

**Health Professions Council
Education & Training Panel – 2 August 2007**

PROGRAMME APPROVAL

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The visitors have confirmed that the conditions relating to the following programmes approval have been met. The visitors are now satisfied that the programmes meet the standards of education & training and wish to recommend approval. The attached visitors' reports have been updated to reflect that the conditions have been met.

Education Provider	Programme	Mode of Study
Bangor, University of Wales	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy	Full-time Accelerated
University of Birmingham	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Full-time
University of Birmingham	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Flexible
Brunel University	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)	Full-time
University of Derby	MA Art Therapy	Full-time
University of Derby	MA Dramatherapy	Full-time
University of Dundee	Non-Medical Prescribing	Part time
Edge Hill University	DipHE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Glasgow Caledonian University	DipHE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
The Institute of Arts in Therapy & Education	MA Integrated Arts Psychotherapy	Part time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	Part-time (In service)
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	Full-time
London South Bank University	Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography	Full-time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Part time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Full time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Part-time (In service)
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography	Part-time (In service)
London South Bank University	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy	Full-time
London South Bank University	Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography	Full-time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography	Full-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	Full-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	Part time

Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Psychology & Speech Pathology	Part time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Psychology & Speech Pathology	Full-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology & Therapy	Full-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology & Therapy	Part time
Napier University, Edinburgh	Non-Medical Prescribing	Part time
Northumbria University at Newcastle	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Part time
Northumbria University at Newcastle	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Full-time
Northumbria University at Newcastle	DipHE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Northumbria University at Newcastle	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)	Full-time
Oxford Brookes University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Oxford Brookes University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Part time
University of Paisley	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences	Full-time
The Robert Gordon University	Non-Medical Prescribing	Part time
University of Salford	Post Graduate Certificate Non Medical Prescribing (Level M)	Flexible
University of Salford	Graduate Certificate Non Medical Prescribing (Level 3)	Flexible
Sheffield Hallam University	Dip Higher Education Paramedic Practice	Full-time
Staffordshire University and Keele University	DipHE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Suffolk College	DipHE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Surrey, University of	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Teesside, University of	University Certificate of Professional Development Non-Medical Prescribing	Part time
Thames Valley University	DipHE Operating Department Practice	Full-time

Decision

The panel is asked to approve the above named programmes, in line with the visitors' recommendations that the programmes now meet the standards of education and training.

Background information

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-07-23	a	EDU	PPR	Cover paper - approve programme (conditions met) - Aug 07	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

Visitors reports (29)

Date of paper

23 July 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Bangor, University of Wales
Name and titles of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full Time (Accelerated)
Date of Visit	26 April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	January 2008
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Sue Thompson (Occupational Therapist) Carol Walker (Occupational Therapist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	David Wright (Chair) Karen Chidley (Secretary)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	25
--	----

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must revise the programme documentation to reflect the University's procedure of annually monitoring CRB checks and remove the reference to state registration. (See section 11.1.1 in the documentation)

Reason: Currently the documentation refers to the previous procedure of police checks and to state registration. The documentation needs to be revised to ensure that the correct information is available to staff and students.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The programme team must provide a clear and current structural map to show where Occupational Therapy is situated in relation to the new College Structure. The team should also remove all reference to outdated and superfluous information.

Reason: The diagram in the current document is unclear and does not explain clearly the relationship between the Post-graduate diploma in Occupational Therapy and the new College structure. Also there is a diagram which refers to the School of Nursing and this is erroneous and misleading.

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition: The Programme Team must ensure that the professional suitability protocol aligns with the University of Bangor regulations and as a consequence of this the Programme team should reflect on all documentation to ensure accuracy and transparency to reflect the University of Bangor's identity.

Reason: The programme team produced the professional suitability documentation at the visit for the visitors to review, but it constantly referred to Cardiff University and was therefore not a true reflection of the University of Bangor's lead on professional suitability.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 29 June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should provide the curriculum vitae for Fiona Hill.

Reason: The curriculum vitae for this member of staff was not included in the documentation provided for the visit.

Commendations

The involvement of the service users in the development of the programme and in the teaching and learning was seen as an example of good practice.

The students' knowledge and understanding of the educational strategy employed to aid their training and their enthusiasm and their engagement with it (including the spiral curriculum and the problem Based learning) was very good.

The Commitment of the teaching and the clinical educators was clearly evidenced in the meeting with students.

The visitors applauded the Programme Teams' growth and development as an academic team and their approach to teaching and learning.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Susan Thompson

Carol Walker

Date: 30 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time / flexible
Date of visit	15 th and 16 th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist, clinician/educationalist) Kathleen Bosworth (Physiotherapist, clinician)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Anne Ruston – Chair Chris Whiteley – Secretary Nina Thompson – Education Officer, CSP Alison Chambers – Visitor, CSP (15 th May) Nesta Hartley – Visitor, CSP (16 th May)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	Approx 76
--	-----------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit advertising materials for the programme to ensure the entry criteria provides clear information for students wishing to apply for the programme.

Reason: Currently the website and university prospectus include a pre-requisite for entry of 'some physiotherapy/health care experience'. It was clear from discussions with the programme team that this terminology is explained to students who attend an open day or interview. However, the Visitors felt that this must be clarified for those students who only review the website and/or prospectus prior to applying for the programme.

and

Condition: The programme team must review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and access to the HPC Register.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation states that students 'are eligible to register with ... the Health Professions Council on graduation'. Examples of this can be found in the university prospectus and on the website. These must be updated to explain that upon graduation students are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The programme team must meet the conditions stated below under Standard of Education and Training 5: Practice Placement standards.

Reason: To provide the Visitors with further explanation and clarification about the management of the programme and how the programme team meets the Practice Placement standards, the conditions against the listed SETs must be met;

- 5.2, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.6, 5.8.1 and 5.13
- 5.5 and 5.7.2
- 5.7.1, 5.7.4, 5.8.3 and 6.5.

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme team must implement and submit appropriate protocols for gaining student consent across all areas in which students participate as patients or clients.

Reason: Currently there are verbal protocols for gaining student consent for acupuncture and grade 5 procedures. To ensure students are fully aware of the expectations of the

programme, the Visitors felt that these protocols must be expanded to cover all areas of practical or clinical teaching.

3.11 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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to clearly state which modules or elements of the programme call for mandatory attendance and the consequences of missing compulsory teaching.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook states that 'some elements of the programme are so essential that student attendance is considered mandatory' and that 'non-attendance of such mandatory elements may lead to a delay in practice placements'. The Visitors felt that this information must be revised to clearly communicate the requirements and policies to students.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment

5.3.2 The practice placement settings must provide for safe and effective practice.

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

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 must have relevant qualification and experience;

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must implement and submit policies and processes for approving, and systems for ongoing monitoring, of placements. These must show how the university ensures the placement is a safe environment, a safe and effective practice, there is adequate and appropriately qualified staff and that the placement implements and monitors equal opportunity and anti-discriminatory policies. These must be applicable for both NHS and private placements.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team it was noted that new placements are required to complete a Physiotherapy Placement Quality Review document. However, the Visitors were unclear about the policies and processes that surround initial approval and about the systems in place for monitoring placements on an on-going basis. To ensure that students have a safe and appropriate placement experience this information must be provided.

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Condition: The programme team must draft and submit contingency plans to ensure that should a short fall in the number of clinical placements occur during the course of the programme, students can be assured of continuing opportunities to meet their learning outcomes.

Reason: During the 2006/7 programme, twenty year 1 students experienced difficulties when they were told, before Easter, that their forthcoming placement was no longer available. It is recognised that this was a highly unusual situation; however the Visitors felt that the programme team must have clear processes in place to respond to a situation like this, should it happen in the future.

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.1 the learning outcomes to be achieved;

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure;

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.3 must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The programme team must submit policies and processes which ensure that all new placement educators attend a university led training day and that experienced educators attend regular university led refresher training.

Reason: From the discussions with the placement educators, students and programme team, the Visitors noted that the level of training about the learning outcomes and assessment processes was not consistent across all placement educators. In order for students to receive similar levels of feedback and assessment, the Visitors felt it was necessary for all placement educators to undertake similar levels of training.

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the placement handbook to include reference to HPC's Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Reason: Currently the placement handbook refers students to the university and professional body standards for conduct, performance and ethics. The Visitors felt that more direction to the HPC Standards is required to ensure students are aware of the thresholds they are expected to meet whilst in education and when registered.

5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the placement handbook to remove the reference to a minimum of 1000 hours of supervised placement practice to qualify for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The HPC does not stipulate a minimum number of hours for registration and as such, the placement handbook is currently misleading.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 29th June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Date
2007-05-23

Ver.
d

Dept/Cmte
EDU

Doc Type
RPT

Title
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy

Status
Final
DD: None

Int. Aud.
Public
RD: None

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Recommendation: It is recommended that if there is further development of the option modules, the programme team should update the programme documentation and forward the module descriptors to the HPC for review.

Reason: It was clear from the visit, that the programme enables students to meet HPC's Standards of Proficiency for Physiotherapy. However, there is currently uncertainty regarding the number and content of option modules and to provide students with full information prior to registration, the Visitors have recommended that if there is further development of the option modules, the programme documentation is updated and forwarded to the HPC for review.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider incorporating the reading lists in the module descriptors in the programme handbook.

Reason: From the review of WebCT, it was evident that there are comprehensive reading lists, linked to library status, for each of the modules. However, the Visitors felt that to provide students with a further source of information, the reading lists should be added to the module descriptors.

and

Recommendation: The programme team should consider incorporating journal references in the WebCT facility and in the module descriptors within the programme handbook.

Reason: While the WebCT facility provides a comprehensive reading list, the Visitors felt that this could be enhanced by including a list of journals, both on the WebCT facility and in the programme handbook.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider redrafting and resubmitting the module descriptor for Practice Placement 6 to provide further information about the portfolio and associated reflective thinking requirements.

Reason: It was clear from discussions with the programme team that the portfolio requirement in year 3 is an important area for reflective thinking. The Visitors felt that this importance was not articulated within the programme documentation and should be updated to reflect this.

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider redrafting and resubmitting the module descriptor for Developing as a Health Professional to inform students, in the learning outcomes and indicative content, that they will address HPC's Standards of Proficiency 1a.1 and 2b.5.

Reason: It was clear from discussions with the programme team that students are taught and assessed on what is required of them by the HPC (SoP 1a.1) and their ability to maintain records appropriately (SoP 2b.5) in this shared module. However, to provide students with clear information, the Visitors felt that this descriptor should be revised.

COMMENDATIONS

- The visitors wish to commend the programme team for the blended approach to running the full time and flexible route side by side.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

K Bosworth

Nicki Smith

Date: 22/05/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Name and titles of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full-time
Date of visit	30/31 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	17 th September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Sue Rugg, University of Plymouth, Occupational Therapist Sarah Johnson, University of Plymouth, Occupational Therapist
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins, Education Officer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Derek Milligan, Director of Academic Development, Brunel University (Chair) Karen Holmes, Education Officer, College of Occupational Therapists Ruth Heames, Coventry University, College of Occupational Therapists Helen Stoneley, University of Derby, College of Occupational Therapists Taeko Wydell, Social Sciences, Brunel University Anthony Blazeovich, Sport and Education, Brunel University Ruth Simpson, Brunel Business School

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	30
---	-----------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The University must put in place an interview procedure as part of its admission process to ensure that students meet all of the entry criteria, are clear about expectations, and are fully prepared for the programme.

Reason: Currently interviews are only held with prospective students in exceptional circumstances. The HPC Visitors do not believe that this process is sufficiently robust.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.7.2 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title.

Condition: The documentation must be amended to make it clear that any student completing the programme without passing the practice placement element will not receive an award with an HPC protected title.

Reason: The University currently offers intermediate awards in Therapeutic Studies, however it is not clear in the documentation that these awards also apply to those students who complete sufficient credits for the award of a Masters qualification but do not complete the practice placement element.

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

Condition: The documentation must be amended to make it clear that any student receiving an aegrotat award will not receive an award with an HPC protected title and will not be eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The programme team made it clear during discussions that a student would not be given the MSc in Occupational Therapy through an aegrotat award, however this was not clear in the documentation.

Deadline for conditions to be met:	6 July 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:	5 July 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:	1 August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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.

Recommendation: The wording of Module HH5538 should be amended to ensure that it is clear that the module is not intended to 'prepare' students for Masters level study but is designed to further develop their skills.

Reason: The HH5538 Module is currently delivered in the second year of the programme. The programme team explained that the module is not intended as a preparatory module however this was not clear in the module description.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation: Ensure the wording in the practice placement handbook makes it clear how re-assessment of practice placements will occur.

Reason: The procedures outlined in the documentation do not align with current practices, as discussed with the programme team

COMMENDATIONS

- *The programme team produced a clear and concise set of documentation that made the approval process very straight forward.*
- *Students spoke very highly of the existing programmes and the support that they have received from the programme team.*
- *The new facilities are excellent and provide an ideal learning environment for Occupational Therapy.*
- *The team's innovative and efficient approach to curriculum design and delivery is highly commendable.*

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

Sue Rugg
Sarah Johnson

Date: 1 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Name and titles of programme(s)	MA Art Therapy MA Dramatherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	6-7 February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	MA Art Therapy Philippa Brown (Art Therapist, Educationalist) Barry Falk (Art Therapist, Clinician) MA Dramatherapy Bruce Bayley (Dramatherapy, Clinician) Donald Wetherick (Music Therapist, Educationalist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dominique Davidson, Faculty Quality Manager (Chair) Hazel Punnett, Administrative Officer (Secretary)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme not visited since publication date of QAA benchmark statement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	MA Art Therapy - 16
	MA Dramatherapy - 12

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

GENERIC CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme teams must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials for both the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy to clearly articulate that the University no longer accepts criminal records checks completed by an applicant's previous employer and that a system of monitoring/declaration of criminal record status is in place.

Reason: The programme team indicated in discussion that the documentation has not been amended to reflect the intention that for the coming academic year neither programme would continue to accept criminal records checks from an applicant's previous employer. Further, though some placement providers required additional criminal records checks prior to placement, the Visitors felt that not all students may be provided with the opportunity to either be checked or declare a change in status of a criminal record unless the University of Derby implemented some form of monitoring process.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: The programme teams must submit documentation to evidence the physical facilities in place at Britannia Mill for the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy programmes. The documentary evidence to show the progress of the refurbishment project should contain photographs and a statement of progress relating to relevant art therapy and dramatherapy specific facilities. In particular, for the MA Dramatherapy programme, the programme team must evidence how the historical problem of noise from dramatherapy groups has been overcome.

Reason: At the visit, the panel was shown the new facilities at the Markeaton campus, which can be utilised for both programmes through the University of Derby central timetable. However, the proposed facilities at Britannia Mill campus were not in place as the refurbishment project had not yet commenced. Given the Britannia Mill campus will be the site of profession specific teaching facilities, the Visitors felt that some evidence of completion of this refurbishment process is required.

From the documentation and through discussion, the Visitors also became aware that there were historic problems arising from noise from dramatherapy groups. The Visitors felt that this issue could be tackled in the new facilities and felt the programme team needed to evidence how this was one of considerations made in the refurbishment project.

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme teams must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation for the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy to clearly articulate in the protocol for obtaining student consent that students may be participating as patients, clients or colleagues.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-02-20	a	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - University of Derby MA Art Therapy-MA Dramatherapy	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Reason: In the student learning contract, there was not a reference to consent for participation as patient, client or colleague. The Visitors felt within the programme there would be many occasions, such as role-play or reflective group discussions where this consent would need to be obtained.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

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

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

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

Condition: The programme teams must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation for the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy to include an objective marking scheme that articulates the attainment of the standards of proficiency for arts therapists within pass criteria.

Reason: In discussion, it became clear the University of Derby were in the process of adding detail to marking schemes throughout the institution as the previous university-wide standard was felt to require more information. The Visitors also felt the programmes required more developed marking schemes in order to ensure students obtained the threshold attainment levels for meeting the standards of proficiency within the boundaries of a pass mark.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programmes teams redraft and resubmit the programme documentation for the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must come from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The programme documentation indicated the current external examiners for both programmes are appropriately registered, however, to ensure that future appointees are correctly registered, the Visitors felt the definitive programme documentation should make clear this stipulation.

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

MA Dramatherapy

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Condition: The dramatherapy programme team must redraft and resubmit the recommended reading lists from the module descriptors to evidence an update of the library stock to include a wider range of contemporary psycho-analytic and psycho-therapeutic literature.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-02-20	a	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - University of Derby MA Art Therapy-MA Dramatherapy	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Reason: The Visitors felt the recommended reading list did not recommend a sufficient range of psycho-analytic and psycho-therapeutic texts to direct students towards the theoretical basis of, and the range of approaches to, assessment and intervention (SoP 3a.1)

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition: The dramatherapy programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that students may approach individuals registered with the British Association of Dramatherapists for personal therapy.

Reason: The programme documentation indicated a disparity between the requirements for personal therapy for both programmes. The Visitors felt that dramatherapy students should have the option to seek personal therapy with individuals registered from the relevant professional body in the guidance issued by both programmes.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 24th May/21st June

Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

For approval of report: 31st May 2007

For approval of programme: 5th July / 2nd August 2007

GENERIC RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place.

Recommendation: The MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy programme teams should consider devolving the personal tutor allocations away from the programme leader and to other members of academic staff.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent that the programme leaders for MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy were both personal tutors to all students registered on the respective programmes. Also through discussion, it was clear that students utilised all staff associated with the programmes for academic and pastoral support. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the workload could be appropriately spread amongst the academic staff.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.7.2 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Recommendation: The MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy should consider relocating the workload for clinical placement co-ordination away from the programme leader.

Reason: Through discussion, it became clear there were historic problems with placement co-ordination. Although much work had been done to ensure placement allocation occurred on time, the Visitors felt that by devolving the responsibility for placement co-ordination to another member of staff, improvements would be accelerated as more time could be dedicated to placement co-ordination.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-02-20	a	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - University of Derby MA Art Therapy-MA Dramatherapy	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Recommendation: The MA Art therapy and MA Dramatherapy programme teams should consider developing a more comprehensive agenda for training opportunities for placement providers.

Reason: Through discussion with the placement providers, it became clear, although attendance at training days is difficult to achieve owing to work commitments, placement providers would value the opportunity to attend the University for a full day of training. It was also suggested that the placement providers would appreciate the academic discussion of current practice at these events to add value.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider other forms of assessment across a range of assessment types throughout the whole programme.

Reason: The Visitors felt the programme exhibited an over-dependency on written essays as a method of assessment when other assessment methods might be utilised. In particular, through discussion the students suggested they would be very much in favour of differing assessment methods, such as tutor assessment within supervision groups or assessment of a solo autobiographical performance.

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

MA Dramatherapy

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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.

Recommendation: The dramatherapy programme team should accelerate the development in the programme of wider theoretical perspectives from a variety of psycho-analytic and psycho-therapeutic theories.

Reason: The Visitors noted the achievements of developing an integrated approach in the dramatherapy programme. However, it was felt that this should be accelerated to give students greater access to a wider range of theories.

4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Recommendation: The dramatherapy programme team should review the group size for year 1 supervision groups and tutorials.

Reason: The Visitors felt the current number of students in supervision groups for dramatherapy was significantly higher than they would normally expect. The Visitors

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-02-20	a	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - University of Derby MA Art Therapy-MA Dramatherapy	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

considered that smaller groups would aid the reflective process by ensuring individuals all had greater opportunity to contribute to discussion.

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-02-20	a	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - University of Derby MA Art Therapy-MA Dramatherapy	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- the enormous volume of work channelled into ensuring consistency in placement co-ordination over the last two years and the hard work of the wider programme teams.
- the lively, enthusiastic and honest student group whom were met in the meeting with students.
- the placement providers for their high level of awareness of their responsibilities for teaching and learning and their evident satisfaction with and commitment to the working relationship with University of Derby

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

MA Art Therapy
Philippa Brown
Barry Falk

MA Dramatherapy
Bruce Bayely
Donald Wetherick

Date: 19/02/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Dundee
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Part time
Date of Visit	26 April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jim Pickard, Podiatrist Patricia Fillis, Radiographer
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr James Newton, Chair Professor Gary Mires Karen Stansfield (NMC) Jennifer Donachie (Secretary) Gill Tooze (Secretary)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *	<input type="checkbox"/>

* Note: the Visitors met with Librarian and viewed written summary of library resources. The Visitors also viewed Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) during meetings but did not feel given the content of the programme that a visit to the clinical teaching facilities was required.

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	35 x 2
--	--------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make, or to take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The course team must revise all documentation (including the Programme Specification, Student Handbooks and Course Fact sheet) to clearly differentiate between levels 9 and 11. This information must address the differences in the teaching and learning strategies and its assessment.

Reason: The programme enables students to be able to undertake level 9 or level 11 study to obtain the same award. The difference between the levels of study and their assessment must be clearly articulated in order for students to be able to make an informed choice about the level of study they wish to undertake.

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The HEI admissions procedure must make explicit that all applicants must have been subject to a CRB (enhanced disclosure) check.

Reason: The current admission procedure assumes that a student who is currently a registered practitioner will have an up to date CRB check. A system needs to be put in place to ensure that the employer signs that the CRB check has been completed and kept up to date.

2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including compliance with any health requirements

Condition 3: The HEI admissions procedure must make its procedure for ensuring that all applicants have been subject to a positive health check explicit in the documentation.

Reason: The process for ensuring that all entrants to the programme have demonstrated that they have been subject to a positive health check was not evident in the programme specification.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition: The HEI must document and implement a structured programme to approve, monitor and quality assure all practice placement sites and ensure effective teaching and learning on placement.

Reason: There was no evidence that the HEI had a robust system in place (such as undertaking placements visits or establishing regular, formal correspondence with placement providers) for the adequate monitoring of placements. The HEI cannot rely upon previous good experience, or on the efforts of the student in relation to other education programmes, in determining that the placement is adequate to meet HPC's standards. The HEI also cannot rely on a student's status as an employee with a practice placement provider.

Deadline for conditions to be met:	22 June 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:	12 June 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:	2 August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

6.7.5 The HEI must ensure that one external examiner of the programme is an AHP from the relevant part of the HPC register.

Condition: That before an external examiner is appointed the course team liaise with the HPC to establish the credentials required to meet HPC standards.

Reason: The programme team currently intends to appoint an external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC register, however the HPC is currently consulting on a change to this standard so before an external examiner is appointed the HEI should check the latest requirements.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The sharing of good practice across all of the HEIs in Scotland through working parties is commended.
2. The individual approach to tailor the teaching and learning to meet the clinical needs of the individual learner is also an example of very good practice.
3. The ongoing work with NES Scotland with regard to e-Learning is commended.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training. We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Jim Pickard
Patricia Fillis

Date: 26 April 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	1 st – 2 nd May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr Alan Mount – Professional Lead in ODP & Critical Care – Canterbury Christ Church University Mr Nick Clark – Senior Lecturer - HSHS
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ms Wendy Cooke - (Chair) - Secondary ICT programme leader - Faculty of education - Edge Hill University Mr Edmund Harrison (secretary) – Academic Quality Officer Ms Angela Birchall - Journalism - Faculty of Arts & Sciences – Edge Hill University Mr James Caveney – ODP course director – University of Wales Bangor

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	100
---	------------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition:

The programme team should amend the statement within the admissions criteria to indicate that there is an English IELTS level for overseas students to meet on entry

Reason:

The current admissions criterion does not include a statement on English language requirements for overseas students. The HPC does not have a specific entry level requirement. There is an expectation that students must reach IELTS 7.0 on completion of the programme, as there is a requirement for them to meet the Standards of Proficiency, requirement under 1.b.4.

Condition 2

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition:

The programme team must review the documentation to include the term 'enhanced' when referring to CRB checks

Reason:

References made within the documentation referring to CRB checks were inconsistent in stating the students will be required to complete an 'enhanced' CRB clearance check. This needs to be clearly stipulated and consistent within the documentation.

Condition 3

2.3 The admission procedures must ensure that the education provider has an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition:

The programme team must submit a clear equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy from the university.

Reason:

The visitors were unable to see clear evidence of an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy from the university. Documentation must be submitted which clearly presents that a policy within the university is in place.

Condition 4

SET 3 Programme Management and Resource Standards

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition:

The programme team must redraft and submit documentation to include a form utilised to obtain consent from students prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, e.g. role plays, practicing profession-specific techniques.

Reason:

The documentation lacked evidence which insured that this standard is met. A consent mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that potential candidates are aware of the expectations of the programme regarding the level of participation expected by and from the student.

Condition 5:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition:

The programme team must include within the module descriptors reference to HPC, in particular HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics and reference to the HPC website.

Reason:

Within the module descriptors, such as within the list of learning resources, there were no references made to HPC. This should be included so that students are aware of the importance and allocation of HPC information.

Condition 6:

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:

5.3.1 a safe environment; and for

5.3.2 safe and effective practice.

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

Condition

The programme team must review and submit an up to date audits for clinical placements.

Reason:

The visitors were unable to view any recent clinical audits at the event which would have enabled them to determine whether the above SETs were being met. An up to date clinical audit would clearly demonstrate the approval and monitoring of placements.

Condition 7

5.8.2 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators are must be appropriately registered.

Condition:

The programme team must review and submit a clear and up to date mentor list which includes mentors registered qualifications.

Reason:

It was difficult to see within the documentation, clear up to date information regarding placement mentor staff, such as who they are and what qualifications they hold. Through the use of a clear mentor list it would enable the visitors to determine whether this SET has been met.

Condition 8

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.2 for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title.

Condition:

The programme team must amend and resubmit the first paragraph within the briefing paper for the validation document to be changed from 'students' who successfully complete the programme will be able to register', it should be 'will be eligible to apply for registration'. This also applies to the paragraph in the validation submission document, section 2.2, page 12.

Reason:

Terminology used within the documentation was misleading for it implied that registration is automatic after the completion of the programme which is incorrect. Students should be made aware that registration is not automatic and that on completion of the programme they will be eligible to apply for registration with HPC.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements

Recommendation:

Encourage the practice to include a follow up on health checks in years 2 and 3.

Reason:

At present students do not have to carry out any additional health checks once they are on the programme. An additional screening for health checks would ensure any changes to students' health would be picked up.

Recommendation 2

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation

The visitors recommend continuing to undertake the intention to appoint the additional members of staff to support the large cohort of students.

Reason:

There should always be an assurance that there is enough staff to deliver the programme effectively, without compromising our standards and that there is an adequate balance between staff and students.

Recommendation 3:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation:

To ensure that the current resources available at Aintree campus are transferred successfully over to the new site and this is included within the HPC annual monitoring process.

Reason:

It is important for students to continue to have access to resources to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme during and after the move to the new site.

Recommendation 4

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation:

To review the Inter-professional learning within the programme to be more integrated.

Reason

The Visitors were assured that students were exposed to inter-professional learning; however it was not formally integrated within the programme. The visitors' encourage the development of inter-professional learning to be more embedded within the programme.

Recommendation 5:**SET 5. Practice placements standards**

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

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 must have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation:

To review those current mentors who are currently D32/D33 qualified to be a priority to undertake the full mentor award.

Reason:

Mentors should possess the knowledge, skills and experience to support students and ensure they have a safe environment for effective learning. It would greatly aid those mentors who currently do not possess a mentor award to undertake one, enhancing their skills for this specific role.

Recommendation 6:**SET 6. Assessment standards**

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation:

To review the making and timely feedback of assignments given to students.

Reason:

In light of students' comments, it was strongly felt that many would have improved in their assignments if they had received feedback of previous assignments earlier.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Mr Alan Mount



Mr Nick Clark

Date: 14th May 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education in Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	17 and 18 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Maria Boutabba (ODP) Penny Joyce (ODP)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mrs Irene Bonnar (Chair) Associate Dean Quality Built Environment Miss Cheryl Cooper (External) Edge Hill University Ms Karen Thomson (Internal) Associate Dean Quality School of Life Sciences Gill Paterson (Secretary) Quality Office

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT facilities	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	15
---	-----------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must provide a copy of the new CRB criteria that indicates self declaration at level 2.

Reason: At the meeting with the programme team the panel discussed with the team the issue around the continuing currency of the CRB procedure. The team have developed a new form for the students to complete at level 2 as self declaration and the visitors have asked to see a copy of this new form to satisfy the requirement of SET 2.2.2.

2.3 ensure that the education provider has an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must remove all references to “mature” entry in all documentation.

Reason: All documentation needs to be revised to remove the reference to “mature” entry to ensure the documentation reflects the current equal opportunities legislation.

SET 6. Assessment standards

Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements:

6.7.2 for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title;

Condition: The programme team must ensure that the exit award (Certificate of Higher Education) does not include the protected title of “Operating Department Practice”

Reason: Currently the documentation has the protected title listed against the exit award.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 30 June 2007

Expected date visitors’ report submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2 August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The programme team should reflect more contemporary literature on the indicative reading in all modules.

Reason: The indicative reading in modules is limited and does not reflect current Literature available for Operating Department Practice and Perioperative Care.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The University should explore opportunities for wider inter-professional learning for ODPs.

Reason: At the meetings with the Senior Management, Students and the programme team it became apparent that although the mapping documents had indicated that there was no inter-professional learning happening, there was evidence that inter-professional learning was occurring in practice. The visitors felt that the University did have an opportunity for the ODP students to share learning with other relevant professions within the student community at Glasgow Caledonian University.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should formalise the audit process as part of the quality review cycle.

Reason: This part of the audit process was happening, but was not documented.

COMMENDATIONS

The visitors commend the team on the formative tripartite assessment procedure.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

Maria Boutabba

Penny Joyce

Date: 21 May 2007

Visitors' Report

Name of education provider	Institute of Arts in Therapy & Education
Validating body	London Metropolitan University
Name and titles of programme(s)	MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	12/13 July 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2008
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Donald Wetherick (Music Therapist) David Edwards (Art Therapist) Eileen Thornton (Physiotherapist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mark Maybe (Chair)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A

Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	20
---	-----------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: IATE should submit the information, which is given to prospective students about the programme. This information should include details about the travel and cost implications of placements, the requirements for CRB and health checks and an explanation of the role and relationship with HPC in terms of approving the programme and providing eligibility to register as an Art Therapist or Art Psychotherapist.

Reason: The documentation currently available to prospective students does not include CRB and health requirements as part of the admissions procedure, nor did it provide detailed information on placements. It was felt that prospective students should be aware of the potential relocation and/or increased travel costs associated with placements at the earliest opportunity. From the meeting with the students, it was apparent that there was still some confusion over the role of the HPC and the specific protected title that graduates would be eligible to use. The Visitors acknowledged that the current publications had been designed to meet the requirements of UKCP registration, but felt that in order to meet this Standard; they needed to be satisfied that future applicants would be fully prepared for the experience and expectations of their Art Therapy training programme.

The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including 2.2.5 accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The documentation given to students must be revised to reflect the common understanding of APL (as defined in London Metropolitan University's regulations) and the course-specific regulation that this programme operates under, which means that APL is not available.

Reason: There is currently an inconsistency between the use of the term 'APL' as defined in London Metropolitan University's regulations and that referred to in IATE's policy document. Through discussions, it became apparent that London Metropolitan University has validated the programme with a course-specific regulation that did not permit students to claim APL on this programme. It was felt that it needed to be made explicit to students that there was no mechanism for APL and that course-specific regulation superseded London Metropolitan University's regulations.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: The core programme team must include at least one appropriately qualified Art Psychotherapist or Art Therapist.

Reason: The core programme team currently includes a number of Drama Therapists, but no Art Psychotherapist, or Art Therapist. Given the professional identity of Art Therapy and the increased focus on visual art, it was felt that at least one Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist was essential to delivering an effective Art Therapy programme. In discussion, the programme team explained that they had already entered into discussion with an Art Psychotherapist about joining the programme team.

3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well-being of students must be both adequate and accessible.

3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place.

Condition: The documentation given to students must be revised so that both applicants and students are aware of the facilities and support which is available to them through the partnership with London Metropolitan University.

Reason: Throughout the duration of the visit, it became evident that a great deal of support and facilities (both academic and welfare) were available through London Metropolitan University to students on this programme. However, from the tour of facilities and meeting with the students, it was obvious that the support and facilities at London Metropolitan University were not being fully promoted or utilised. The Visitors had no concerns about the adequacy of the facilities and support available to students, but felt that the full range of facilities should be made more accessible to students.

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must clarify how they ensure students have access to adequate resources in placements.

Reason: Currently, students are responsible for supplying their own resources (e.g. paint, materials) whilst on a placement. There is no requirement on the placement provider to provide resources. The Visitors acknowledged that IATE allowed students to take resources from their supplies, but felt that there should be a mechanism in place to ensure a parity of experience at all placements.

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Condition: IATE must enhance their IT facilities available to students on the programme.

Reason: IATE currently only has one PC station dedicated to students on site. The visitors acknowledged that many students had their own laptops and PCs at home, however, they felt that additional resources should be available to allow students to be able to access on-line resources (e.g. library catalogue, London Metropolitan University's virtual learning environment) whilst on site. Given the attendance patterns and timetabling, there could be up to 40 students wishing to use the IT facilities at any one time.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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: IATE must revisit the documentation so that it is clear where the Standards of Proficiency - 1b.3, 2b.4 and 1b.4 are met.

Reason: There was much discussion about where the students covered these Standards, both in the taught part of the programme and the placements. The visitors were satisfied that the Standards were covered, however they felt that the documentation needed amending so that it was explicit from the learning outcomes and award requirements that they were guaranteed to be met by all graduates.

SET 5. Placements standards

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

Condition: IATE must devise a system to ensure that placement liaison officers are appropriately qualified.

Reason: There are currently no requirements on the background and qualifications of the individuals who take up the role of 'placement liaison officer'. During the meeting with placement providers, the visitors learnt that in some instances, the placement liaison officer was a psychotherapist, or Arts Therapist, but in others, it was a person in a position of management or administration within the placement organisation. When questioned, those in the latter group felt that it would be inappropriate for them to be signing off reports on student performance, which would contribute towards a student's final award and eligibility to practice. The visitors

agreed and felt that a mechanism was needed to ensure that where staff in placements were expected to comment on students' progress and ability to meet specific learning outcomes, their suitability was assessed and monitored against set criteria.

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

Condition: IATE must provide detailed information on how visits to placements will be developed and implemented as part of their system for approving and monitoring placements.

Reason: The programme team explained verbally that they intended to visit placements in the future, now that the placement officer position was secured. They envisaged the visits taking place annually and including a meeting with the student and placement liaison officer and a tour of facilities. The visitors explored this development in the meeting with the placement providers and it was received enthusiastically. The placement providers praised the new tutor handbook and welcomed this addition of face-to-face interaction at the location of the placement. The visitors felt that these proposed visits needed to be developed as a priority to ensure a parity of standards across all placements.

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement, which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: IATE must provide more guidance on the assessment procedures and communication between students and their placement liaison officer.

Reason: During the meetings with the students and the placement providers, it became apparent that there were variations in practice across placements in some areas. When the placement liaison officers were asked what they would do if a student were underperforming and risking failure, there was a variation in responses. Likewise, when students were asked how often they spent with their placement liaison officers, there was a marked difference from once a term to fortnightly. The visitors felt that IATE needed to take responsibility for ensuring a consistent approach by providing more information on the learning outcomes for a successful placement.

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: IATE must revisit the expectations of, and the required training for those individuals who take up the role of 'placement liaison officer'.

Reason: There are currently no requirements on the background and qualifications of the individuals who take up the role of 'placement liaison officer'. During the meeting with placement providers, the visitors learnt the role could be undertaken by someone who is a psychotherapist, or Arts Therapist, as well as by someone who is within a position of management or administration within the placement organisation. Given the significance of this role and the contribution towards assessment, the visitors felt that careful consideration needed to be given to who was appropriate to take up this role and what support would be necessary for them from IATE.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition: IATE must revise the assessment design to require that at least two practical assessments are undertaken using the art-therapy modality specifically. Both assessments must use the visual art modality and at least one of these assessments must be in the final year of training and no more than one may use the sandplay modality.

Reason: In order to ensure that graduates of the programme are fit to practise as Art Therapists/Art Psychotherapists it is necessary that they are assessed specifically in this modality before the end of their training. The Visitors noted that the programme teaches a range of therapeutic modalities, including art therapy, and that the existing assessment design does not specify the arts modalities that will be assessed. This condition will ensure that future graduates will all have to demonstrate specific competency in the art therapy modality before graduation. The Visitors consider that sandplay alone does not demonstrate a sufficient range of art therapy competencies, and so the condition requires that at most one of the two art therapy assessments may use this modality.

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: IATE must revise the assessment design and procedures across the programme to ensure that the award of MA is synonymous with meeting the Standards of Proficiency.

Reason: The programme is currently designed to meet the requirements of UKCP registration, which includes a period of further training and assessment after the award

of MA. Registration with the HPC operates differently; the award of MA provides eligibility to register, there is no further assessment by an external body on a graduate's fitness to practice. To this end, the requirements for the MA award must include checks and balances to ensure that a graduate can practise safely and effectively. During the meeting with the programme team, it was agreed that various components of assessment in the current programme (e.g. 'personal readiness', the clinical supervisor reports, and placement attendance reports) would need to be incorporated into the assessment design of the MA. There was an acknowledgement that the timing and criteria of the clinical placement exam would need to be readdressed too.

6.7.3 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register; and

Condition: IATE must revisit their assessment regulations so that it is explicit that an aegrotat award does not to provide eligibility to register with the HPC.

Reason: The requirements for an aegrotat award are defined in London Metropolitan University's regulations, but there is nothing in IATE's policy document to suggest that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to register with the HPC. The visitors felt that it needed to be made explicit to students that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to register with the HPC. An aegrotat award could still be conferred as long as students were aware that it could not be recognised for professional regulation.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: IATE must ensure that an External Examiner from the Art Therapy part of the Register is appointed.

Reason: The current external examiner is not an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist. During the meeting with the programme team, there were discussions about whether a replacement or second external examiner should be appointed and IATE agreed to discuss this issue further with London Metropolitan University, taking the regulatory, financial and succession planning implications into consideration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: TBC
Report to be submitted to Approvals Panel/Committee on 10 October 2006

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation: IATE should consider including an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist interview process.

Reason: The core programme team currently includes a number of Drama Therapists, but no Art Psychotherapist, or Art Therapist. Once an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist has been appointed to the programme team, the visitors felt that they should be involved in the interview process to help assess applicants' potential in the visual arts. This recommendation is in line with the QAA subject benchmark statements.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Recommendation: IATE should continue the internal process of reviewing the remit and membership of their management committees.

Reason: The visitors were pleased with the self-critical approach adopted by IATE that had led them to review their management structure to ensure transparency and reduce conflicts and wished to encourage it early completion.

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

Recommendation: IATE should consider how the appointed Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist is best utilised in the delivery of the programme.

Reason: The core programme team currently includes a number of Drama Therapists, but no Art Psychotherapist, or Art Therapist. Before an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist is appointed, the visitors felt that the programme team should carefully consider how their experiences were best used, given that they could contribute to a range of areas (e.g. admissions, teaching, learning, assessment, placements).

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

Recommendation: IATE should maximise the staff development opportunities available to them at London Metropolitan University, especially in the areas of research and teaching development.

Reason: Through the meeting with the senior team, it became apparent that there was a range of staff development opportunities available to IATE staff at London Metropolitan University. The visitors felt that all staff should be encouraged to take up these opportunities especially in research development.

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: IATE should take advantage of the resources available to them at London Metropolitan University and review and enhance their stock of journals specific to art therapy.

Reason: During the tour of facilities, it was clear that a number of resources available through London Metropolitan University were not being fully utilised (e.g. electronic journals, inter-library loan facilities). There was also some confusion over the full stock of art therapy journals and this was reflected in their absence in reading lists.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Recommendation: IATE and London Metropolitan University should consider the programme's alignment with the QAA subject benchmarks at the next revalidation of the programme.

Reason: At the next revalidation of this programme, the programme should be an approved Art Therapy programme and therefore it would be good practice to consider the programme alongside the subject benchmarks when determining its fitness for award.

4.5 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: IATE and London Metropolitan University should consider including an Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist as an external specialist at the next revalidation of the programme.

Reason: At the next revalidation of this programme, the programme should be an approved Art Therapy programme and therefore it would be good practice to include an independent Art Psychotherapist/Art Therapist to scrutinise the programme and offer advice on the currency of the curriculum.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: IATE should consider broadening and deepening their placement opportunities.

Reason: During the meeting with placement providers, it was apparent that not all placements would offer students the opportunity to work with Arts Therapists. The visitors were aware of the difficulties of finding suitable placements, but wished to encourage IATE to develop more opportunities for placements in art therapy settings.

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

Recommendation: IATE should consider developing a tri-partite contract between the student, placement provider and themselves.

Reason: The idea of a contract was discussed during the meetings with the placement providers and programme team and was felt to provide an additional safeguard to ensuring the roles and responsibilities of all parties were clearly understood.

Commendations

- The clarity of the marking criteria
- The emphasis based on ethical conduct and standards throughout the programme.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Donald Wetherick

David Edwards

Eileen Thornton

Date:

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography PG Dip Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	BSc = Full time/Part time in service PG Dip = Full time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	BSc = September 2007 PG Dip Diagnostic Radiography = September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair) Catherine Moss (Secretary) Mr John Newton Society and College of Radiographers Professor Mike Molan LSBU Professor Geoffrey Elliott LSBU Lisa Greatrex LSBU

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc 67 P G Dip 10
---	------------------------------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 1. *Level of qualification for entry to the Register*

The Council normally expects that the **threshold** entry routes to the Register will be the following:

- 1.1.1 PG Dip/MSc degree with honours for the following professions:
- Diagnostic radiography

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that the PGDip is the HPC approved qualification for entry onto the register, not the MSc.

Reason: Currently the PGDip is an exit award for those who do not complete the entire MSc, however the University only seeks HPC approval for the PGDip, not the entire MSc. The documentation for the PGDip therefore needs to be separated from the documentation for the MSc.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: Three months before the programme commences a written statement explaining what student numbers, timing and resource allocation will be required, together with an explanation of any impact this will have on other existing programmes.

Reason: The University have indicated that the programme is not likely to start until September 2008 and could not provide firm information on the impact the programme is likely to have on the commissioning numbers for other programmes or on the resources available to other programmes.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition: The learning outcomes of the PGDip modules should be revised to ensure that they are consistent with the level expected of an M level programme.

Reason: The current learning outcomes are insufficiently different from the BSc to justify its higher level status.

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The assessment requirements for each module should be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with the revised learning outcomes.

Reason: The current assessment is inconsistent with the requirements of an M level programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

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

Recommendation: Criminal conviction and health checks could be updated on an annual basis, or students could be asked to complete an annual self declaration.

Reason: Currently CRB checks and health checks are required before the programme commences, however there does not appear to be any mechanism to ensure these are kept up to date.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: Access to IT facilities and internet access should be equally available to all students on practice placement.

Reason: After discussion with the students it became evident that the internet access was variable in the hospital setting due to the various restrictions imposed by the trusts on access. This means that some students were unable to access the internet and specifically Blackboard as often as they wished.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Recommendation: Where the BSc (Hons) and the PG Dip are delivered jointly, the programme team should consider the learning and teaching approach is appropriate for the academic level.

Reason: The visitors noted that there could be an issue of an inappropriate academic level being taught when the two groups have shared learning.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation: There should be equity of experience across all placements.

Reason: Currently students are not necessarily having the same placement experience and this could result in inadequate learning outcomes for the students on placements.

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation; There should be closer monitoring of student clinical progress.

Reason: This should ensure that all the learning outcomes for the placements are achieved at the appropriate stages.

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.1 the learning outcomes to be achieved;

Recommendation: Students need to be better informed of their responsibilities on placements.

Reason: Discussions with students and representatives from clinical placements indicated on occasion students and clinical staff were unaware of the learning outcomes of specific placements. The students by knowing their responsibilities on placement will know what their own learning outcomes are.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Recommendation: Feedback on student assessments should be more explicit.

Reason: **To facilitate the student learning experience. Students felt that, used on their own, generic marking schemes were not very helpful as a form of assignment feedback. They found additional comments by lecturers more useful.**

COMMENDATIONS

1. The module guidelines and clinical portfolios are excellent.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Linda Mutema
Shaaron Pratt**

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	BSc (Hons) Fulltime and Part-time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	BSc (Hons) Part time September 2007 BSc (Hons) Full time approximately September 2008
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Carol Lloyd, Occupational Therapist Claire Brewis, Occupational Therapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair), London South Bank University Catherine Moss (Secretary), London South Bank University Jan Jenson, College of Occupational Therapists Ms Mary Gottwald College of Occupational Therapists Professor Mike Molan, London South Bank University Professor Geoffrey Elliott, London South Bank University Lisa Greatrex, London South Bank University

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme BSc (Hons) Full time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme BSc (Hons) Part time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc (Hons) Part time = 48 BSc (Hons) Full time to be confirmed
---	---

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The documentation for the BSc (Hons) programme needs to be revised to make it clear that completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC; it does not automatically confer or entitle the student to HPC registration.

Reason: Currently the documentation could leave students with the impression that HPC registration is an automatic entitlement at the end of the programme.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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 HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics must be formally incorporated into the teaching content of the pre-placement modules of the BSc (Hons) programmes.

Reason: The HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics are as relevant to students as to practitioners, and this is not clearly stated in the document.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition: The documentation for the BSc (Hons) must be revised to make explicit how learning disabilities are integrated into the programme.

Reason: It is currently unclear how this content is incorporated into the modules.

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Condition: The module content for OTP-M-1-02 must be revised to include an indicative content as well as learning outcomes.

Reason: The current indicative content is identical to the learning outcomes.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The BSc (Hons) documentation should be revised to make explicit where the re-takes of practice placements occur.

Reason: This information is not clear in the documentation.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title;

Condition: The programme documentation should be revised to make it clear which programmes provide eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The current documentation is not clear.

**Deadline for Conditions to be met:
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:**

**29 June 2007
2 August 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

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

Recommendation: Criminal conviction and health checks could be updated on an annual basis, or students could be asked to complete an annual self declaration.

Reason: Currently CRB checks and health checks are required before the programme commences, however there does not appear to be any mechanism to ensure these are kept up to date.

COMMENDATIONS

- 1. The one day conference including students and practice placement providers was excellent practice.**
- 2. The tripartite agreement between students, placement providers and the university was very clear and an excellent example of good practice.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Carol Lloyd
Claire Brewis**

Date: 9 March 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	BSc (Hons) Part-time – In service
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	BSc (Hons) Part time In Service September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Carol Lloyd, Occupational Therapist Claire Brewis, Occupational Therapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair), London South Bank University Catherine Moss (Secretary), London South Bank University Jan Jenson, College of Occupational Therapists Ms Mary Gottwald College of Occupational Therapists Professor Mike Molan, London South Bank University Professor Geoffrey Elliott, London South Bank University Lisa Greatrex, London South Bank University

Scope of visit (*please tick*)

New programme BSc (Hons) Full time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme BSc (Hons) Part time	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc (Hons) to include Part time in service = 48
---	--

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The documentation for the BSc (Hons) programme needs to be revised to make it clear that completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC, it does not automatically confer or entitle the student to HPC registration.

Reason: Currently the documentation could leave students with the impression that HPC registration is an automatic entitlement at the end of the programme.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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 HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics must be formally incorporated into the teaching content of the pre-placement modules of the BSc (Hons) programmes.

Reason: The HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics are as relevant to students as to practitioners, and this is not clearly stated in the document.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition: The documentation for the BSc (Hons) must be revised to make explicit how learning disabilities are integrated into the programme.

Reason: It is currently unclear how this content is incorporated into the modules.

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Condition: The module content for OTP-M-1-02 must be revised to include an indicative content as well as learning outcomes.

Reason: The current indicative content is identical to the learning outcomes.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The BSc (Hons) documentation should be revised to make explicit where the re-takes of practice placements occur.

Reason: This information is not clear in the documentation.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title;

Condition: The programme documentation should be revised to make it clear which programmes provide eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The current documentation is not clear.

**Deadline for Conditions to be met:
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:**

**29 June 2007
2 August 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

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

Recommendation: Criminal conviction and health checks could be updated on an annual basis, or students could be asked to complete an annual self declaration.

Reason: Currently CRB checks and health checks are required before the programme commences, however there does not appear to be any mechanism to ensure these are kept up to date.

COMMENDATIONS

- 1. The one day conference including students and practice placement providers was excellent practice.**
- 2. The tripartite agreement between students, placement providers and the university was very clear and an excellent example of good practice.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Carol Lloyd
Claire Brewis**

Date: 9 March 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography PG Dip Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PG Dip = Full time BSc = Part time in-service
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Angela Duxbury
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair) Catherine Moss (Secretary) Gaile Biggart Society and College of Radiographers Professor Mike Molan LSBU Professor Geoffrey Elliott LSBU Lisa Greatrex LSBU

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	
Major change to existing programme	X
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc = 12 PG Dip = 17
---	---------------------------------------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 1. *Level of qualification for entry to the Register*

The Council normally expects that the **threshold** entry routes to the Register will be the following:

- 1.1.1 Bachelor degree with honours for the following professions:
- chiropody or podiatry;
 - dietetics;
 - occupational therapy;
 - orthoptics;
 - physiotherapy;
 - prosthetics and orthotics;
 - radiography;
 - speech and language therapy;
 - biomedical science (with the Certificate of Competence awarded by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS), or equivalent if appropriate); and

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that the PGDip is the HPC approved qualification for entry onto the register, not the MSc.

Reason: Currently the PGDip is an exit award for those who do not complete the entire MSc, however the University only seeks HPC approval for the PGDip, not the entire MSc. The documentation for the PGDip therefore needs to be separated from the documentation for the MSc.

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The admissions procedures must clearly articulate the fact that students on successful graduation must apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Currently the documentation does not explain this and therefore the students are not aware that this process is not automatic.

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	PG Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PG Dip Fulltime
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Carol Lloyd, Occupational Therapist Claire Brewis, Occupational Therapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair), London South Bank University Catherine Moss (Secretary), London South Bank University Jan Jenson, College of Occupational Therapists Ms Mary Gottwald College of Occupational Therapists Professor Mike Molan, London South Bank University Professor Geoffrey Elliott, London South Bank University Lisa Greatrex, London South Bank University

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The education provider must provide confirmation and review of the resources for the new programmes.

Reason: Before the new programmes commence there must be evidence produced that will show that the commissioned numbers have been given support by NHS London and that the numbers and resources have not been moved to the detriment of the other established programmes.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:

5.3.1 a safe environment; and for

5.3.2 safe and effective practice.

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The documentation must include clinical placement resources for 2 of the cancer centres involved in student placements.

Reason: In the current documentation the practice placement educator information for the 2 cancer placements is missing. There is no named placement educator or mentor listed.

Recommendation

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including student self declaration on an annual basis.

Reason: Currently there is no formal policy to monitor criminal conviction checks and health requirements after entry to the programmes.

Commendations

The partnership with the Trusts is excellent.

The quality of the subject specific documentation was excellent.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Angela Duxbury

Date: 9 March 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	PG Dip = 69
---	------------------------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 1. *Level of qualification for entry to the Register*

The Council normally expects that the **threshold** entry routes to the Register will be the following:

- 1.1.1 Bachelor degree with honours for the following professions:
- occupational therapy

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that the PGDip is the HPC approved qualification for entry onto the register, not the MSc.

Reason: Currently the PGDip is an exit award for those who do not complete the entire MSc, however the University only seeks HPC approval for the PGDip, not the entire MSc. The documentation for the PGDip therefore needs to be separated from the documentation for the MSc.

3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and who should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

Condition: The University must provide a written explanation of the rationale for having a non-OT as the programme leader for the PGDip and how this person will be supported in that role.

Reason: The current programme leader is a biomedical scientist, not an occupational therapist.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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 HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics must be formally incorporated into the teaching content of the pre-placement modules of the PG Dip programme.

Reason: The HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics are as relevant to students as to practitioners, and this is not clearly stated in the document.

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Condition: The module content for OTP-M-1-02 must be revised to include an indicative content as well as learning outcomes.

Reason: The current indicative content is identical to the learning outcomes.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The learning outcomes of the PGDip modules should be revised to ensure that they are consistent with the level expected of an M level programme.

Reason: The current learning outcomes are insufficiently different from the BSc to justify its higher level status.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title;

Condition: The programme documentation should be revised to make it clear which programmes provide eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The current documentation is not clear.

**Deadline for Conditions to be met:
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:**

**29 June 2007
2 August 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

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

Recommendation: Criminal conviction and health checks could be updated on an annual basis, or students could be asked to complete an annual self declaration.

Reason: Currently CRB checks and health checks are required before the programme commences, however there does not appear to be any mechanism to ensure these are kept up to date.

COMMENDATIONS

- 1. The one day conference including students and practice placement providers was excellent practice.**
- 2. The tripartite agreement between students, placement providers and the university was very clear and an excellent example of good practice.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Carol Lloyd
Claire Brewis**

Date: 9 March 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full Time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2008
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Angela Duxbury
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair) Catherine Moss (Secretary) Gail Biggart Society and College of Radiographers Professor Mike Molan LSBU Professor Geoffrey Elliott LSBU Lisa Greatrex LSBU

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	
Major change to existing programme	X
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc = 10 to be confirmed by SHA/University
---	---

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The admissions procedures must clearly articulate the fact that students on successful graduation must apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Currently the documentation does not explain this and therefore the students are not aware that this process is not automatic.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: The education provider must provide confirmation and review of the resources for the new programmes.

Reason: Before the new programmes commence there must be evidence produced that will show that the commissioned numbers have been given support by NHS London and that the numbers and resources have not been moved to the detriment of the other established programmes.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:

5.3.1 a safe environment; and for

5.3.2 safe and effective practice.

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The documentation must include clinical placement resources for 2 of the cancer centres involved in student placements.

Reason: In the current documentation the practice placement educator information for the 2 cancer placements is missing. There is no named placement educator or mentor listed.

Recommendation

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including student self declaration on an annual basis.

Reason: Currently there is no formal policy to monitor criminal conviction checks and health requirements after entry to the programmes.

Commendations

The partnership with the Trusts is excellent.

The quality of the subject specific documentation was excellent.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Angela Duxbury

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time and Part time
Date of visit	27 and 28 June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mrs Mary Macdonald (Biomedical Scientist) Mr Tommy Cavanagh (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr P Roberts (Chair) Mrs B Furnival (Secretary) Mrs A Geddis External Advisor Professor P Whiting External Assessor Mrs M Kelly Academic Standards Unit Dr E A Price Faculty Academic Development Representative Mr A Wainwright IBMS Dr M Bowen IBMS Dr N Hall IBMS

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT facilities	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	10 F/T 15P/T
--	-----------------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

Condition: The Programme Team must provide a list of the names of associate lecturers who teach into the programme including specialism and HPC registration details and also copies of curriculum vitae.

Reason: In discussions with the Senior Team and the Programme Team it became apparent that there were a number of associate lecturers (visiting lecturers) teaching into the programme. However supporting documentation did not include details of associate lecturers and the visitors wanted to ensure that subject areas were taught by appropriately selected staff to ensure the students received the required teaching.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 16 July 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2 August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Recommendation: The Visitors suggest that the Programme Team review the process of assessment by examination in order that students do not feel disadvantaged by going for long periods without formal written examinations.

Reason: It was noted during the meeting with the current cohort of students that not having many "essay type" examinations until the final year of the programme made them feel unprepared for this type of examination. Although the Programme Team have addressed this by putting more support in place to aid the students with examinations, the Visitors felt that the Programme Team should keep this area of assessment under review to ensure equity of student experience.

COMMENDATIONS

- *The quality of the documentation*
- *The high quality and professionalism of the Programme Team and in particular the input made by the placement co-ordinator.*
- *The Student Support information provided by the University was exemplary.*
- *The library, IT, research and laboratories were state of the art.*
- *The range of research being carried out within the School was most impressive together with its other research partners.*
- *The students seen were a credit to the programme and were highly supportive of the Universities and the Placement Providers.*

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

Mary Macdonald

Tommy Cavanagh

Date: 29 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	FT / PT
Date of visit	12 – 13 June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Martin Duckworth (Educationalist, Speech and Language Therapist) Lesley Culling (Clinician, Speech and Language Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	<p>Dr Ken Hume (Chair), Head of Division of Health Science, School of Chemistry, Biological and Health Science, Faculty of Science and Engineering</p> <p>Mr Stuart Ramsden (Secretary), Programme Development Officer Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education</p> <p>Mr Ian Barron (Internal Panel Member), Academic Division Leader: Early Years & Childhood Studies, Institute of Education</p> <p>Miss Peggy Cooke (Internal Panel Member), Principal Lecturer for Quality School of Health, Psychology and Social Care</p> <p>Mr Robert Baker (Internal Panel Member), Principal Administrative Assistant</p> <p>Miss Sandra Sharpe (Internal Panel Member), Principal Faculty Administrator Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education</p> <p>Dr Gaye Powell (External Panel Member), Head of Speech & Language Services (Adults & Children) Plymouth Teaching Primary Care Trust</p> <p>Ms Claire Johnson (RCSLT), Head of Division Speech and Language Therapy and RNIB Rehabilitation Faculty of Health, UCE Birmingham</p> <p>Ms Rubana Hussein (RCSLT), Professional Development Standards Manager</p>

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy – 50 BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology - 20
---	---

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The Programme Team, in collaboration with the University of Manchester and Clinical Educators, are to review and resubmit the clinical placement marking criteria at pass level (40% - 49% band) to ensure that the graduates from the programme are able to practise safely and effectively.

Reason: In the submitted documentation the wording of the clinical placement marking criteria at pass level was suggestive of deficiencies of knowledge and skills required to practise safely. The Visitors felt that, in order to ensure clinical placement staff are able to effectively grade a students' performance, the clinical placement marking criteria required review and redrafting.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 16th July 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.12 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of patients or clients and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider making explicit to students the process for obtaining consent from all client groups for treatment by students.

Reason: The Visitors recognised relevant protocols were in place to ensure patients and clients gave consent for student involvement in their treatment. The Visitors considered it would be beneficial to students to be made aware of this process to assist their understanding of the rights of patient and clients.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider continuing the development of objective assessment criteria across all units in the programmes.

Reason: The Visitors felt the programme assessment processes effectively met this standard, but felt students would benefit from published assessment criteria for all assessments to assist them in their preparation of assessed work.

COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- The admission handbook, which provides significant and useful detail for staff on the admission process and criteria for assessment of admission requirements.
- The innovative role of Clinical Education Support Centres in providing profession specific facilitation in all areas of the collaboration between the Universities and the placement environments.
- The clinical resources provided by the ICON Centre which is a wide-ranging and well funded resource which enhances the learning and teaching facilities for students.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

Martin Duckworth

Lesley Culling

Date: 14th June 2007

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-06-15	b	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - Manchester Met - BSc (Hons) PSP SPT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Napier University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of visit	19th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr David Halliwell – South Western Ambulance NHS Trust Mrs Penelope Renwick – Director of School of Psychology and Social Care, Manchester Metropolitan University.
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mr Sam Allwinkle (Chair) – Director of life long learning services Napier University Mrs Gill Perry – Faculty assistant manager, Quality Mr David Reid – Senior lecturer faculty of engineering, computing and creative industries, Napier University. Mr Kevin McClure – Lecturer school of health and social sciences, Napier University Ms Mandy Edwards – Health and Life Sciences Partnership Mrs Gillian Davies – Quality Enhancement Services, Napier University

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	Min 15 Max 25
--	------------------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme admissions

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

Condition:

The programme team must revise and resubmit documentation that outlines the process for ensuring health checks are in place for independent practitioners.

Reason:

Currently there is no health check system in place, in admission, for independent practitioners who may access this course. A process needs to be implemented and outlined within the documentation of how this is carried out, for e.g., self declaration.

Condition 2

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition:

The programme team must submit evidence which outlines and ensures that the requisite specialist expertise for Allied Health Professionals attending the course is in place.

Reason:

It was not clearly articulated within the documentation how the needs for Allied Health Professionals are specifically met on the course. The visitors

felt that through submitting documentation that clearly outlines the specific provisions that are in place for Allied Health professionals, it would assure them that their specific needs are also being met. For e.g.; listing the different AHP focused clinicians who may contribute to the course, or evidence of the on-line learning resources available for AHP students.

Condition 3

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition:

The programme team need to develop and submit a specific consent form for use when students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason:

Currently there is no system in place to obtain consent from students prior to any activity which may involve them in acting as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching. This needs to be put in place.

Condition 4:

3.11 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 programme team need to make it more explicit within the documentation, what aspects of the programme require mandatory attendance and what procedures are in place to manage non-attendance.

Reason:

It was not clearly articulated within the documentation where attendance is mandatory and the implications of non-attendance. This needs to be made much more explicit to students so that they are fully informed.

Condition 5

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.3.2 The practice placement settings must provide for safe and effective practice.

5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment

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

5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

Condition:

The programme team must develop and submit an audit mechanism to ensure the quality of the practice learning environments. They should also submit a clear list of all Designated Medical Practitioner's (DMP), which should include their relevant qualifications, area, and when it was last updated.

Reason:

Currently there is no audit mechanism in place to assess the quality of the practice learning environments. The visitors also found it difficult to assess whether the DMP's are appropriately qualified, for there was no information submitted which outlined the relevant qualifications the DMP's possess.

Condition 6**SET 5. Practice placements standards**

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

Condition:

The programme team need to make it more explicit within the documentation the expectations of professional conduct and the actions that are taken in the case of failure.

Reason:

It was not clearly articulated within the documentation the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics and the actions that are taken in the case of a failing student. These need to be made more explicit within the documentation so that students are fully informed.

RECOMMENDATIONS**Recommendation 1:****SET 2 Programme admissions**

2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Recommendation 1:

The visitors encourage the programme team to consider the development of a brochure that clearly sets out information that enables applicants to make an informed choice about the course.

Reason:

The visitors felt that a brochure about the course would be very useful for prospective students, for they did not see any evidence of this within the submitted documentation.

COMMENDATIONS

- 1) **The commitment and professionalism of the programme team and the leadership shown by the programme leader.**
- 2) **The high quality of the on-line learning resources.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

Mr David Halliwell

Mrs Penelope Renwick

Date: 26/6/07

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Northumbria University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy MSc Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	BSc (Hons) - FT/PT MSc - PT
Date of Visit	8 th & 9 th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Sarah Johnson – Occupational Therapy Bernadette Waters – Occupational Therapy
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock – Education Officer Daljit Mahoon – Education Officer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	<p>Ian Shell (Chair) - Associate Dean, Learning & Teaching Support, Newcastle Business School</p> <p>Colin Chandler - Director of Postgraduate Studies</p> <p>Helen Smith - Principal Lecturer, Learning in Organisations</p> <p>Jim Clark - Subject Division Leader, Pre and School learning</p> <p>Jackie Waterfield - CSP</p> <p>Nina Thomson - CSP</p> <p>Linda Charlton- Secretary</p> <p>Colin Keiley - Team leader A & R, Stockport Health</p> <p>Stephen Wordsworth - Head of department, UCE Birmingham</p> <p>Joanna Jackson – Physiotherapist, University of Essex, HPC Visitor</p> <p>Kathleen Bosworth - Retired Physiotherapist , HPC visitor</p>

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
--	-----	----	-----

Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	60
---	-----------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The programme team are to provide evidence that they have a system in place and support participation in research training for staff

Reason: Documentation did not include CVs of each member on the programme team. There was no evidence supplied to show staff development.

Condition 2

3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well-being of students must be both adequate and accessible.

Condition: Documentation must be redrafted and resubmitted to include the universities policy on support for student with learning needs.

Reason: Documentation did not include the universities policy on the support for students with learning needs such as dyslexia

Condition 3

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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 redraft and resubmit documentation to include mapping of the learning outcomes against the standards of proficiency

Reason: There was no documented evidence to show mapping against the learning outcomes to provide information as to which module met which standard of proficiency. This is needed to ensure all standards of proficiency are been covered throughout the modules

Condition 4

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to include the assessment strategy

Reason: Documentation did not include the assessment strategy. Evidence of this is needed to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of the validity, reliability and explicitness of assessment

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should review staffing levels to ensure current initiatives can be implemented effectively

Reason: The staffing levels currently appear to fall short of those in other similar institutions and it may be that more staff time will be taken up in implementing the newly proposed programme. It was also noted by the visitors that staff development to doctoral level has been slow and this could also be influenced by the pressure on existing staff available to teach. An increase in the staff establishment should therefore be explored.

Recommendation 2

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The programme team are recommended to arrange the removal of old editions of publications from the library and review reading lists within the documentation

Reason: The reading lists within the documentation were dating back to 1985 publications. In order for students to have up to date information the library needs to have regular updates as do the lists within documentation

Recommendation 3

SET 4. Curriculum standards

4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Recommendation: The programme team are recommended to review and reinforce the use of PPDF

Reason: It became apparent throughout the visit that the use of PPDF was not used as a tool for assessment and therefore been overlooked by both staff and students

Recommendation 4

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: We recommend the continuation of building on inter-professional learning in academic and practical initiatives

Reason: The change to this programme to fit in with a suite of programmes to carry the same module of inter-professional learning will bring changes which each profession will need an active involvement throughout

Recommendation 5

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Recommendation: The education provider is recommended to collate and disseminate outcomes of placement evaluation on an annual basis to placement providers

Reason: This would fall into line with national quality enhancement expectations concerning the responsibility of the university to share evaluation outcomes with placement providers and thus enhance the students' learning experience whilst on placement.

COMMENDATIONS

- **Commendation is given to the programme team on their plans for new clinical facilities which will enhance inter-professional learning opportunities**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Sarah Johnson

Bernadette Waters

Date: 23/5/07

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Northumbria University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	8th – 9th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Colin Keiley – Team leader A & R – Stockport Health Stephen Wordsworth – Head of department – UCE Birmingham
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Daljit Mahoon – Education Officer Katherine Lock – Education Officer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ian Shell (Chair) – Associate Dean – Learning & Teaching Support – Newcastle business School Ms Linda Charlton – Secretary Colin Chandler – Director of postgraduate studies Helen Smith – Principle lecturer – Learning in organisation Jim Clark – Subject division leader – pre and school learning Patricia McClure – COT Jackie Taylor – COT Remy Reyes – COT Jackie Waterfield – CSP Nina Thomson – CSP Joanna Jackson – Physiotherapist – University of Essex – HPC Visitor Kathleen Bosworth - Retired Physiotherapist – HPC visitor Sarah Johnson – Occupational therapist – University of Plymouth – HPC Visitor Bernadette Waters – Occupational therapist – University of Southampton – HPC Visitor

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	25
---	-----------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition:

Within the admissions information for students, the entry qualifications should be expressed as a UCAS entry tariff.

Reason:

This would enable the university to explore student applications in support of their policy on widening participation. It would help to make admissions information more meaningful to applicant and bring the course in line with information provided across other programmes within the suite of awards.

Condition 2

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition

To include within the student handbook the requirement for students entering the second year to submit CRB self declaration.

Reason

Through ensuring that students submit a CRB self declaration in the second year, this will allow any changes in student circumstances relating to CRB will be picked up.

Condition 3

**SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

Condition:

The programme team must submit documentation to include a form utilised to obtain consent from students prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, e.g. role plays, practicing profession-specific techniques.

Reason:

The documentation lacked evidence which insured that this standard is met. A consent mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that potential candidates are aware of the expectations of the programme regarding the level of participation expected by and from the student.

Condition 4:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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 map the HPC Standards of Proficiency into the module outlines so that students and mentors are able to identify, when signing off competencies, which of the HPC Standards of Proficiency's are being met.

Reason:

The visitors found it difficult to see how the HPC Standards of Proficiency were clearly being met by students as it was not clearly articulated within the documentation. They were assured that the HPC Standards of Proficiency are built into the learning outcomes however this needs to be made more explicit within the module outlines so both the students and mentors are fully informed. After meeting students and placement providers, it became

apparent that it would be beneficial if the HPC Standards of Proficiency were clearly mapped into the module outlines as suggested

Condition 5

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition:

The programme team must submit an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy for students attending non NHS placements.

Reason:

The visitors were unable to see clear evidence of an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy for students within non NHS placements. Documentation must be submitted which clearly presents that a policy within these placements is present

Condition 6

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

- 5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- 5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;**

Condition:

Statements presented within the documentation relating to HPC need to be corrected. This refers to:

- 1) In volume 2, page 81, first paragraph in section 16, it reads: 'As your programme leads to eligibility for registration, you should be fully aware of the Health Professions Council Code of Professional Conduct.' This needs to be amended to: 'As your programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration, you should be fully aware of the Health Professions Council Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and Standards of Proficiency for Operating Department Practitioners'
- 2) In volume 2, page 27, first paragraph in section 2.4.1, it reads: 'ODP students are required to complete 3000 of theory and practice within the programme in order to meet the criteria for HPC Registration'. This needs to be removed for HPC do not specifically stipulate the number of hours students need to complete.
- 3) In volume 2, page 6 the abbreviation 'RODP' is used. This is not necessary as all Operating Department Practitioners are now deemed to be registered and the title is therefore not helpful. This should also apply to section 4.2.2, on page 37 again in volume 2.
- 4) In volume 2 Page 81 Section 14 it states ' Students will be expected to observe, participate and finally to engage in inter-professional and inter-agency work during the three-year programme in order to meet the NMC proficiency' this is incorrect and should read 'Students will be expected to

observe, participate and finally to engage in inter-professional and inter-agency work during the two year programme in order to meet the HPC Standards of Proficiency

- 5) In volume 2 Page 81, Section 15 it states: 'This is to ensure that students make up the relevant hours and type of experience in order to meet the regulations of the programme and the Professional Statutory Regulatory Body.' In light that the Professional Statutory Regulatory Body is HPC, this statement needs to be amended, HPC do not specifically stipulate the number of hours students need to complete.
- 6) The names of the module leaders should be included within the module descriptors

Reason:

Any references to HPC need to be correct to avoid any confusion in the role of the regulator and to ensure that students and mentors are made fully aware of the HPC statutory requirements. With point 6, within the Module descriptors some of the names of the module leaders were not included, which made it unclear who the module leader was. There should be consistency, informing students who the module leaders are for all of the modules, not just a few.

Condition 7

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.7.3 for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition:

To include an explicit statement within the programme specification that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register.

Reason:

It was not clearly articulated within the documentation that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register. This needs to be included within the documentation, ensuring that students are fully informed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English

Recommendation

To include a statement in the admission requirements for overseas students to have an English IELTS level 6 on entry.

Reason:

The requirement for overseas students to demonstrate a good command of English is included within the documentation; however the visitors felt that through including more detail, students would be fully informed of the requirements.

Recommendation 2

2.2.4 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation:

To review the academic entry standards of 5 GCSEs

Reason:

The visitors felt that the level of the academic entry standards, consisting of 5 GCSEs could be seen to be quite low and therefore this may lead to some students experiencing difficulties in completing the course based on their unrealistic expectations of what is needed to successfully complete the award.

Recommendation 3

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation:

To monitor the staffing in relation to any increases in student numbers or staff workload.

Reason:

There should always be an assurance that there is enough staff to deliver the programme effectively, without compromising our standards and that there is an adequate balance between staff and students.

Recommendation 4

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

Recommendation:

To utilise any opportunity for Operating Department Practitioners to have more input into the programme.

Reason:

In order to develop the programme and its profession specific knowledge and skills, the Visitors felt that more input from additional Operating Department Practitioners, with the relevant academic qualifications and experience would enhance the development of the programme

Recommendation 5

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation:

To review the stock of periodicals, subject books and access to e-journals and ensure these resources are kept up to date.

Reason:

In light of student's comments and supported by evidence from a visit to the library, the visitors felt that access to resources could be improved and the university should aim to ensure resources are updated.

Recommendation 6

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Recommendation:

The visitors would like to the course team to continue to explore the possibilities to have more Operating Department Practitioners to act as mentors for Operating Department Practitioner students

Reason:

Through having more Operating Department Practitioners acting as mentors, they would have more subject specific knowledge which would enhance students experience and learning and act as professional role models within the clinical area

Recommendation 7

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation:

To explore opportunities to improve specific Operating Department Practitioner resources to enable clinical skills teaching.

Reason:

Through improving more specific Operating Department Practitioner resources it would enhance teaching and learning and student experience on the programme.

Recommendation 8

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Recommendation:

To review the effectiveness of the extended initial theory placement in light of difficulties in obtaining CRB clearance.

Reason:

The theory aspect of the programme was placed at the start to aid the duration for CRB clearance checks to be processed and not to aid the pedagogical development of the students. It is recommended that the programme team should monitor students' experience of the effectiveness of having this extended theory element at the start of the programme.

COMMENDATIONS

- Commendation is given to the programme team on their plans for new clinical facilities which will enhance inter-professional learning opportunities

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Mr Colin Keiley

Mr Stephen Wordsworth

Date: 23.05.2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education in Operating Department Practice Programme delivered at Swindon Campus
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT
Date of Visit	6-7 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount (Educationalist) Stephen Oates (Clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Peter Bradley (Chair) Director of Academic Development and Quality Ailsa Clarke, Quality Assurance Officer

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1 Owing to the introduction of the new programme at a new Swindon campus, this visit was utilised to monitor the programme delivery at the Brunel ODP Centre and Marston Road campus which will be closing in 2008 when the existing students graduate. The HPC panel received the standard annual monitoring submission to assess and discuss at the visit. Oxford Brookes University were made aware that if required, the HPC Panel may set conditions and recommendations against the programmes delivered at Marston Road and Brunel ODP Centre.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Proposed student cohort intake number please state	41		

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials, including an addendum to the prospectus, to clearly articulate successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to register rather than right to register. Further, the location of the programme's delivery must be updated throughout the documentation.

Reason: The documentation and website information for the programme could be considered to mislead an applicant into believing completion of the programme would entitle registration rather than lead to eligibility. The Visitors also noted in some places the information for applicants had not yet been updated to reflect delivery at the new site in Swindon.

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that criminal records and occupational health checks are part of the admissions criteria and are undertaken prior to the commencement of the programme and are satisfactorily completed before a student attends placement education. Furthermore, it should be clearly stated in the documentation that the criminal records checks are enhanced.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that that criminal records and occupational health checks were being performed in such a way to meet this standard, however, the documentation did not reflect this process as it indicated occupational health and criminal records bureau checks were performed not at the admissions stage but before each and every placement. The Visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated reflect the actual process undertaken and that the criminal records check performed are enhanced.

2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation removing any reference to ENB awards

Reason: In discussion, it became apparent that the ENB award route through the programme would no longer be offered. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the documentation for the programme must be updated to remove this route.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the breakdown of staff full time equivalents and provide CVs of appointed staff.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that the documentation submitted did not accurately reflect the intended staff compliment and division of staff hours between individuals. The Visitors felt the correct breakdown of staff full time equivalents must be included in the definitive documentation along with CVs of any staff appointed in order to consider this standard being met.

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

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must submit documentation to clearly articulate the project plan to transfer equipment and resources from the Marston Road campus to the Swindon campus. This evidence should include a statement of progress in the project plan, photographs of any completed facilities and an indication of further steps to consolidate clinical facilities at the Swindon campus that may take place upon the completion of delivery at Brunel ODP Centre and the Marston Road campus.

Reason: In discussion and through documentation submitted on the visit date it was clear that the programme team and the senior management team had in place a project plan to manage the transfer of physical resources to the Swindon campus. The Visitors felt that to ensure facilities were in place for the commencement of the programme further evidence of implementation and completion of the project plan would be required. It was also noted that there may be a transition period in which students would access facilities at other sites whilst the programme was being delivered in three separate locations and the Visitors felt that plans for consolidation of these additional resources upon completion of the delivery at the Marston Road campus and Brunel ODP Centre would ensure adequacy of resources at the Swindon site.

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Condition: The programme team must submit documentation to clearly articulate the transfer process of subject books to the Swindon campus. This documentation should also take into account the increased demand on the stock arising from cross-usage of texts between nursing and ODP students.

Reason: In the tour of facilities, the Visitors were shown the intended space to be used to house the library stock. Though this space was felt to be adequate to service the requirements of the students, the Visitors felt that confirmation of the transfer process of texts was required to ensure they were accessible to students on the commencement date of the programme. Further, the Visitors noted that the library space was already in use for nursing students and that some consideration would need to be made in any additional purchasing to ensure adequate numbers of texts were available for both student groups.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the role of the regulator and professional body and use appropriate terminology in terms of HPC approval and professional body accreditation of programmes of study.

Reason: Throughout the documentation there were misappropriations of terminology and documentation attributed to the HPC, such as “HPC Benchmarks”, requirements for hours of practice placement experience and completion times for the award.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must submit the documentation from the new practice mentor database to clearly articulate, for the existing programme delivered at Marston Road campus and the new programme to be delivered at the Swindon Campus, that practice mentors are appropriately qualified, experienced, registered and have been trained and attended updating sessions.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that the database that has been used to hold information on the practice mentors is to be upgraded. The Visitors felt it was necessary to ensure that this new system of recording information on the practice placement mentors was in place in time for the start of the programme and contained relevant information to be used in the decision making process regarding the allocation of a student to a practice location.

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

Recommendation: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the considerations made to the integration of placement environments previously managed by Brunel ODP Centre staff. In particular, this information will need to take into account the differing lead-in times in providing details of placements to placement providers and students.

Reason: In discussion it became apparent that placement co-ordination between Oxford Brookes University and Brunel ODP Centre was to an extent managed in different ways. The Visitors felt that confirmation of the arrangements for Oxford Brookes University to take over placement co-ordination from the Brunel ODP Centre and the considerations in adapting to potentially different methods of co-ordination would need to be clearly agreed and documented.

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies are assessed in the approval process of placement environments.

Reason: Currently all placements are held in NHS trusts and are covered by robust equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies. However, in discussion it was acknowledged that there may be moves to place students within private hospitals and the Visitors felt that the programme documentation should reflect a rigorous process of ensuring all placement environments were able to provide suitable policies to protect students, staff and patients.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the stipulation that at least one external examiner must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register.

Reason: In discussion it was made clear that the current external examiner was appropriately registered. However, the Visitors felt that in order to ensure that this standard continued to be met in future the programme documentation must include the stipulation for registration.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 21st June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing the IT facilities available at the Swindon campus to ensure adequate provision to the number of students requiring access. The Visitors also recommend that the programme team consider implementing a cross-campus loan system that regularly delivers to the Swindon Campus.

Reason: The campus at Swindon has sufficient IT facilities to support the programme and the library facilities provide an adequate range of texts. The Visitors felt that a review of the IT facilities and consideration of providing easy access to texts at the other University libraries would be beneficial to students on the programme.

Commendations

The Visitors commend:

- The use of WebCT, which in its application to providing information to practice educators was well developed and implemented.
- The programme teams at both of the delivery sites, particularly the Brunel ODP Centre team who are leading the programme through its final year of a successful provision which has produced many graduates clearly exhibiting fitness to practice.
- The strong student group showing enthusiasm and determination at our meeting.
- The enthusiasm and hard work of the placement providers, particularly in the transition period affecting the programmes.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Stephen Oates

Alan Mount

Date: 28/03/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Paisley
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc(Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	14/15 Feb 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr Thomas Cavanagh, Biomedical Scientist Prof William Gilmore, Biomedical Scientist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mr Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mr Ian Smith, Dean, School of Education, University of Paisley (Chair) Mr D Bishop, Pathology Department, Ninewells Hospital and Medical School NHS (representing IBMS) Mrs Liz Kennedy, Director, University Campus, Ayr, University of Paisley Professor Paul Whiting, Faculty of Health & Life Sciences, De Montford University (representing IBMS) Mr Alan Wainwright, Institute of Biomedical Science Ms Nina Anderson, Quality Enhancement Unit, University of Paisley Mr Kim Macintyre, Quality Enhancement Unit, University of Paisley

Scope of visit (*please tick*)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	15-20
---	--------------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make professional body and regulatory requirements clear to students before they take up the programme.

Reason: Currently students do not receive this information until towards the end of the programme, by which time they will have already invested considerable time and resources.

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that CRB checks should be completed before a student commences the programme.

Reason: CRB checks are not currently required until students begin practice placement. By this time they will have invested considerable time and resources into a programme they may be prevented from completing.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: The programme team needs to be revised to ensure that there are sufficient teaching staff with recent clinical experience.

Reason: CVs provided for the current fulltime staff do not provide sufficient evidence that there are sufficient staff with recent clinical experience teaching on the programme.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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 module descriptors must be re-written to ensure that professional ethics and responsibility are integral to the programme, including a basic overview towards the beginning of the programme.

Reason: Professional ethics and responsibility are not currently taught until towards the end of the university-based part of the programme.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

5.8.2 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must be appropriately registered.

Condition: The University must provide a list of all staff involved in supervising practice placements and their CVs, along with an explanation of how they will ensure that those staff are appropriately registered.

Reason: The University did not provide reassurance that there were adequate mechanisms in place to ensure that placements were supervised by appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The programme team must ensure that sufficient time is allocated to ensure that the learning outcomes identified for practice placement can be met.

Reason: It is not currently clear that sufficient time is allocated to ensure placement learning outcomes can be met on placement or where the learning outcomes are unable to be met on placement, alternative arrangements are made to ensure these learning outcomes are covered within the University-based components of the programme.

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

Condition: Further evidence must be provided as to how the University's existing policies and processes for work-based/placement learning will be implemented for this programme.

Reason: It is currently unclear how the programme team will coordinate practice placement components of the programme.

5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Condition: The programme team must ensure that all practice placement educators are provided with information on the learning outcomes to be achieved at the practice placement.

Reason: Some practice placement providers spoken to during the visit had not been provided with detailed information on the learning outcomes to be achieved (for example, they had not seen the module descriptors).

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.

5.11 Practice placement providers must ensure necessary information is available at the appropriate time for both the education provider and students.

Condition: The programme team must implement a system of regular, minuted meetings with placement providers to monitor how placements are progressing and identify any issues that need to be resolved.

Reason: Discussion with placement providers identified a differing degree of knowledge about the programme and the learning outcomes sought from the placements. There was also a wide variation in the quality of the communication between the programme team and the placement educators.

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training;

Condition: The University must provide a written description of how they will ensure those involved in supervising placements have undertaken appropriate educator training programmes.

Reason: The current system is inadequately defined and does not provide assurance that placement supervisors will be adequately skilled in training and assessment techniques.

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Robert Gordon University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non – Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	16 th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jim Pickard, Chiropodist Gordon Burrow, Chiropodist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Bob Gammie, Chair, Associate Dean (Undergraduate Studies) Mandy Wells, HLSP Representative Lucy Jack, Secretary, Faculty Quality Officer

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	24
--	----

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to clearly articulate the rationale available to perspective students which indicates different expectations at levels 9 and 11.

Reason: It was not clear in the documentation as to the rationale behind two different module levels. There was no information for students to make an informed choice as to which level they should enter the programme at or the process involved in choosing the level with the staff within the programme team.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the documentation to include a protocol where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: There was no explanation of a system in place for student consent when taking part in practical teaching. The programme team said there is a verbal agreement but the process was not articulated within the document.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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 redraft and resubmit the documentation to include the learning outcomes for Level 11 which must include safe and effective practice.

Reason: The learning outcomes differed from level 9 and level 11. Level 9 stated that on completion the student would be able to apply knowledge of medications in order to prescribe safely, appropriately and cost effectively. However there was not a learning outcome to state that the students at level 11 would achieve this.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition: The programme must redraft and resubmit documentation which must clearly specify the processes involved in the selection, monitoring and audit of placements.

Reason: The documentation did not have clear evidence of how each placement is monitored. The HPC visitors expect the education provider to visit all placements to ensure that they are fit for purpose. The HEI should not rely upon either previous good experiences in relation to other education programmes, nor rely on the efforts of the student in determining that the placement is 'Fit for purpose'

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.3 must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to clearly articulate that in cases where the role of the designated medical practitioner is delegated the university must ensure appropriate practice placement training is in place for these individuals.

Reason: There was no evidence that training for the designated medical practitioner went under compulsory training. Training is needed to ensure all students are meeting learning outcomes throughout the assessment. During meetings it became apparent that there were difficulties in training all DMPs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Recommendation: Programme team should consider the possibility of transferability, in both directions, between levels 9 and 11.

Reason: It was mentioned that the level of the module is discussed with the programme team and student at the start of the programme but there is no system in place to consider those who are excelling or struggling whilst completing the module.

SET 6. Assessment standards

Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for:

6.7.5 the appointment of at least one external examiner for the relevant part of the register

Recommendation: The programme team should stay in regular contact with the HPC with regards to the external examiner being from a relevant part of the register.

Reason: It is currently anticipated that this standard will change once it has gone through the education and training committee. We have received feedback about this standard which suggests that it may be causing difficulties to approved programmes, and may not be suitably flexible to meet the needs of the education sector. The HPC are therefore consulting on a change to this specific standard. The HPC propose that the new standard should read: 'Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.'

Commendations

- **Commendation should be given to the programme team and the successful working relationship evident between themselves and NHS Grampian**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Jim Pickard

Gordon Burrow

Date: 24th May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Name and titles of programme(s)	Post Graduate Certificate Non Medical Prescribing (Level M) Graduate Certificate Non Medical Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Flexible
Date of visit	15 June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic Radiographer) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ruth Chadwick (Dean) Emma Williams (Secretary) Joy Duxbury (NMC)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	Level 3 40 Students Level M 20 students Both levels have 2 cohorts per year
--	---

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements;

Condition: The University must ensure that all documentation relating to admissions to the programmes should include a procedure for the criminal convictions check and the health check to make certain that students can make a fully informed decision for admission to the programme.

Reason: Although the application form for admission to the programmes indicates that both the criminal conviction check and the health check are required it is not included in the Programme Specifications or the website where students access information that lead to an informed decision on whether they take up a place on the programmes.

2.2.4 apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme team must have a protocol and the appropriate form for gaining student consent in such areas as role play.

Reason: It emerged that role play would be involved for the OSCE and although there is a protocol and form already in existence for other programmes within the faculty, this form was not available to visitors during the visit.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must formalise the process of ensuring that Designated Medical Practitioners (DMPs) are visited in practice regularly to discuss progress of students on the programme.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team it was indicated that DMPs would be visited as part of the collaborative process for the new programmes to ensure that students and DMPs are supported by the programme team throughout the duration of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must ensure that all placement providers are communicated with and are included in all feedback mechanisms and involvement in future curriculum developments.

Reason: At the meeting with the placement providers there was discussion around feedback mechanisms and what could be fed back to them under the Data Protection Act and how much input they had had to the design and development of the new programmes. The visitors were concerned that the lack of communication detracted from what is a good programme.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 16 July 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider having annual study days for DMPs and to publicise the local network of DMPs to allow a support network to be built.

Reason: Feedback from the DMP's indicated that it would be beneficial to meet with other DMP's on an annual basis in order to be a support for each other and to have this network available for students so they could be used as an additional resource if required.

5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.

Recommendation: The programme team should provide programme information to all placement providers so that they are fully informed of all aspects of programme delivery and assessment and their role within it. This would ensure that students are fully supported across all placements.

Reason: The placement providers need to have details in advance of receiving a student for placement so that delivery patterns and assessment issues are resolved and allow the student to be treated equitably.

COMMENDATIONS

- ***Complement the team on the documentation provided.***
- ***Complement the University of the range of resources available to students on the programmes.***

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

Patricia Fillis

Gordon Pollard

Date: 18 June 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of visit	28th – 29th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Bob Fellows - Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service NHS Trust. Vince Clarke – Training Officer, London Ambulance Service
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Roger New (Chair) – Faculty of Arts, Computing, Engineering and Sciences. Eleanor Willcocks (Secretary) – Student and Academic Services Monica Dawson – Internal Panel Member, Faculty of Development and Society Jenny Shelton – Head of Quality and Enhancement, Faculty of Health and Wellbeing Andy Freeman May – External panel member, Programme lead Paramedic Emergency Care, Oxford Brooks University John Martin – British Paramedic Association

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	18
---	-----------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition:

The programme team must submit evidence in the form of a list of mentors with their current qualifications and an action plan on how they will address any shortfalls.

Reason:

It was difficult to see within the documentation, clear up to date information regarding placement mentor staff, such as who they are and what qualifications they hold. Through the use of a clear mentor list it would enable the visitors to determine whether this SET has been met. It will also help assure the visitors that the education provider has an action plan in place in case there are any shortfalls, such as if placement mentors are lacking in relevant qualifications to act as mentors or even if there ever is a shortage of mentors. The team stated that there would be 3-4 mentors per student on the proposed clinical placement pattern

Condition 2

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition:

The programme team must submit a signed copy of a memorandum of co-operation between the education provider and the practice placement providers.

Reason:

Currently there is no formal signed memorandum of co-operation between the education provider and the practice placement providers (East Midlands and Yorkshire Ambulance Services). A signed memorandum would ensure a more formalised agreement is in place and that there is consistency between both parties.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to apply, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Recommendation:

To reproduce the brochure provided for prospective students in relation to the driving entry standards

Reason:

The information presented within the programme brochure in relation to the documentation regarding driving entry standards was inconsistent. To avoid misleading prospective students, this information should be clear and consistent throughout ensuring students are able to make an informed decisions at all stage of the entry pathway.

Recommendation 2

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation:

To explore the possibilities for the range of placements to be broadened to other areas of health care, such as maternity.

Reason:

Through broadening the range of possible placements to include other areas of health care, it would help to enhance the student experience.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The use of I.T., such as the use of blackboard, incorporating placement audits and mentor preparation.
2. The way in which all the Allied Health Professions are facilitated in one area within the university and the associated clinical practice areas/facilities that are available.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

Mr Bob Fellows

Mr Vince Clarke

Date: 4/07/07

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University and Keele University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice (delivered at Staffordshire University and Keele University concurrently)
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of visit	22 nd – 23 rd May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	David Bevan, (ODP, Clinician) Paul Brown (Radiographer, Educationalist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Mike Hamlyn (Chair), Faculty Director – Learning and Teaching, Faculty of Computing, Engineering and Technology, Staffordshire University Andrea Jones (Secretary), Quality Improvement Officer, Quality Improvement Service, Staffordshire University Christopher Pike (Internal Panel Member), Director of Quality Assurance, Keele University Peter Considine (Internal Panel Member), Senior Lecturer in Strategic Management, Business School, Staffordshire University Peter Grannell (Faculty Representative), Deputy Director of Quality Assurance, Keele University Dawn Holding (Faculty Representative), Faculty Director – Learning and Teaching, Faculty of Health, Staffordshire University

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	32 total cohort 16 Staffordshire (March start) 16 Keele (September start)
---	--

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove references to *statutory* registration or regulation. The documentation must also be amended to ensure it is clearly stated that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to *apply for* registration.

Reason: In the submitted documentation, there were incorrect references to statutory regulation and registration and an indication that completion of the programme led to eligibility for registration. The Visitors felt students might misunderstand the regulatory framework and process of registration unless these references are corrected.

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for monitoring criminal record status throughout the programme.

Reason: In the documentation it is stated students undergo an enhanced CRB check prior to the commencement of the programme but monitoring of criminal record status was not described. In discussion, it was clear a continued self declaration of criminal record status was being implemented, but this was not reflected in the documentation.

2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for applying accreditation of prior learning or experience to an applicant to the programme.

Reason: In discussion, the programme team stated the APEL information provided in the documentation would require redrafting to bring it in line with Staffordshire University policy. In order to determine the effectiveness of the changed APEL process, the Visitors require the opportunity to assess the updated document.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: Staffordshire University and Keele University must submit the signed final draft of the Memorandum of Agreement between both institutions.

Reason: The Memorandum of Agreement issued to the panel was unsigned and, in order to effectively determine if the programme has a secure place in the business plan of both Universities, the Visitors felt a signed copy was required.

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the protocols in place to obtain student consent when participating as a patient or client in practice and in the academic and clinical environment.

Reason: In discussion, it was clear students participated in practice as patients in manual handling teaching. The documentation submitted for approval did not make reference to protocols to obtain consent from students. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the programme team must put in place a relevant process and provide details in the programme documentation.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the reference on page 21 of the *Award Handbook* to entry to the HPC Register relying on successful completion of 3000 hours of study.

Reason: The requirement for completion of 3000 hours is a requirement of the College of Operating Department Practitioners for the programme duration and not a requirement of the HPC for entry to the register. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the statement on page 21 of the *Award Handbook* must be amended.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

The practice placement settings must provide

5.3.1 a safe environment

5.3.2 for safe and effective practice.

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

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include a description of the process for approval and monitoring of placement environments utilised by Staffordshire University and Keele University. The resubmission should include information on how confirmation that practice environments are safe and effective for practice and also ensure placement environments are covered by appropriate equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies.

Reason: In discussion it was clear that both Universities operate robust processes for approving and monitoring placement environments. However, neither process was documented in the submission the panel received. Further, in light of the utilisation of private practice environments, the Visitors felt the approval and monitoring process should be clearly documented to include equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies in the assessment to ensure students in non-NHS areas received the same level of protection.

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

5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placements educators must have relevant qualifications and experience

5.8.2 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must be appropriately registered

Condition: The programme team must resubmit amended mentor database reports for Oswestry, Staffordshire, North Staffordshire and Burton hospitals to include all details of qualifications and registration.

Reason: The submitted information the panel received from the mentor database included some omissions in the qualifications and registration of some members of practice staff. The Visitors felt the database must be brought up to date to ensure these mentors were suitable to receive and supervise students.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include evidence of the system of moderation of clinical assessment.

Reason: The programme team indicated there were current challenges in ensuring parity in the assessment of clinical practice. It was indicated that steps were being made to ensure a moderation process was in place, which would require the completion and the dissemination of workbooks for each year of the programme.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include the stipulation that at least one external examiner must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register.

Reason: The current external examiner for the programme is a from the relevant part of the HPC Register, however, in order to ensure this will always be the case, the Visitors felt the documentation should be amended to include the stipulation on external examiners.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 21st June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 3rd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider developing and implementing contingency protocols for periods when Theatre Training Supervisors are unavailable to support students.

Reason: With the change in programme structure to introduce block placement patterns, the Visitors recognised increased demand on the time of Theatre Training Supervisors. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the Theatre Training Supervisors and the students would benefit from clear routes of delegation when the Theatre Training Supervisors were unavailable.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider providing feedback from the placement audit mechanisms directly to Theatre Managers.

Reason: In discussion with the Theatre Managers, it was suggested submission of the feedback from the educational audit of placements would be very helpful to assess the resource requirements of student supervision and how well they are being met.

COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- the collaboration with stakeholders conducted by the programme team. Evidence of a strong consultative process was demonstrated in discussion.
- the evident commitment to the provision and its development from clinical staff at all levels.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

David Bevan

Paul Brown

Date: 23rd May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Suffolk College
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	13 th and 14 th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount (Educationalist) Julie Weir (Clinician)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Joanna Jackson - Chair Alison McQuin - Secretary Shaune Richardson - UEA validation Anne Jonston - Internal Alex Seabrook - University of Essex validation (13 th June only) Kay Thompson - University of Essex validation (14 th June only) Penny Joyce - CODP Karen Latcham - External Ron Impey - Internal quality assurance (13 th June only)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	12
---	-----------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials and programme specification to ensure consistency between the documents and to provide information about the new programme, which includes the entry criteria for English language, enhanced criminal conviction checks and health requirements.

Reason: Currently the advertising materials and programme specification do not provide full and consistent information about the new Dip HE Operating Department Practice programme. The Visitors felt applicants and students must be made aware of the entry criteria for English language, enhanced criminal conviction checks and health requirements and that they will be applied. To allow students to make an informed choice, these documents must be updated.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

Condition: The programme team must forward the CV's for all lecturers on the programme, including those who participate from practice.

Reason: From discussions with the placement providers it became apparent that not all the CV's for the lecturers from practice had been provided. As such, the Visitors were unable to determine whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme or whether the staff identified on the module specifications as teaching, have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

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

Condition: The programme team must review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and entry to the HPC register.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation, which is a resource, states that students are eligible to register with the HPC upon graduation. To provide full and clear information about the programme, the Visitors felt the programme documentation must be amended to state that upon graduation, students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme team must implement and submit procedures for gaining informed consent from students prior to the commencement of simulated clinical activities where students act as patients or clients.

Reason: The Visitors felt the current, faculty wide, consent form was too generic and did not address all the activities which a student may be asked to undertake as part of the programme. As such, the Visitors felt procedures must be implemented which are specific to ODP students.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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 redraft and resubmit the HPC standards of proficiency mapping document to clearly identify each standard of proficiency against each module in which it is taught and assessed.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team, the Visitors identified omissions from the standards of proficiency mapping document and to provide a complete overview of the programme, this document must be updated.

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 review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the module specifications to clearly identify which standards of proficiency are taught and assessed in each module.

Reason: Currently the module specifications do not provide full information about which standards of proficiency will be met in each module. Examples of this can be found in Professional Practice 1, Anaesthetic Practice and Surgical Practice. The Visitors felt that these must be updated to provide students with full information.

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.

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the inter-professional learning module specification, Communications and Interpersonal Skills, to include reference to HPC's standards of proficiency.

Reason: Currently the module specification directs students to the NMC and QAA standards but not HPC's. To provide ODP students with profession specific knowledge, the Visitors felt this must be updated.

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

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

5.4 Learning, teaching and supervision must be designed to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the practice portfolio to clearly identify at which stage of the programme students are expected to complete each competence.

Reason: Feedback from current students and placement providers about the existing portfolio, indicated confusion surrounding at what stage of their training a student would be expected to prove competence, such as checking an anaesthetic machine. Placement providers confirmed they would realistically expect that at the end of their first year, a student should be able to set up for a 'basic' operating list and perform standard equipment safety checks in accordance with the A.A.G.B.I's checklist for Anaesthetic Equipment (2004), but this area of competence is not assessed within the proposed practice portfolio until the second year. Nor was it apparent from discussions with the programme team, that underpinning theory associated with some of these fundamental anaesthetic and surgical skills was delivered at an appropriate stage to enable safe and effective practice. To provide clear information to students and placement providers, the Visitors believe that the proposed practice portfolio must be updated to harmonise theory and practice and reflect appropriate and realistic stages of skill acquisition throughout the first and second year.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must submit an updated mentor list, which includes the qualifications, speciality training and when the mentor last received practice placement educator training.

Reason: The information received at the visit did not allow the Visitors to undertake a full assessment of the above standards of education and training and as such, an updated list must be forwarded.

5.4 Learning, teaching and supervision must be designed to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook and, where necessary, the module specifications to include reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation does not mention HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The Visitors felt that more direction to the HPC standards is required to ensure students are aware of the thresholds they are expected to meet whilst in education and when registered.

SET 6: Assessment standards

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the practice portfolio and, where necessary, the module specifications to clarify which competences can be appropriately assessed within the practice or academic environment.

Reason: From the review of documentation and discussions with the programme team, the Visitors felt the proposed practice portfolio contained competences which would be more easily assessed by academic methods e.g. competences 3.1 and 17.9.4. Placement providers confirmed this view by commenting that competences, such as 3.1 (Shows evidence of research awareness; can perform a literature search using Athens), would be difficult to assess within the practice environment. As such, the practice portfolio and module specifications must be updated to clarify the distinction between practice and academic competences.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 26th July 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 27th September 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 27th September 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider recruiting another permanent member of staff with relevant theatre experience.

Reason: To further support the Programme Leader, the Visitors felt that a further relevantly qualified individual should be employed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider prioritising bids for clinical skills resources, specifically theatre specific equipment.

Reason: While the Visitors believe the current resources are used effectively, by admission the programme is in the process of building up the stock of instruments. The Visitors felt that to allow students to further practice in a safe and controlled environment before placement, this resource should be prioritised.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: It is recommended that all staff involved in the delivery of the inter-professional learning modules, are made fully conversant with the profession specific issues of the students they are teaching.

Reason: From discussions with students and the programme team, it was noted that inconsistencies between tutors have been identified and a staff update is in development. The Visitors feel this training should be undertaken before the new programme commences.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider standardising the allocation of mentors across the practice placement sites.

Reason: Discussions with the programme team and students identified different approaches to the allocation of mentors between placement sites. The Visitors felt that to dispel student perception of 'being able to choose your mentor' at Bury, this process should be standardised.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:



Julie Weir



Alan Mount

Date: 27/06/07

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	24 th and 25 th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Penny Joyce (Educationalist) Tony Scripps (Clinician)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Corrine de Vries – Chair Simon Appleton – Secretary (Senior Team meeting only) Tony Watson – Secretary Nigel Conway – CODP Dr Emanuela Todeva – University Dr Ian Hammerton – University

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	35
--	----

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2. *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials to include information on the relationship between holding the qualification, access to the HPC Register and the use of the protected title 'Operating Department Practitioner'.

Reason: Currently the advertising materials do not make reference to the HPC. To provide full and clear information about the programme, the Visitors felt the advertising materials must be amended to state that upon graduation, students are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. In addition, the Visitors felt students must be informed that should they wish to use the protected title of Operating Department Practitioner, they must be registered with the HPC.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to include reference to the library facilities for ODP students.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook refers to the library facilities for nurses. To ensure students are directed to the ODP facilities within the University Library, the Visitors felt the programme handbook must be updated.

and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to include reference to HPC's standards of proficiency for Operating Department Practitioners.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook refers to the Proficiencies of Professional Practice. To ensure students are able to locate the correct information on HPC's website, the Visitors felt the programme handbook must be updated.

3.11 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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to remove the references to 3,000 theory/practise hours and compulsory attendance 'in order to comply with the HPC requirements'.

Reason: The HPC does not stipulate a minimum number of hours or an attendance policy for registration and as such, these references must be removed.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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.

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

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the module outlines and programme handbook to show that where standards of proficiency are incorporated in the learning outcomes, they are part of the formal credit bearing and assessment procedures.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the Visitors noted the introduction of a portfolio in the Supervised Practice module, which is assessed against the standards of proficiency but does not contribute to the final award of the Dip HE. The Visitors believe students will have met the standards of proficiency prior to this final module, but feel the incorporation of the standards in the learning outcomes suggests it is an additional requirement and not a transition from the qualification to the work place. In addition, the Visitors believe this carries an element of risk as a student could argue they have already achieved the required number of credits for the award of the Dip HE. The Visitors felt that to fully acknowledge the value of this module, the learning outcomes and assessment procedures for the Supervised Practice module must be reviewed and redrafted.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to include reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook refers students to the university academic codes and professional body Code of Behavioural Conduct. The Visitors felt that more direction to the HPC standards is required to ensure students are aware of the thresholds they are expected to meet whilst in education and when registered.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 9th July 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation: The programme team should consider expanding the entry criteria within the advertising materials to take account of international students, including English language requirements.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team it was evident there is a desire to widen participation and attract international students to the programme. To do this, the Visitors felt the advertising materials should be amended to provide international students with the information they need to make an informed choice about the programme.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider developing the clinical teaching facilities within the European Institute of Health & Medical Sciences to further support ODP students.

Reason: From the visit, the Visitors are confident the facilities on campus and those used at the Chelsea and Westminster NHS Trust enable students to meet the standards of proficiency. However, there was no evidence on campus of subject specific equipment, such as an operating table and scrub up facility and the Visitors believe the provision of these resources would better support the students.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: Where ODP students engage in inter-professional learning, the programme team should further develop their role in contextualising the importance and relevance of this learning style.

Reason: From discussions with students and the programme team, the Visitors noted that some students did not recognise the importance and relevance of inter-professional learning, particularly in the area of nutrition.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:

Penny Joyce

Tony Scripps

Date: 11 June 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Teesside
Name and titles of programme(s)	University Certificate in Professional Development (UCPD) University Certificate in Postgraduate Professional Development (UCPPD)
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	21 st June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Kathy Burgess – Radiographer Jane Topham - Paramedic
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Angela Morgan – Assistant Dean, Learning and Teaching Development – Chair Fiona Terry – Secretary Roy Connell – HLSP Reviewer Marion Grieves – School of Health and Social Care Carol Wylie – School of Health and Social Care Jill Kent – Senior Lecturer - Physiotherapy

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	60
--	----

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must resubmit documentation so that it clearly specifies what numeracy skills are required prior to admission and what procedures are in place if these skills are deficient.

Reason: Through reading the documentation and meeting with the programme team it became evident that a certain level of numeracy was a requirement for admission and it was unclear as to how each student's numeracy skills will be assessed. Also, it was not clear whether the outcome of the assessment would then lead to numeracy skills being included into the academic learning or withdrawing the applicant from the programme.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.11 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 programme team must resubmit documentation to include where attendance is mandatory and what procedures are in place if this is not met.

Reason: The documentation does not clearly outline where attendance is mandatory and when meeting the programme team it was unclear what percentage of attendance is expected of students and what systems are in place if students do not meet the required amount.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Condition: The programme team must resubmit documentation to include specific clinical learning hours and a student timetable.

Reason: It was not clear in the documentation how many hours constituted a full day with regards to the amount of clinical learning hours. It is indicated as 12 learning days but not clear what constitutes a day. There was no outline or clear breakdown of what aspects of the curriculum would be taught within these learning hours.

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure;

5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must resubmit documentation to include any action to be taken in the case of student failure in the Mentor handbook

Reason: There was no information for students in the documentation as to what procedures are in place for both mentors and students if they fail to meet all of the learning outcomes.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition: The assessment process for OSCEs must show students can achieve fitness to practise by identifying the core elements of the OSCE that must be passed.

Reason: The score for a pass mark within this assessment is 60% and above. It was not clear in the documentation what the criteria was for a pass mark and whether if learning outcomes were not all achieved a student could still pass the module as they scored higher in a different aspect of the OSCE.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should keep student numbers at an adequate number for the programme team to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The programme team stated that the cohort for this module was to be up to 60 which was felt to be the maximum cohort for the size of the programme team. If the provision for numbers can be greater, thought needs to be given as to the efficiency of the staff if this was the case.

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Recommendation: The programme team should use the undergraduate policy for consent where students participate as patients in practical settings.

Reason: Students were not currently participating as patients in practical settings. However, if students are required to in future or are used in OSCEs then a system will need to be implemented.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should update the audit system to include the potential for AHP students and placements.

Reason: It was evident that placements were audited for the purpose of monitoring them but the current auditing form did not have any scope for AHP placements that may be needed in the future.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Kathy Burgess

Jane Topham

Date: 25th June 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Thames Valley University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma in HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of visit	6th – 7th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Julie Weir – Operating Department Practitioner, Lecturer, clinical teacher – BUPA, LSBU Penny Joyce – Principle Lecturer – University of Portsmouth.
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Patricia Morton (Chair) – Deputy Academic Registrar Frank McMahon – Programme Leader, Journalism, TVU Patrick Laryea – Pre-Qualifying Nursing, Common Foundation Co-ordinator Amalia Tsiam – Senior Lecturer, Nutritional Medicine Dieter Herde – CAT's Co-ordinator

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	14
---	-----------

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition:

The programme team needs to develop and submit a specific consent form utilised to obtain consent from students prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, e.g. role plays, practicing profession-specific techniques.

Reason:

At present a Health and Safety form is being used prior to simulation and laboratories areas. This form however does not clearly address the specific requirement for obtaining student consent prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching. A more specific form for obtaining consent needs to be used.

Condition 2

3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place.

Condition:

A system of academic and pastoral student support must be made explicit within the programme handbook.

Reason:

In light of student feedback it became apparent that students were not fully aware of the academic and pastoral support available to them from the university. This information needs to be made more explicit to students.

Condition 3:

3.11 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 programme team must provide evidence of how attendance will be recorded and monitored through the use of the Personal Development Plan (PDPs)

Reason:

A system of recording and monitoring attendance needs to be in place to ensure that students attend all mandatory aspects of the programme which are essential in making sure they meet the standard of proficiency. Through discussions with the programme team it became apparent that the Personal Development Plans will be used for this. This needs to be made available to students prior to the start of the programme.

Condition 4:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition:

The programme team needs to submit a mapping document to show the HPC Standards of Proficiency are fully mapped only against the mandatory modules.

Reason:

Currently, some of the HPC Standards of Proficiency's are mapped into an optional unit, which presents the possibility that some of the Standards of Proficiency would not be achieved if a student decided not to take this module. It was not clearly articulated within the documentation how all the HPC Standards of Proficiency are being achieved by the students through the mandatory modules. This needs to be made more explicit.

Condition 5:

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

**5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

Condition:

The programme team needs to produce and submit a mentor database showing the designation, qualifications and clinical specialism of all mentors including when last updated. This should be across all sites where Operating Department Practice students are on placement.

Reason:

It was difficult to see within the documentation, clear up to date information regarding placement mentor staff, such as who they are and what qualifications they hold. Through producing a clear database, this will help ensure this information is kept up to date and can also act as a monitoring aid.

Condition 6:

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

Condition:

The programme team must provide evidence to show how the Practice Environment Profiles (PEPs) reflect the needs of Operating Department Practice students.

Reason:

The current PEPs used to audit placements are more specific for nursing requirements. Audits need to also reflect the specific needs for the Operating Department Practice programme.

Condition 7:

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.1 the learning outcomes to be achieved;

5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition:

The programme team must submit the completed programme handbook

Reason:

The current documentation did not include the programme handbook. This needs to be completed and available to students prior to the start of the programme and should include all relevant information regarding the programme ensuring that the above SETs are included and are being met.

Condition 8:

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition:

The programme handbook should include the relevant professional and regulatory body expectations of conduct.

Reason:

Students should be fully informed of the relevant professional and regulatory body expectations, specifically the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition 9:

5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.

Condition:

The programme team must submit a completed mentor handbook

Reason:

The current documentation did not include a mentor handbook. This needs to be completed and available to mentors prior to the start of the programme so that the mentors are fully informed of their role as mentors and what all the relevant information in relation to the programme and students.

Condition 10:

SET 6. Assessment standards

Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Condition:

The programme handbook must clearly state the expectations of feedback, for e.g. assessment and feedback timeline.

Reason:

Through discussions with students it became apparent that students were unaware of the duration for receiving feedback on assignments once submitted. The visitors felt it is important to provide timely feedback for students on assignments to enable them to progress and improve.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 2 Programme admissions

- 2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme**
- 2.2.4 apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;**
- 2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms**

Recommendation:

To standardise all pre-information to prospective students in relation to standard and non-standard entrants.

Reason:

Through student discussions it became apparent that students were not provided with the same pre-information. To avoid confusion and keep consistency it would be better if all pre-information for both standard & non standard prospective students were the same.

Recommendation 2

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation:

To have Operating Department Practice specific skills facilities, so students are able to practice in a safe environment prior to practice, e.g. gowning , gloving and instrumentation trays.

Reason:

At the present site and with consideration of the new building, there is no indication of Operating Department Practice specific skills facilities. The visitors encourage any possibilities specific skill facilities to be available for students which would enhance student learning and experience.

Recommendation 3

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation:

To make the links between theory and practice are made more explicit to students throughout the duration of the programme.

Reason:

The visitors were assured that there are links between theory and practice within the programme, but felt that this could be made more explicit to students so they can clearly see the relationship between the two.

Recommendation 4

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation:

Where pre and post-registration students learn together, the needs of the pre-registration students must be facilitated.

Reason:

The visitors felt there is the possibility that the needs of the pre-registration students may at times not be facilitated when learning takes place with the post registration students.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme, subject to any conditions being met.

Visitors' signatures:



Mrs Julie Weir

Mrs Penny Joyce

Date: 22/6/07

ALL CONDITIONS MET