the programme are aware of any potential additional expenditure associated with the completion of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were clear that students who are admitted to the programme will become employees of the Camden and Islington Foundation NHS Trust. The visitors were also clear that as a consequence of this students can claim reasonable costs for travel to undertake periods of experience at practice placement sites. However, in discussion with the students the visitors were made aware of a recent change to the policy regarding the claiming of these expenses. Costs of travel would now only be covered beyond the normal travelling distance between a student's place of residence and the education provider. As several students live in central London they articulated that this has left them unable to claim travel expenses for travel to some practice placement sites. The visitors articulated that this policy was clearly set out in the documentation available to current students but they were unclear as to how this policy is communicated to applicants. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team communicates the implications of this policy to applicants prior to them making a choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how applicants are fully informed before they make their decision and how this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to support the work being done to capture the training experience of practice placement educators on the existing database of practice placements.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was made clear that they expected all practice placement educators to undertake the appropriate practice placement educator training which is provided. The visitors also noted that the programme team makes a note of those practice placement educators who have attended the initial training as well as the refresher training for more experienced educators. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, in further discussion with the programme team it was articulated that the information regarding a practice placement educators' training was captured in a system outside the main 'ACE' database. This had the implications of increasing the workload for the members of the programme team who were organising and arranging practice placements. In response to this the programme team have identified what needs to be done in order to include the practice placement educators' training data but that this has not yet been able to be undertaken. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers how best to support this continuing work in developing the 'ACE' database. In this way it may benefit from a reduction in staff time allocated to the arrangement of practice placements and an increase in time for staff to support the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to inform the HPC if a change in regulations governing the programme changes the way students are assessed and ensures that they meet the standards of proficiency.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were satisfied that the postgraduate teaching regulations which govern the programme provide a framework for the programmes assessment strategy. In this way the regulations help ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for clinical psychologists. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, in discussion with the senior team, and with the programme team, it was suggested that the programme may consider being governed by the postgraduate research regulations to better reflect the research aspects of the programme. While these discussions suggested that this decision was not imminent the visitors recommend that the programme team consider how best to inform the HPC if this affects how the programme continues to meet this standard. If the change to postgraduate research regulations affects how the programme continues to apply the assessment strategy in its current form this could affect how the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for clinical psychologists. If this is the case the HPC would need to be informed through either the annual monitoring or major change processes.

Ruth Baker
Sandy Wolfson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	St Georges', University of London
Programme name	Foundation Science Degree in Paramedic Science (Gibraltar)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	13 – 14 March 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	14

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 11 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 11 April 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 10 May 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	4
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2012
Chair	Sean Hilton (St Georges' University of London)
Secretary	Derek Baldwinson (St Georges' University of London)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years for this Gibraltar based programme, as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HPC 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 HPC met with students from the certificate in pre-hospital care, 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 46 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 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

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 programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that it is reflective of the current academic requirements required for successful admission to the programme.

Reason: Through a review of the documentation provided the visitors identified that the programme set a minimum number of UCAS points for entry to the foundation science degree in paramedic science. However they noted in the 'Programme specification' (p7) that the requirement was 200 UCAS points while in the 'FdSc in Paramedic science definitive document' (p25) the requirement was for 260 UCAS points. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that the entry requirement had been reviewed upwards recently and that that the requirement for successful entry to the programme is 260 UCAS points. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that the UCAS requirement for successful entry to the programme is consistently used to avoid any confusion for students or applicants to the programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The programme must provide further evidence of the simulated learning resources available to students and teaching staff in Gibraltar.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and from the tour of facilities at St Bernard's Hospital in Gibraltar the visitors were made aware of the accommodation available for the delivery of the clinical skills components of the programme. However, the visitors noted that details of the equipment used to support clinical skills teaching was not included in the 'Resource document' (p7) and that the equipment seen during the tour was only an indicative sample of what is available. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the equipment available to support the clinical skills components of the course, and in particular the simulated learning tools that are available in Gibraltar. In this way the visitors can be sure there is sufficient resource to support the delivery of the clinical skills elements of the curriculum.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and any advertising material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HPC.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme (Programme specification, p1) and that HPC requires full attendance for the duration of the programme (Gibraltar cohort student handbook, p40). The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes and the HPC does not set a requirement regarding student attendance on the programme, this is for an education provider to determine. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore required the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that it accurately reflects the nature and context of the Gibraltar programme and the likely access students will have to London based resources.

Reason: In reviewing the programme documentation the visitors noted that it was based on the documentation produced for the programme delivered in London and edited to be suitable for students based in Gibraltar. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that access to any of the resources in London was possible for students based in Gibraltar but that the most likely route for access was through the internet or via telephone. Further discussions also highlighted that there were alternative resources and support mechanisms based in Gibraltar and that these were accessed through the Gibraltar Health Authority (GHA). However, the visitors articulated that the programme documentation still heavily focused on the support available at the education provider in London and did not articulate how these resources could be best accessed by the Gibraltar cohort. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to better articulate what resources are directly available to students and how those resources based in London can be best accessed and utilised. In this way the programme documentation will reflect the nature and context of the programme in Gibraltar and highlight the resources available to support student learning in all settings.

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 programme team must provide further information which demonstrates how students will achieve all of the required learning outcomes associated with placement and practical learning in the time available.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors noted that students will spend four weeks on practice placement in the UK as a supernumerary member of a paramedic team. This experience is in addition to the practice placements based in Gibraltar which span the two years

of the programme. During the tour of facilities and in discussion with the Gibraltar based practice placement providers the visitors clarified that there were no registered paramedics in Gibraltar currently available to supervise the students. The visitors were made aware that the students would be supervised by other health professionals or programme staff when undertaking placements in Gibraltar. In this way the students are provided with a breadth of experiences, including all aspects of hospital care, and can demonstrate how they meet the required competencies in a range of settings. Students are also able to demonstrate some paramedic specific competencies when undertaking their role as emergency paramedic technicians and supervised by programme staff.

However, the visitors were unclear as to how a range of role, and profession specific, competencies could be met by a student if they were only able to demonstrate them in the four weeks based in the UK. Due to the episodic nature of paramedic work the visitors were also unclear as to how the programme team would be able to ensure that a student would be able to experience the range of situations needed to meet all of the competencies. The visitors therefore require further information about the programme teams' expectations of how and during which placement a student will demonstrate that they meet the required competencies. In particular the visitors require further information about how and when the profession specific competencies are expected to be met and what remedial actions can be taken if the experience a student receives is not sufficient for them to demonstrate these skills. In this way the visitors can determine how those students who successfully complete the programme will be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about the support available for students to develop skills in reflective and autonomous thinking during their practice placement experience.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided, and in discussion with the programme team, that the curriculum emphasises reflection and provides students with the theoretical basis to become autonomous practitioners. During the tour of facilities, and in discussion with the Gibraltar based practice placement providers, the visitors clarified that there were no registered paramedics in Gibraltar currently available to supervise the students. The visitors were made aware that the students would be supervised by other health professionals or programme staff when undertaking placements in Gibraltar. In this way the students are provided with a breadth of experiences, including all aspects of hospital care, and can demonstrate how they meet the required competencies in a range of settings. Students are also able to demonstrate some paramedic specific competencies when undertaking their role as emergency paramedic technicians and supervised by programme staff.

However, the visitors were unclear as to how the arrangements for students to be supervised by other health professionals reinforced and developed the skills of reflective thinking and allowed students to develop the skills necessary to act as autonomous paramedics. The visitors were also unclear as to how students reflected on their practical experience between periods of supervised practice

and their time in the UK. The visitors therefore require further information about the programme teams' expectations of how students will develop their reflective skills during practice placement. In particular they require further evidence of how this reflective practice benefits students and aids them in developing the skills necessary to become autonomous paramedic professionals. In this way the visitors can determine how the delivery of the programme and in particular the practice placements, supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how the interprofessional periods of placement experience allow students to demonstrate their professional specific skills and meet the required competencies.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors noted that students will spend four weeks on practice placement in the UK as a supernumerary member of a paramedic team. This experience is in addition to the hospital based practice placements based in Gibraltar which span the two years of the programme. The visitors were made aware that the students would be supervised by other health professionals while they undertake hospital placements in Gibraltar. This means that students are provided with a breadth of experiences, including all aspects of hospital care, and can demonstrate how they meet the required competencies in a range of hospital settings.

However, the visitors were unclear as to how a range of role, and profession specific, competencies could be met by a student during their time on placement in hospital. The visitors therefore require further information about the programme teams' expectations of how and during which placement a student will demonstrate that they meet the required competencies. In particular the visitors require further information about how and when the specific competencies are expected to be met and what remedial actions can be taken if the experience a student receives is not sufficient for them to demonstrate these skills. In this way the visitors can determine how on these interprofessional placements profession-specific skills and knowledge are adequately addressed.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The programme team must provide further information to demonstrate how the number, duration and range of practice placements allows students to meet the required learning outcomes in the time available.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors noted that students will spend four weeks on practice placement in the UK as a supernumerary member of a paramedic team. This experience is in addition to the hospital based practice placements based in Gibraltar which span the two years of the programme. Students are also able to demonstrate some paramedic specific competencies when undertaking their role as emergency

paramedic technicians. These supervisory sessions will be available to students eight times across the two year programme to coincide with visits to Gibraltar from members of the programme team.

However, the visitors were unclear as to how a range of role, and profession specific, competencies could be met by a student if the time available meant that they were only able to demonstrate them in the four weeks based in the UK. Due to the episodic nature of paramedic work the visitors could not determine the processes in place to ensure that a student would be able to experience the range of situations needed to meet all of the competencies. The visitors therefore require further information about the programme teams' expectations of how and during which placement a student will demonstrate that they meet the required competencies. In particular the visitors require further information about how and when the profession specific competencies are expected to be met and what remedial actions can be taken if the experience a student receives is not sufficient for them to demonstrate these skills. In this way the visitors can determine how the number, duration and range of practice placements support the delivery of the programme and students' achievement of the learning outcomes.

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 programme team must provide further information about how the assessment strategy ensures that successful students have met the required learning outcomes associated with placement and practical learning in the time available.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors noted that students will spend four weeks on practice placement in the UK as a supernumerary member of a paramedic team. This experience is in addition to the practice placements based in Gibraltar which span the two years of the programme. During the tour of facilities and in discussion with the Gibraltar based practice placement providers the visitors clarified that there were no registered paramedics in Gibraltar currently available to supervise the students. The visitors were made aware that the students would be supervised by other health professionals or programme staff when undertaking placements in Gibraltar. In this way the students are provided with a breadth of experiences, including all aspects of hospital care, and can demonstrate how they meet the required competencies in a range of settings. Students are also able to demonstrate some paramedic specific competencies when undertaking their role as emergency paramedic technicians and supervised by programme staff.

However, the visitors were unclear as to how a student could be assessed on a range of role, and profession specific, competencies if students could only demonstrate them in the four weeks when they are based in the UK. Due to the episodic nature of paramedic work the visitors were also unclear as to how the assessment strategy ensures that a student could be assessed on all of the required competencies if the range of situations needed to demonstrate them were not available. The visitors therefore require further information about how and during which placement a student will be assessed to ensure that they meet

the required competencies. In particular the visitors require further information about how and when the profession specific competencies are expected to be met and what remedial actions can be taken if the experience a student receives is not sufficient for them to demonstrate these skills. In this way the visitors can determine how the assessment strategy ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet all of the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about how the assessment strategy ensures that professional aspects of practice are covered in the interprofessional periods of practice placement.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors noted that students will spend four weeks on practice placement in the UK as a supernumerary member of a paramedic team. This experience is in addition to the hospital based practice placements based in Gibraltar which span the two years of the programme. The visitors were made aware that the students would be supervised by other health professionals while they undertake hospital placements in Gibraltar. This means that students are provided with a breadth of experiences, including all aspects of hospital care, and can demonstrate how they meet the required competencies in a range of hospital settings.

However, the visitors were unclear as to how the assessment strategy ensures that profession specific aspects of practice are covered in the interprofessional periods of practice placement. The visitors therefore require further information about the programme teams' expectations of how and during which placements a student will demonstrate that they meet the required competencies. In particular the visitors require further information about how professional aspects of practice are included in the assessment strategy and how and where this is expected to be demonstrated by students. In this way the visitors can determine how the assessment strategy ensures that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment of a students' practice placement experience.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of the competency portfolio and assessment tools used to assess how students have met relevant learning outcomes while they are on practice placement.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that there are several assessment tools used by the programme team to assess how students are meeting the relevant competencies required to successfully complete the programme. The visitors were also made aware that students would have to meet all of these competencies in order to meet the required learning outcomes associated with practice placement and successfully complete the programme. However, the visitors were unclear about what the individual tools require and how they are utilised to ensure that students meet all of the required competencies and the learning outcomes associated with practice placements.

The visitors were therefore unsure about how these tools worked in tandem with one another to assess students' practice experience. The visitors therefore require further information about the competency portfolio and the associated tools used by students and practice placement educators to record and assess how students have met the required learning outcomes. This is to ensure that students and practice placement educators are aware of the requirements for successful completion of each placement and that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how a student is expected to progress through the programme and what a student is expected to achieve at each stage of the academic programme or in professional practice.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that there are several assessment tools used by the programme team to assess how students are meeting the relevant competencies required to successfully complete the programme. The visitors were also made aware that students would have to meet all of these competencies in order to meet the required learning outcomes associated with practice placement. However, the visitors were unclear about how the competencies that were required to be demonstrated during each placement are clearly communicated to students and practice placement educators. The programme documentation did not provide sufficient evidence for the visitors to determine what broad set of competencies each student would be expected to have met after each placement or stage of the programme. The visitors were therefore unsure about how the programme team ensured that the students would be demonstrating competencies which were within their scope of practice at each stage of the programme. The visitors therefore require further information about how the programme team ensure that the set of competencies a student would be expected to meet on each placement block is clearly communicated to student and practice placement educators. This is to ensure that students and practice placement educators are aware of the requirements for successful completion of each placement and 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 revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have previously been agreed with the HPC.

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 HPC 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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including the HPC 'Guidance on conduct and ethics for students' a core text rather than recommended reading for relevant modules.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documents provided that the HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics are covered in a number of modules and that the implications of these standards are included as part of the curriculum. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, through a review of the module descriptors the visitors noted that while the HPC 'Guidance on conduct and ethics for students' is included on the reading lists for a number of modules it is included as recommended reading. The visitors recommend that this publication is included as a core text for at least one module. In this way the programme team may encourage more students to read HPC's 'Guidance on conduct and ethics for students' and possibly increase their understanding of the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to support students in reflecting on their placement experience and in developing their autonomous and reflective practice.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided, and also in discussion with the programme team, that the curriculum emphasises the reflection and provides students with the theoretical basis to become autonomous practitioners. The visitors also noted that support for reflective thinking could be provided for students remotely via email or via web-link after a web-based seminar or tutorial. However, in discussion with the students it was highlighted that they sometimes supported one another in their reflection on practice rather than wait for a more formal link to be made with a paramedic tutor from London. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team consider how best to facilitate students being able to more frequently reflect on their experiences with a registered paramedic in Gibraltar. In this way the programme team may be able to provide students with a suitable professional opinion on aspects of experience or practice which can help the students become autonomous and reflective practitioners.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider increasing the frequency of visits that tutors and lecturers undertake to Gibraltar.

Reason: In discussion with the practice placement providers, in Gibraltar, and with the programme team the visitors were made aware that the visits undertaken

by programme staff to Gibraltar also provided opportunities for practice placement supervision. These visits take place eight times over the two year period of the programme and lasted for two days at a time. During these visits the programme staff accompany students in their work as emergency medical technicians and sign off students when they have demonstrated certain key areas of competence. The visitors highlighted that this was a valuable part of the programme and that it provided students with an excellent opportunity to demonstrate professional skills; progress through the programme and reflect on their practice. The visitors also articulated that these visits reduced the burden of demonstrating a wide set of competencies during the four weeks of experience the students would get in the UK when working as a member of an ambulance crew. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider consider increasing the opportunities staff and students have for undertaking these periods of supervised practice in Gibraltar.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the implementation of the Gibraltar Health Authority equality and diversity policy under review to ensure that any issues are reported to the appropriate education provider committees.

Reason: In discussion with the senior team and the programme team the visitors were made aware of the equality and diversity policies which have been implemented by the Gibraltar Health Authority (GHA). The visitors were also made aware that these policies would be aligned with the education providers' own mechanisms for reporting any issues and taking appropriate actions to resolve them. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors also noted from discussions with the programme team that the GHA equality and diversity policy had been relatively recently formulated and implemented. The visitors also noted that while the policy was based on recommendations from relevant commissions in the UK there was no oversight of the policy required by these bodies due to Gibraltar's status as a Great British protectorate. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider keep the implementation of this policy under review to ensure that it aligns with its own policies and procedures. In this way the education provider can better ensure that these policies can work in tandem and that the required reporting mechanisms, through the education provider committee structure, can be as effective as possible in dealing with any issues that arise.

Glyn Harding
Mark Nevins

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Smae Institute
Programme name	Diploma in Local Anaesthesia for Podiatry Practice
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant part of HPC Register	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Relevant entitlement	Local anaesthetic
Date of visit	14 March 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	12

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Chiropodist' or 'Podiatrist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve are supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, radiographers and physiotherapists) and programmes in local anaesthetics and prescription-only medicine (for chiropodists / podiatrists).

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 May 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 10 May 2012. 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 12 June 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 5 July 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	15
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Maria Young (University of Brighton)
Secretary	Alison Barnard (University of the West of England, Bristol)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new therefore external examiners' reports do not exist.

During the visit the HPC 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 HPC met with students from the Diploma in Foot Health, 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 43 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 14 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

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 all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme.

Reason: In discussions with students from the Diploma in Foot Health, the visitors noted that students may be expected to self-fund a number of additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme. The visitors also noted that the documentation for the Diploma in Local Anaesthesia for Podiatry Practice did not reference potential additional costs such as those associated with Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks, resources such as books and the internet. The visitors also articulated that costs associated with travel and accommodation and costs associated with undertaking a cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) course were not clearly stated. The visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure that the potential additional costs associated with the programme are clearly stated to demonstrate that this standard has been met.

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 documentation to clearly state all of the requirements an applicant would need to meet in order to gain a place on the programme.

Reason: Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students must either provide evidence of current CPR certification or undertake a course in CPR whilst on the programme. The visitors also noted that the programme is framed around distance learning, and utilises e-learning throughout. However the visitors could not determine, from the documentation provided, how information regarding the requirement for internet access and the requirement for a CPR qualification is provided to applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to clearly outline all of the requirements and procedures associated with an applicant being offered and taking up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly highlight the mechanisms in place that demonstrates all students have undertaken criminal conviction checks at admissions and articulate the procedures that deal with an applicant who declares a criminal conviction.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team the visitors were made aware of the education provider's admissions procedures relating to criminal conviction checks. The visitors noted that applicants are asked to declare any criminal convictions to the programme team and sign a self-declaration form. It was also noted that students must provide evidence of an enhanced CRB check before they undertake the placement component of the programme. The programme team also made the requirement for applicants to the programme to be HPC Registrants clear and articulated that as such they must abide by the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However, the visitors articulated that the information provided about the education provider's procedures relating to criminal conviction checks did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that criminal conviction checks are applied at admission. As such the visitors noted that a student could enrol on the programme, complete all theoretical aspects of the programme and have to terminate study because an offence has been disclosed on the CRB check prior to undertaking placement. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were also unable to determine the formal procedures in place to ensure that any applicant who declares a criminal conviction is treated fairly and in a manner consistent with other decisions of this nature. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how criminal conviction checks are completed during the admissions process and to articulate the procedures in place to deal with any applicant who declares a criminal conviction.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions procedures to clarify the selection and entry criteria.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that as part of the admissions procedures the programme team intend to undertake a phone interview with applicants prior to accepting them on the programme. However, from discussions with the programme team it was stated that all students must attend an open day and it is at the open day where the programme team make an informal judgement on an individual's suitability to undertake the programme. The visitors require clarification of the selection and entry criteria for the programme. The visitors also require further information that highlights how the education provider clearly communicates the admissions processes to applicants before this standard can be met.

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the equality and diversity policies utilised by the programme and further evidence how these policies are implemented and monitored.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the SETs mapping document the education provider signposted the visitors to the 'Student Handbook' as the source of evidence for this standard. However, after reviewing the 'inclusion and diversity

statement' visitors were unable to determine what the equality and diversity policy being implemented and used by the education provider was. The visitors could also not determine, from the evidence provided, what process are in place for collecting information on the application and monitoring of the policy. The visitors noted that in the SETs mapping document it stated that "...these policies are implemented and monitored by the equal opportunities steering committee which feeds back to the Principal". However, the visitors were not provided with evidence of an equality and diversity steering committee, what its role is in relation the equality and diversity policy and how it goes about fulfilling this role. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine what the equality and diversity policy is employed by the education provider, and how the implication of this policy is monitored to ensure this standard is being met.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved, including evidence of lines of responsibility and links with programme committees.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted discussions that highlighted the roles and responsibilities of some members of the programme team and management. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine the exact management structures. The visitors therefore require formal clarification of the programme management structure, including roles and responsibilities of everyone involved and the lines of responsibility. The visitors also require further details of how the committee structures support the management of the programme.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme committee structures and details of how the committee structures support the management of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted a number of references to several committees. In discussions with the programme team it was clarified that the education provider utilises a number of committees to support the management of the programme. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find evidence of committee activity. As a consequence the visitors were unable to determine how these committees operate and what role they play in monitoring and evaluating the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to determine what the regular monitoring and evaluation systems the programme is subjected to and what role the programme committees have in this process.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence of a programme for staff development to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that the education provider has a formal programme in place for staff development. The visitors also noted that the programme team gave a number of examples of where the education provider has supported staff development. However, the visitors noted that they were not provided with documentary evidence of a formal programme for staff development. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure resources are available to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the programme is largely delivered via distance learning and that the education provider has developed a range of e-learning resources to support this. It was also clear that much of the indicative content of the curriculum is available through the e-learning resources. The visitors were also made aware that students on the programme are also required to access books and journal articles to support the learning activity on the programme. However, from a tour of the education provider's resources, and in discussions with students, the visitors noted that the education provider does not provide students with access to these books.

When discussing resources with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider subscribes to 'Science Direct' and students can access five journals through this resource. The visitors articulated that some of the current provision of journals lacked currency and a specialist focus on local anaesthesia and could therefore impact on a student's ability to achieve the required learning outcomes of this programme. The visitors require the education provider to review the current provision of journal and book resources and provide further evidence as to how they will ensure that they are appropriate for this programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources provided by the education provider effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates adequate and accessible facilities that support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Reason: In discussions with students the visitors noted a number of positive comments about the support offered by the programme team. The visitors also

noted in discussions with the programme team where examples were given describing how they have supported the welfare and wellbeing of students by offering flexibility within the programme, including where appropriate, assignment extensions. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine what documented systems were in place to support the welfare and wellbeing of students and where students would find out about the support systems in place. The visitors require further evidence outlining the facilities available for student support, how the education provider tells students about these facilities and how students access the facilities..

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a formal student complaints process.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and the students the visitors noted that an informal process for student complaints was used by the education provider. The visitors were made aware that if a complaint is made that complaint can be cascaded up the education provider's management structure and dealt with formally, if required. However, the visitors could find no evidence of a formalised student complaints process and in reviewing the programme documentation were unable to find documented evidence of the process described to them in the meetings at the visit. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how a student could complain formally or how students are provided information about the complaints process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of a student complaints process, and how this [process is highlighted to students to demonstrate that this standard is met.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students may be involved in practical teaching within biomechanics and anatomy. However the visitors were unable to determine where the evidence of a consent procedure in place to mitigate any risk involved in students participating as service users was provided. The visitors require further evidence to show the consent protocols in place, how the education provider will gain students' consent, and also how they will inform students about this policy and their right to confidentiality.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that a system is in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider's admissions

protocols require students to be HPC Registered. The visitors noted in further discussions that all students must abide by the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics and any profession-related conduct issues would be referred to the HPC. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence of a process in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. As a consequence the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider makes a judgement about what constitutes a profession-related conduct concern and how academic misconduct would be dealt with. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of a formalised process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct in all settings to ensure the process is thorough, fair and open.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the practical assessment methods to ensure that it is clear for students how they can progress and achieve within the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine when the assessment of practical competencies moves from formative to summative assessment. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors were also unable to clarify the number of procedures a student will undertake, how many attempts a student is allowed to demonstrate competence and exactly what constitutes an attempt. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to provide clarity on the assessment methods that are employed to measure the practical learning outcomes.

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 provide further evidence of the regulations in place to ensure that at least one external examiner is on the HPC Register and has appropriate experience of local anaesthesia.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation the visitors noted that the current external examiner is not on the HPC Register. Through discussions with the programme team it was clarified that the external examiner will shortly be on the register and this is a requirement of the position. However, through their review of the programme documentation the visitors could not determine what appropriate experience a professional would need to have in order to take up the role of external examiner. In particular the visitors could not determine what experience an external examiner would need to have of practicing local anaesthesia and how current this experience would have to be. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the criteria the education provider recruits external examiners against and what they consider appropriate experience of local anaesthesia. In this way the visitors can determine how the regulations specify the requirements for the appointment of an external examiner who has appropriate experience and is on the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendations

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further enhance the information that is made available to applicants and students about reasonable adjustments and the support services available to individuals with certain health requirements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. The visitors noted that in the discussions with the programme team that they gave a number of examples where reasonable adjustments had been made to support students on the programme. The visitors did, however, note an apparent discrepancy between the discussions with the programme team and the information made available within the programme documentation. The visitors felt that information on reasonable adjustments and support mechanisms that the programme team were operating could be made more explicit in the programme documentation to ensure that the options and services available to individuals with health requirements are more clearly and consistently highlighted. The education provider may therefore want to consider formalising the processes in place associated with reasonable adjustments and making them more explicit in the programme documentation.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Recommendation: The education provider may want to consider introducing an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) scheme to review CPR certification.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider does not have an APEL scheme. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors also noted that all students who undertake the programme are required to complete a CPR course and the education provider makes a judgement on whether the course is appropriate. The visitors recommend that the education provider may want to consider formalising this process and consider introducing an APEL scheme to review CPR certification.

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 education provider should consider reviewing the access to books within the programme and consider holding core texts for students to access.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that students on the programme are required to access books to support the learning activity on

the programme. The visitors noted that the education provider recommends that students access a range of indicative learning resources outlined within the module descriptors. From a tour of the education provider's resources and discussions with students the visitors noted that the education provider does not provide students with access to books. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the access to books within the programme and consider holding core texts for students to access. In this way they may be able to better support student learning in all settings.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further enhance the information that is made available to students relating to the availability of tutor support.

Reason: The visitors noted a demonstration of the education provider's online virtual learning environment that allowed students to access academic and pastoral support. Through discussions with students the visitors noted that the education provider offers generous access to the programme team through the online system. The visitors did, however, note an apparent discrepancy between the discussions with the students and the information made available within the programme documentation. The visitors felt that information on access to online tutor support could be made more explicit in the programme documentation to ensure that access times are more clearly and consistently highlighted.

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

Recommendation: The education provider may want to consider reviewing the audit processes used to quality assure the practice placement environment.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider is subject to the ISO9001:2008 quality management system. From a review of the education providers practice placement setting the visitors were satisfied that a safe and supportive environment is in place. However, the visitors noted that the ISO9001:2008 quality management system is a generic business audit and does not specialise in auditing clinical settings. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider may want to consider reviewing the audit processes used to quality assure the practice placement environment to further enhance the quality audit systems. The visitors suggest that the education provider may want to consider bringing in an external advisor with expertise in auditing clinical settings.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider utilising the external examiner in practical assessments to ensure the measurement of student performance is objective and offers parity.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that they are considering having the external examiner sit in on some

practical assessments to ensure the measurement of student performance is objective and offers parity. The visitors noted that this suggestion had not yet been formalised and agreed with the external examiner. The visitors recommend that the education provider should ensure that this arrangement is formalised and the external examiner should observe some practical assessment within each student cohort.

Gordon Burrow
Paul Blakeman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University Campus Suffolk
Validating body / Awarding body	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	6 – 7 March 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 HPC keep a register of health 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 25 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 May 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 12 June 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards, programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC 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 and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC'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 HPC visitors and profession	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	12
First approved intake	September 2012
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	David Collins (University of Essex)
Secretary	Alison McQuin (University Campus Suffolk)
Members of the joint panel	Andrew Revitt (Internal Panel Member) Julie Macleod (Internal Panel Member) Sam Jarmin (Internal Panel Member) Alan Karkoska (External Panel Member) Dave Huggins (External Panel Member) Stephen White (External Panel Member) Alan Mount (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 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 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 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

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

Condition: The programme team must resubmit programme documentation once errors and omissions have been corrected and it has been approved by the education provider.

Reason: Discussions with the programme team highlighted several errors and omissions within the programme documentation submitted by the education provider. The programme team were made aware of the errors and omissions and agreed to amend the documentation in order for it to be accurate and suitable for use by students and placement providers. In order to ensure the revised programme documentation will be appropriate the visitors require the programme team to resubmit the final versions.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The programme team must ensure that operating department practice specific skills and knowledge are being adequately addressed within the IPL module groups.

Reason: During discussions with students the visitors learnt there had been occasions where operating department practice (ODP) students felt excluded within the IPL groups. The visitors learnt that students signed themselves up to the IPL module groups rather than the education provider assigning students to groups. As the ODP student body is much smaller than the other allied health professions in the IPL module the ODP students were more likely to be underrepresented within their IPL groups, sometimes being the only ODP students within their group. The visitors learnt there had been instances where the role of an ODP was not fully understood by some facilitators of the IPL module. This meant ODP students feel discouraged from undertaking some lectures in the IPL module. The visitors were concerned ODP students could not fully benefit from the IPL module if the role of an ODP, including the profession-specific skills and knowledge, was not being adequately addressed by all IPL module facilitators. They were also concerned ODP students could not benefit from discussions if they were underrepresented within IPL groups. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures ODP roles are fully understood by the IPL module group facilitators.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Condition: The programme team must submit further evidence to demonstrate there is enough support in place for students at placements and they can be assured there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff available at the placement settings.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information from the mentor database. During discussions with the placement providers the visitors learnt refresher training for any mentor overseeing students needed to be taken every two years. It was raised by the joint panel that some of the mentors on the list had not updated their training since 2007. The placement providers stated the list had not been updated recently but maintained all current mentors who were overseeing students have had their refresher training within the last 2 years. The placement providers stated the mentors on the list that did not have current refresher training were no longer active mentors, if they wished to mentor again they would have to undergo refresher mentor training before overseeing students. Without an updated version of the mentor list the visitors could not accurately determine if there was enough support in place for students at placements. The visitors were also concerned the education provider would be unable to determine the mentors who were currently active and able to oversee students and therefore be unable to be assured there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff available at the placement settings. Therefore the visitors require evidence that there is enough support in place for students at placements and that the education provider is able to demonstrate there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff available at the placement settings.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure mentors have undertaken refresher training before working with students.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information from a mentor database. During discussions with the placement providers the visitors learnt that refresher training for any mentor overseeing students needed to be taken every two years. It was raised by the panel that some of the mentors on the list had not updated their training since 2007. The placement providers stated the list had not been updated recently but maintained all current mentors who were overseeing students have had their refresher training within the last 2 years. They stated mentors on the list who did not have current refresher training were no longer mentors and they would have to undergo refresher mentor training before overseeing students. The visitors were concerned the current mechanisms in place did not frequently monitor the training status of mentors, the information provided prior and at the visit was inaccurate and out of date including on it the names of staff who were no longer mentors. The visitors require further evidence to ensure the programme team robustly checks mentors training status before students go on placement. .

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**

- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The programme team must submit evidence of the guidance to be provided for staff supervising students on surgical wards and at critical care placements.

Reason: Visitors learnt from the documentation provided prior to the visit that within the new programme students will have two new placements, a “2 week placement on a surgical ward and a 2 week placement in a critical care area” (Self-evaluation document for the periodic review). The visitors learnt through discussions with the programme team that guidance would be provided to ward staff before they oversaw any students to fully prepare them. The visitors have not been provided with the guidance to be used for these particular placement settings. The visitors need to be sure staff on the surgical wards and at critical care placements will be fully prepared for placement, including awareness of the competencies students must meet and how this should be facilitated. The visitors therefore require evidence of the placement guidance to be sure it suitably prepares practice placement providers and practice placement educators for working with students.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider could consider giving examples of 'non standard applicants' for the alternative entry routes to the programme.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met. It was stated within programme specification that 'non standard applicants' could apply to the programme. To provide additional transparency to potential applicants the visitors suggest that a few examples of the 'non-standard applicants' and entry routes to the programme could be added to the advertising material for this programme.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Recommendation: The education provider could consider uploading the number of students completed practice hours on the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)..

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met. During discussions with the students the visitors learnt some were unsure of how many practice hours they had gained and would like a simple way of checking this. To make it easier for students to find out the number of practice hours they have acquired the visitors suggest the education provider upload the number of completed practice hours on the VLE, in this way students could keep track of their completed hours regardless of where they are.

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

Recommendation: The education provider could consider reviewing how the practical aspects of the programme could be assessed in a way that reduces the duplication of assessing.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met. Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the education provider assessed the competencies within the students practice portfolio without the practice placement mentor's input. The mentors would assess competencies undertaken at placement in a separate method. The visitors felt this could lead to duplication of the students undertaking different methods to meet the different assessments of the same competencies. The visitors suggest the education provider look to reducing duplication by combining the two assessments undertaken or by having the education provider work with the placement mentor on one set of assessments.

Tony Scripps
Julie Weir

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	14 – 15 March 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 HPC keep a register of health 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 25 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 11 May 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 5 July 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC'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 HPC visitors and profession	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HPC observer	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Janet Lange (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Carolyn Johnson (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	James Battersby (Internal Panel Member) David Huggins (External Panel Member) Helen Booth (College of Operating Department Practitioners) Lloyd Howell (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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"/>
Practice documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Various committee meeting minutes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is a new programme therefore no external examiner reports exist. The education provider did submit external examiner reports' for their approved Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice programme.

During the visit the HPC 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 HPC met with students from the Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice 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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the processes in place for when a conviction is highlighted through a criminal conviction check including information of how the placement providers are involved with this process.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated a criminal convictions check was carried out upon admission to the programme. Discussion at the visit indicated any convictions were treated on a case by case basis by the programme team with the student involved. It was then highlighted convictions were not always communicated to the placement provider if the student had been allowed to continue onto the programme. The visitors were shown a school wide policy for criminal conviction checks however they could not determine how this programme applied the policy and how the placement providers would be involved in any decisions about a student with a conviction. The visitors were concerned a criminal conviction could become apparent after the student had been accepted onto the programme or was already working at the placement. The education provider would have to manage this situation and it may affect the student's ability to continue on the programme. The guidance for this standard indicates the education provider may need to consult with practice placements when a conviction is present to be sure they will accept the student. The guidance also indicates there may need to be a procedure in place if a practice placement is not willing to offer a student a place after they have already been accepted as a student on the programme.

The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the education provider has appropriate processes in place to be able to appropriately deal with a conviction that is highlighted through the criminal conviction checks and involves the placement providers where necessary.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to remove instances of incorrect admissions information and to clearly articulate successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted prior to the visit incorrect information. The programme specification document had a statement that implied the HPC set requirements for admissions to programmes – “Applicants must meet the HPC requirements for literacy, numeracy, good health and good character” (Programme Specification 16. Admissions criteria). This is incorrect as the HPC does not set requirements for admissions to programmes and could be confusing to anyone using the programme specification document. The visitors also noted the programme specification and the programme handbook did not clearly articulate that successful completion of the programme would confer eligibility to apply for HPC Registration. The visitors considered

these instances of inaccurate and incomplete information to be confusing for students. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to remove instances of incorrect information and to clearly articulate that successful completion of the programme would confer eligibility to apply for HPC Registration.

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 any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirmation the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change prior to final programme approval by HPC.

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. If any changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them 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 if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change, 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 any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirmation the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change prior to final programme approval by HPC.

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. If any changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate within the programme documentation that there is no aegrotat award policy for this programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding aegrotat award policies for the programme. Discussion with the programme team indicated the education provider does not use aegrotat awards. The visitors were satisfied with this arrangement however, to demonstrate this standard is met for this programme, the visitors require the programme team to include a statement explaining there is no aegrotat award policy for this programme, in the programme documentation.

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 at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register or that other arrangements will be agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding external examiner policies for the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the arrangements currently in place for the programme however, to demonstrate this standard is met, the visitors require documentary evidence to show recognition of HPC requirements for the external examiners.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider look to improve the resources used to support student learning.

Reason: From documentation and discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied the resources to support student learning in all settings were being effectively used. Discussion at the visit highlighted some matters the education provider could address to use the resources available more effectively. The visitors noted from the module descriptors the reading lists had books which were over 10 years old. The students indicated the education provider's referencing guidelines suggested not using texts that were over 5 years old. The visitors suggest the education provider look at updating the module reading lists to make them more useful for students.

The visitors noted the students were not using the library as much as they could be because they found it difficult to use in comparison with the smaller hospital trust libraries available whilst they are on placement. The visitors felt the library was a valuable resource for students and suggest the education provider look to encouraging students to use the library more by explaining the lay-out or providing specific library use training sessions at the beginning of the programme by the subject librarian.

The visitors additionally noted students are away on placement for a great proportion of the programme. Whilst away at placements the visitors could not determine whether there was a system in place for remote borrowing/returning of library books. Information given at the library tour suggested a system such as this was no longer in place. Information given at the senior team meeting suggested there was this system in place. The visitors suggest the education provider look to clarify if there are arrangements in place for the remote borrowing/lending of library books and if there is not look at the possibility of implementing such a system.

The visitors felt these suggestions could improve the resources available to support student learning in all settings.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider look to improve the mechanisms in place for the programme team to use to improve the resources available to support student learning.

Reason: From documentation and discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied the resources to support student learning in all settings were being effectively used. Discussion at the visit highlighted some things the education provider could do to use the resources available more effectively. The visitors noted there was some confusion between the senior team and the programme team around the money available for purchasing library books. The

senior team indicated there was a pool of money available for resources within the department and if a particular programme needed some for purchasing library books this could be easily accommodated. The programme team however were unaware of the ease of which money could be allocated for this. The visitors suggest the programme team look to clarifying the procedures for this so that the money available can be used more effectively.

Discussion at the visit indicated the library books were used by both nursing students and operating department practitioner students. This meant the availability of certain popular books was limited. The visitors also noted the majority of books were aimed for nursing students, and they considered some more books aimed at operating department practitioners would be more useful. The visitors suggest the programme team work with the subject librarian more to look at the use of the books in the library to be assured the books available for students are appropriate for operating department practitioners, sufficient in numbers and more readily available.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider look to providing students with as full a range of practice hours and practice experiences as possible.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the placement arrangements in place would provide students with enough of an experience for them to be able to meet their competencies, and so the standards of proficiency, upon completion of the programme. Discussion with the students, placement providers and programme team indicated students undertook a 'standard' working week of Monday to Friday shifts. The visitors are aware that in 'real' practice there may be other hours that are needed to be worked such as weekends, overnights, very early and very late shifts. The students stated it would be useful to be able to experience the full range through the programme and currently it is only upon request if there is a placement mentor available. The visitors are also aware that there may be a move towards role emerging developments in the future; operating department practitioners may be needed to work in environments outside of the NHS hospitals. The visitors suggest the programme team look to providing more of an experience of these different working environments for students to better equip them for their future practise.

Andrew Steel
Derek Adrian-Harris

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging (formerly BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic))
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	21 – 23 February 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 HPC keep a register of health 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 5 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 June 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 23 August 2012.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology and BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic Radiographer) Russell Hart (Therapeutic Radiographer)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	48
First approved intake	September 1991
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Denise McAlister (University of Ulster)
Secretary	Brian McArthur (University of Ulster)
Members of the joint panel	Lesley Forsyth (College of Radiographers) Sandra Shaw (College of Radiographers) Alison Wright (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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"/>
Additional programme, faculty and education provider information collated for visit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new therefore external examiners' reports do not exist. The HPC reviewed external examiners' reports from the last two years from the BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) programme.

During the visit the HPC 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 HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 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 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 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

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 education provider must provide information to indicate who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme and that this person will be agreed with the HPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine who would have overall professional responsibility for the programme and therefore were unable to determine whether they would be appropriately qualified, experienced and supported in the role. It was clarified at the visit a person could not be officially appointed to the role until the programme had been approved through the education provider's approval processes. In order to ensure this standard is met the visitors require details of who is expected to be programme leader and confirmation that if this person is not appointed the programme team will notify the HPC of the programme leader through the major change process.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to remove instances of incorrect information and to clearly articulate that any exit awards from the programme do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted prior to the visit incorrect information. The programme handbook (p29, 2.2.7 Copying and Plagiarism) has a sentence that states "SCOR [Society and College of Radiographers] and the HPC make up the JVC [Joint Validation Committee]." This is incorrect in that the HPC do not contribute to the JVC (which has not existed since the formation of the HPC in 2002). The visitors also noted there was a lack of clarity when considering the exit awards for the programme. The programme specification document clearly specifies the final award confers eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The programme specification does not clearly state that exit awards do not lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration (pB8). The visitors noted the course specific regulations (which are included in the programme handbook) did not include details about the award that confers eligibility to apply for HPC registration and the exit awards that do not lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The visitors considered the incorrect information to be confusing for students. From discussions during the visit the visitors also learnt that documentation submitted for this visit was in draft form and was due to be finalised and approved by the education provider.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to remove instances of incorrect information and to clearly articulate that exit awards from the programme do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure that upon successful completion of the programme all students' will meet the following standard of proficiency (SOP);

- 3a.1 know the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice
 - understand the radiobiological principles on which the practice of radiography is based

The education provider must additionally submit any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirmation the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change prior to final programme approval by HPC.

Reason: Documentation referenced to evidence this SOP (SOPs mapping document p48) directed the visitors to a number of different modules within the programme and documents submitted for this visit. Due to the number of references given in the SOPs mapping document the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly teach and assess the students understanding of radiobiological principles on which the practice of radiography is based. Discussion at the visit also indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the education provider. If any changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them 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 therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure all students will be able to meet the SOPS in general and SOP 3a.1 in particular their understanding of the radiobiological principles on which the practice of radiography is based, upon completion of the programme. The visitors also require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change, 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 provide further evidence to demonstrate where the learning outcomes that allow trainees to meet the following SOP are adequately assessed:

- 3a.1 know the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice
 - understand the radiobiological principles on which the practice of radiography is based

The education provider must additionally submit any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirmation the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change prior to final programme approval by HPC.

Reason: Documentation referenced to evidence this SOP (SOPs mapping document p48) directed the visitors to a number of different modules within the programme and documents submitted for this visit. Due to the number of references given in the SOPs mapping document the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly teach and assess the students understanding of radiobiological principles on which the practice of radiography is based. 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. If any changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or the assessment of the learning outcomes.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will assess the students understanding of SOP 3a.1 in particular their understanding of the radiobiological principles on which the practice of radiography is based. The visitors also require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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 that other arrangements will be agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding external examiner policies for the programme. The programme specification document (B16) did have a section for external examiner policies however there was no information regarding this particular standard. The visitors were satisfied with the arrangements currently in place for the existing programme however, to demonstrate this standard is met for the new programme, the visitors require documentary evidence to show recognition of HPC requirements for the external examiners.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider review programme documentation to ensure consistency across both radiography programmes.

Reason: The visitors were also reviewing the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programme at this event. They noted the two programmes whilst very different did however have some aspects which were very similar in terms of education provider processes which applied to both and the standard programme documentation. The visitors noted the documentation submitted did not appear to have been co-ordinated as much as it could have been. The visitors found sections which, when compared, were confusing. For example the programme specifications for both programmes include Criteria for Admission information. The BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programme describes a “criminal convictions check” whereas the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging programme describes instead a “Pre-Employment Consultancy Check”. The visitors received a placement handbook for staff for the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programme which had the aims of the course including the aim “To produce competent, safe and proactive radiographers (diagnostic or therapeutic) with a professional qualification that confers eligibility for registration with the HPC” (p4). This document was provided for the therapeutic radiography programme however refers to the diagnostic programme. The BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging programme submitted a different Practice Educator’s Handbook as part of this submission. The visitors found the differences between the programmes’ documentation to be confusing, especially as they seemed to have similar aspects to them which could be co-ordinated for an event such as this one or for anyone using the documentation or reviewing the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider consider implementing a formal forum to update practice educators about changes to the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation indicated the practice educators are appropriately trained to work with students from this programme. The visitors noted there is close communication with individual practice educators through mid-placement visits, through telephone/email communication and through committee meetings that both the programme team and the practice placements are members of. The visitors suggest a more formal forum (such as a training day or specific meeting) for updating practice educators about changes made to the programme would be a useful way of ensuring the same information is communicated to all practice educators. The visitors feel this would encourage consistency and parity across all placement settings.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider include a specific check for the registration status of practice educators into the placement auditing and monitoring process.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme has a detailed auditing and monitoring process with a form that is filled in by the placement provider and then is checked by the education provider. Through discussion it was indicated the programme team would use this process to check the registration status of the practice educators. The visitors were satisfied this would occur however to strengthen the evidence for this standard suggest the programme team include a specific section of the audit form to ensure the registration status of practice educators is being checked at the placement setting.

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 the education provider keep the assessment strategy for the programme under review.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the assessments in the modules were appropriate to assess module learning outcomes. They noted in the modules overall there were assessments which were similar types but which were weighted at a different percentage of the overall mark and some which had similar percentage weightings but were different assessment types. The assessment strategy for the programme was discussed between the programme team and the visiting panel and it was indicated the assessment strategy was in line with education provider requirements however the visitors felt it could be confusing for students and for external reviewers of the programme. The visitors recommend the programme team keep the assessment strategy under review to ensure consistency in the types of assessments across modules.

Stephen Boynes
Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology (formerly BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic))
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Therapeutic radiography
Date of visit	21 – 23 February 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 'Therapeutic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 5 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 June 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 23 August 2012.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging and BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic Radiographer) Russell Hart (Therapeutic Radiographer)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	16
First approved intake	September 1991
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Denise McAlister (University of Ulster)
Secretary	Brian McArthur (University of Ulster)
Members of the joint panel	Lesley Forsyth (College of Radiographers) Sandra Shaw (College of Radiographers) Alison Wright (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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"/>
Additional programme, faculty and education provider information collated for visit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new therefore external examiners' reports do not exist. The HPC reviewed external examiners' reports from the last two years from the BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) programme.

During the visit the HPC 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 HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

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 can be reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 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 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 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

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 education provider must provide information to indicate who will have overall professional responsibility for the programme and that this person will be agreed with the HPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine who would have overall professional responsibility for the programme and therefore were unable to determine whether they would be appropriately qualified, experienced and supported in the role. It was clarified at the visit a person could not be officially appointed to the role until the programme had been approved through the education provider's approval processes. In order to ensure this standard is met the visitors require details of who is expected to be programme leader and confirmation that if this person is not appointed the programme team will notify the HPC of the programme leader through the major change process.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme specification document to ensure it contains complete and accurate information about the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme specification document there were incomplete areas of information. The programme specification document clearly specifies the final award confers eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The programme specification does not clearly state that exit awards do not lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration (pB14). The visitors noted the programme specification document included a section on criteria for admission (B16). The admission requirements did not include any GSCE, GCE, A level or alternative qualification requirements for the programme. The visitors are aware there are qualifications required for entry to the programme.

The visitors considered the programme specification document to inform other programme documents and resources, including advertising materials, and so should have information in it to ensure correct information is passed on to these sources. From discussions during the visit the visitors also learnt that documentation submitted for this visit was still in draft form and was due to be finalised and approved by the education provider.

The visitors require the education provider to revise the programme specification document to clearly articulate exit award policies and admission requirements. The visitors also require the programme team to provide evidence of the final programme documentation after it has satisfied the requirements of the education provider.

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 any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirmation the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change prior to final programme approval by HPC.

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. If any changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them 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 if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Reason: The education provider must revise module descriptors for the modules shared between the radiography programmes to ensure they articulate the therapeutic aspects of the teaching for this professional group.

Condition: Documentation and discussion indicated the programme takes part in shared learning alongside the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging programme. For several of the modules the visitors found the module descriptors and reading lists to be based on diagnostic radiography instead of therapeutic radiography. Through discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard the shared modules would have shared teaching but would incorporate the profession-specific skills and knowledge of both professional groups. The visitors considered clarity for the therapeutic radiography students to be important so they can fully understand the objectives of the shared modules from their profession perspective. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the module descriptors for the shared modules to ensure they clearly articulate the therapeutic aspects of the teaching for this professional group.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate they have overall responsibility for placements and maintain a formal process for initially approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: Discussion and documentation detailed the management of the placements for the programme. There is one centre which hosts students on placement; the centre holds monthly meetings with the programme team. These meetings are used to ensure the placement setting continues to be effective and appropriate for the students. Discussion at the visit indicated the education

provider had no formal documented process for the approval or monitoring of placements.

The visitors were concerned that, although there were systems in place to monitor the placement, the systems did not adhere to a formal process and so there was the potential for the programme team to not have a consistent approach to monitoring or enough of an input into the monitoring of placements. This could mean the programme team are not fully maintaining a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements. The visitors are aware currently there is only the one placement setting the programme works with however discussion indicated there was the possibility of expanding the range of placements to include a new centre that is being planned. With no formal processes for approving the placements before students are placed on placement the programme team cannot be sure the new placement settings are appropriate for students.

The visitors reviewed the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging programme at this event. The visitors noted this programme has a placement form and process which they use to approve and monitor placements. The visitors suggest the programme team look at how this other radiography programme's approval and monitoring processes work and adapt them for this programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate they have overall responsibility and can maintain a formal process for initially approving and monitoring all placements.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure placement educators are appropriately registered or how other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information of how the education provider monitors the placements. The centre which hosts students on placement holds monthly meetings with the programme team. These meetings are used to ensure the placement settings continue to be effective and appropriate for the students. Discussion at the visit indicated the education provider has no formal documented process for the monitoring of placements.

The visitors were concerned that although there were systems in place to monitor the placement the systems did not adhere to a formal process and so there was the potential for the programme team to not have a consistent approach to monitoring or enough of an input into the monitoring of placements. This could mean the programme team are unable to ensure placement educators working with students are appropriately registered or from agreeing other arrangements.

The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring the students are working with a placement educator who is appropriately registered or agreeing other arrangements if this is not the case. The condition for SET 5.4 should be looked at alongside this condition as they are linked; ensuring placement educators' registration status is often included in approval and monitoring processes. The visitors require the education provider to

submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure placement educators are appropriately registered or how other arrangements are agreed.

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 any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirmation the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change prior to final programme approval by HPC.

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. If any changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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 that other arrangements will be agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding external examiner policies for the programme. The programme specification document (B18) did have a section for external examiner policies however there was no information regarding this particular standard. The visitors were satisfied with the arrangements currently in place for the existing programme however, to demonstrate this standard is met for this new programme, the visitors require documentary evidence to show recognition of HPC requirements for the external examiners.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider review programme documentation to ensure consistency across both radiography programmes.

Reason: The visitors were also reviewing the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging programme at this event. They noted the two programmes were very different however did have some aspects which were very similar in terms of education provider processes which applied to both and standard programme documentation. The visitors noted the documentation submitted did not appear to have been co-ordinated as much as it could have been. The visitors found sections which, when compared, were confusing. For example the programme specifications for both programmes include Criteria for Admission information. The BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programme describes a “criminal convictions check” whereas the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging programme describes instead a “Pre-Employment Consultancy Check”. The visitors received a placement handbook for staff for the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology programme which had the aims of the course including the aim “To produce competent, safe and proactive radiographers (diagnostic or therapeutic) with a professional qualification that confers eligibility for registration with the HPC” (p4). This document was provided for the therapeutic radiography programme however refers to the diagnostic programme. The BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging programme submitted a different Practice Educator’s Handbook as part of this submission. The visitors found the differences between the programmes’ documentation to be confusing, especially as they seemed to have similar aspects to them which could be co-ordinated for an event such as this one or for anyone using the documentation or reviewing the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider consider implementing a formal forum to update practice educators about changes to the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation indicated the practice educators are appropriately trained to work with students from this programme. The visitors noted there is close communication with individual practice educators through mid-placement visits, through telephone/email communication and through committee meetings that both the programme team and the practice placements are members of. The visitors suggest a more formal forum (such as a training day or specific meeting) for updating practice educators about changes made to the programme would be a useful way of ensuring the same information is communicated to all practice educators. The visitors feel this would encourage consistency and parity across all placement settings.

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 the education provider keep the assessment strategy for the programme under review.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the assessments in the modules were appropriate to assess module learning outcomes. They noted in the modules overall there were assessments which were similar types but which were weighted at a different percentage of the overall mark and some which had similar percentage weightings but were different assessment types. The assessment strategy for the programme was discussed between the programme team and the visiting panel and it was indicated the assessment strategy was in line with education provider requirements however the visitors felt it could be confusing for students and for external reviewers of the programme. The visitors recommend the programme team keep the assessment strategy under review to ensure consistency in the types of assessments across modules.

Stephen Boynes
Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of visit	21 – 23 February 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Speech therapist' or 'Speech and language therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 5 April 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 10 May 2012. 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 June 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 23 August 2012.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	27
First approved intake	1 September 2001
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2012
Chair	Gillian Armstrong (University of Ulster)
Secretary	Grainne Dooher (University of Ulster)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Mullan (Internal Panel Member) Claire Hartley (External Panel Member) Carol Sacchett (Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists) Dominique Lowenthal (Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC 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 HPC 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 52 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 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 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 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 programme team must revise the advertising materials for this programme to clearly articulate the cost of the HPAT test and the potential additional costs occurring from the health check.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the cost of the HPAT test was not clearly articulated to potential applicants on the education providers' website or in the programme documentation. The visitors were given a link to the HPAT test website in which applicants could find information regarding the cost; however this was not clearly made available on the website for potential applicants. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors also learnt that health checks are conducted by the education provider with no cost to the students however the costs of any additional immunisations were not covered and were dependant on whether or not the student's own GP charged for them. This potential additional cost was not articulated either within the programme documentation or for potential applicants. To ensure applicants are fully aware of all the costs associated with the programme and are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on this programme the visitors require the programme documentation to be revisited to clearly articulate all costs associated with the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit 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 advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to "State Registration" with HPC. From discussions during the visit the visitors also learnt that documentation submitted for this visit was in draft form due to be finalised and approved by the education provider. The visitors considered the terminology of "State Registration" could be misleading to students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology; they also require the programme team to provide evidence of the final programme documentation after it has satisfied the requirements of the education provider.

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 programme team must revise the marking guidance to ensure the terminology accurately reflects the threshold level required for a student to pass an assessment.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the language used within the marking guidance documents suggested a 'weak' student who had 'significant omissions' and 'limited ability' could pass various assessments. During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that this is not the case. The visitors are satisfied the threshold to pass assessments are appropriate, however they are concerned if the current marking guidance remains as it is there could be the possibility of a student passing who was underperforming and therefore not meeting the Standards of proficiency (SOPs) through the assessment of the learning outcomes. To ensure all students who pass an assessment can meet all the SOPs upon graduation the visitors require that the terminology within the marking guidance be corrected to reflect the accurate threshold levels to pass an assessment.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the title of any aegrotat awards for the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the name of the aegrotat award given to final year (honours degree) students. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that all aegrotat awards are named 'Applied Health Studies'. To ensure this standard is being met, the visitors need to see evidence that the name is clearly communicated within the programme documentation so all students are clear that the aegrotat award would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register.

Recommendations

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to carefully monitor practice placement providers to ensure practitioners are appropriately registered.

Reason: The visitors noted that currently the programme has a contract with The Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (DHSSPS) who commission all their placements. The visitors were aware the programme is seeking to increase their placement provisions which could mean some placements being outside of Northern Ireland or outside of the NHS. The visitors were satisfied the SET has been met, however recommend the programme team continue to apply appropriate monitoring procedures to ensure all placements continue to provide placement educators who are appropriately registered.

Lorna Povey
Penny Joyce