VISITORS' REPORTS

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction
The attached visitors' reports for the following programmes have been sent to the education providers and following a 28 day period no representations have been received. The education providers are in the process of meeting the conditions recommended by the HPC visitors.

Education provider	Programme name	Delivery mode
University of Wales, Bangor	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy	Full Time Accelerated
University of Birmingham	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Full-time
University of Birmingham	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Flexible
University of East Anglia	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Full-time
University of East Anglia	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Full-time
Leeds Metropolitan University	Non-Medical Prescribing	Flexible
Liverpool John Moores University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences	Full-time Part-time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Part-time
London South Bank University	MSc Physiotherapy	Full-time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Full-time Part-time
London South Bank University	PG Dip Occupational Therapy	Full-time
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences	Full-time Part-time
The Robert Gordon University	Non-Medical Prescribing	Part-time
Sheffield Hallam University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Staffordshire University and Keele University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time

Decision
The Panel is asked to –

accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, including the conditions recommended by the visitors
or
accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, and vary the conditions recommended by the visitors

Background information
None

Resource implications
None

Financial implications
None

Appendices
Visitors' reports (13)

Date of paper
25 June 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	September 2007
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	☐
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	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☐	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐
IT facilities	X	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

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

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: 15 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	15th and 16th 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 (15th May) Nesta Hartley – Visitor, CSP (16th May)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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	University of East Anglia
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of Visit	24th and 25th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapist, clinician / educationalist) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist, educationalist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist, clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Geoff Moore (Chair) Nathalie Brown (Secretary) Rosie Doy (UEA) Gibson D'Cruz (UEA) Lyn Westcott (COT visitor) Catriona Khamisha (COT visitor) Karen Holmes (COT Education Officer) Ann Green (CSOP visitor) Nina Thomson (CSOP Education Officer)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A

Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**30 PT** **45 OT**

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 review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure that references to registration with the HPC, clearly state that the programmes lead to eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation states that there is automatic entry to the HPC Register. Examples of this can be found in the university prospectus and Appendix IV (Programme Conditions) of the Course Re-approval Document.

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 submit and implement guidelines for the use of Blackboard technology, so that when e-learning facilities are utilised, students can expect a consistent and effective approach.

Reason: Student feedback indicated some confusion when locating information on Blackboard. In order to provide students with clear access to e learning, guidelines must be implemented.

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:
        5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

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

Reason: Currently students are referred to the Code of Conduct, Performance and Ethics or the Standards of Conduct. To ensure students are able to easily locate the correct documentation on HPC's website, these references must be amended.

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 unit descriptors to include further details on how and when students are assessed against the learning outcomes.

Reason: Currently the unit descriptors do not provide sufficient detail in order for the visitors to determine whether a student is assessed against the learning outcomes and therefore able to demonstrate fitness to practice.

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 unit descriptors to show which assessment method is used to assess each learning outcome.

Reason: Although a range of assessment methods are utilised, the visitors were unable to determine whether the methods used are in line with the learning outcomes for each unit.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to inform students that an aegrotat award does not lead to eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: Students must be provided with full information about the requirements of HPC.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY SPECIFIC CONDITION

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.

and

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

and

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 unit descriptors to clearly articulate how students undertaking the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme meet HPC's Standard of Proficiency 3a.1.

Reason: Currently there are omissions within the unit descriptors of basic underpinning knowledge regarding health, disease, disorder and dysfunction.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 15th 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

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

        Joanna Jackson

        Anthony Power

Date: 26 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	9 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jane Topham (Paramedic) Dugald MacInnes (Lay)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Terry Moran, Associate Dean & Head of School of Social Sciences (Chair) Alison Bohan, Principal Officer, Academic Quality & Research, Faculty of Health (Report writer) Jacqui Parkin, Administrative Officer Faculty of Health (Course administrator) Alison Caswell, Group Head Public and Environmental Health, Faculty of Health (Internal panel member) Julie Rogers, Clinical Services Manager, MSK Services, Leeds Primary Care Trust (External panel member)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through annual monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☐	☐	☒

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 None	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	50 (30-40% AHPs)

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: The programme team should review the admissions criteria to ensure that it accurately reflects and distinguishes between the different requirements for the level three and masters level programmes.

Reason: The entry criteria listed in the programme specification and approval document does not currently detail the different requirements for studying at level three and masters level. The module descriptor for the masters level module includes an additional pre-requisite of 'a related first degree or the proven facility to function at level M' and the Faculty CPD scheme definitive document includes first degree requirements. Through discussions with the programme team, it became clear that a prospective students' potential to study at different levels would be assessed as part of the selection process and they would receive guidance on the most appropriate level. Consequently the visitors felt that the programme admissions criteria should be updated to ensure that applicants were clear of the entry standards for the two different versions of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team should review the ap(e)l procedures to ensure that students who are eligible for ap(e)l, are still able to meet the standard of proficiency for supplementary prescribing*. In particular, the programme team should clarify the attendance and assessment requirements following the application of ap(e)l.

**Registrants must know and be able to apply the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber in order to have their name annotated on the Register.*

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team it was confirmed that students could ap(e)l up to 50% of the programme and that this could include both the taught and clinical parts of the programme. It was explained that if a student received ap(e)l for 50% of the programme, then the 80% attendance requirement would be waived. Whilst the visitors were aware that this would only happen in exceptional circumstances, they felt that there needed to be a safeguard to ensure that students would still attend the clinical component of the programme and complete the assessment. The visitors recognised the value of ap(e)l for parts of the programme, but felt that any reduction in the time spent in clinical practice would not enable students to develop into safe and effective practitioners.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: Friday 8 June 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 21 June 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 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.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including the course programme delivery team details in the course handbook, so that students are aware of the wider programme team and their relevance to particular parts of the programme.

Reason: The Faculty CPD scheme definitive document included a wide range of CVs which showed the number and expertise of the staff who deliver this programme. In the meeting with the programme team, it was explained how these staff contributed to the programme delivery. The visitors felt that the information in the course handbook, which listed a team of four, could be elaborated on, so that students were clear which staff would be responsible for the delivery of the taught part of the programme.

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: The programme team should consider expressing the 12 clinical days, as hours, to ensure that all students receive sufficient support, teaching and supervision from their Designated Medical Practitioner (DMP) to allow them to achieve the learning outcomes.

Reason: The programme team do not currently provide any interpretation or guidance on what constitutes a 'working day' in practice. To eliminate variations (e.g. six hour days compared to twelve hour days) , the visitors suggest that the programme team consider equating days to hours so that all students clinical experience allows them to meet the learning outcomes.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Recommendation: At the next available opportunity, the Faculty should reconsider the wording used in the 40-49% descriptor in the assessment criteria, to guarantee that they are producing graduates who are safe, effective and competent.

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team, it was explained how the assessment criteria detailed in the documentation was not used to assess clinical competencies. Clinical competencies are assessed on a pass/fail basis, so the visitors were confident that this programme's assessment ensured that students were fit to practise, upon completion. However, as these assessment criteria are used more widely within the Faculty, the visitors suggested that it be reviewed at the next appropriate opportunity to ensure that the references to 'levels of supervision' were amended, removed or edited with a caveat, so that it was explicit that those who received a grade within the 40-49% band were able to practice as safe and effective autonomous practitioners.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The students were positive and complimentary about the programme and staff support**
- **The programme team, senior staff and placement educators contributed to a constructive, open and friendly discussion throughout the visit.**

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:

Jane Topham

Dugald MacInnes

Date: 10 May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time Part time
Date of Visit	9th & 10th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Phil Warren (Biomedical Scientist, Educationalist) Martin Nicholson (Biomedical Scientist, Clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Tony Hall (Chair) Debbie Richardson (Secretary) Robert Williams (IBMS visitor) Alan Wainwright (IBMS) Sarah May (IBMS) Joanne Knowles (LJMU) Chris Rostron (LJMU) Dhiya Al-Jumeily (LJMU)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐

IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**12 - 15**

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 review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove references to 'state registration'.

Reason: The term 'state registration' is no longer used by the professions which the HPC regulates and must be removed from the programme documentation. An example of where this can be found is in the university prospectus.

and

Condition: The programme team must review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly state that the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme leads to eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation indicates that there is direct entry to the HPC Register and to provide students with clear information, this must be updated. Examples of this can be found in the university prospectus and student handbook 2007-8.

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:

    5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

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

Reason: Currently students are referred to the Code of Ethics. To ensure students are able to easily locate the correct documentation on HPC's website, these references must be amended.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the University Modular Framework Assessment Regulations to clearly inform students that an aegrotat award does not lead to eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: Currently the University Modular Framework Assessment Regulations lists those programmes which the aegrotat policy does not apply to. The BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme does not appear in this list and must be added.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 25th 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

Visitors' signatures:

      Phil Warren

      Martin Nicholson

Date: 16th May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
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)	Margaret Curr, Physiotherapist Anthony Power, Physiotherapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair), London Southbank University Catherine Moss (Secretary), London South Bank University Jenny Carey, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Helena Johnson, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Professor Mike Molan, London Southbank University Professor Geoffrey Elliott, London Southbank University Lisa Greatrex, London Southbank University

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc 22

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that IELTS level 6.5 is required for admission to the programme.

Reason: The documentation is currently inconsistent, with some documentation specifying that 6.0 is required, while other parts specify 6.5. The programme team explained that 6.5 is required so the documentation needs to be revised to make this clear.

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

Condition: The age restriction preventing students under the age of 18 entering the programme should be removed.

Reason: This restriction is inconsistent with the anti-discrimination policy.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **29 June 2007**
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **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 Visitors were impressed by the continual operation of the service users strategy and how this has enhanced ongoing programme improvement.**

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:

Margaret Curr
Anthony Power

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	Approximate start date 2008
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Margaret Curr, Physiotherapist Anthony Power, Physiotherapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair), London Southbank University Catherine Moss (Secretary), London South Bank University Jenny Carey, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Helena Johnson, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Professor Mike Molan, London Southbank University Professor Geoffrey Elliott, London Southbank University Lisa Greatrex, London Southbank University

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	10

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that IELTS level 6.5 is required for admission to the programme.

Reason: The documentation is currently inconsistent, with some documentation specifying that 6.0 is required, while other parts specify 6.5. The programme team explained that 6.5 is required so the documentation needs to be revised to make this clear.

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

Condition: The age restriction preventing students under the age of 18 entering the programme should be removed.

Reason: This restriction is inconsistent with the anti-discrimination policy.

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 MSc 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*

6.2 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.

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 MSc 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.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **29 June 2007**
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **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 Visitors were impressed by the continual operation of the service users strategy and how this has enhanced ongoing programme improvement.

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:

Margaret Curr
Anthony Power

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full-time and Part-time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	Part time September 2007 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	☒
Major change to existing programme BSc (Hons) Part time	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

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: **29 June 2007**
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **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

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	PG Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full-time
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	
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**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: **29 June 2007**
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **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

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Northumbria at Newcastle
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT
Date of Visit	2nd-3rd May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Dr Robert Williams (Biomedical Scientist, Educationalist) Dr Mary Macdonald (Biomedical Scientist, Clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Colin Creasy (Chair), Associate Dean, Staff and Student Affairs, Northumbria University Mrs Catherine Barker (minutes), Principle Administrator, School of Applied Science, Northumbria University

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	10

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that all students on the Applied Biomedical Science pathway must undergo criminal convictions checks.

Reason: At present, criminal convictions are indicated in the programme documentation to be carried out when necessary at the discretion of the employer. In order to meet this standard of education and training, all students must undergo the criminal convictions check and the documentation must be updated to reflect this.

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 correct the reference to the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and to replace outdated terminology regarding state registration.

Reason: The programme documentation in most instances provided correct terminology and document references. However, in several instances reference was made to the previous system of regulation which included state registration. Further, students may be misled by the existing inaccurate reference to the Standards of Conduct rather than Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.7.4 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placements which will include information about and understanding of the following: the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

6.7.1 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the implications of failure of the Applied Biomedical Science pathway. In particular the programme documentation should provide information on the process for referral in the final year and the process for credit transfer in order to achieve the Biomedical Science pathway award.

Reason: The programme documentation makes reference to the Biomedical Science pathway awards as being accessible upon failure of the professional practice elements of the Applied Biomedical Science pathway. However, the Visitors felt this information needs to

make explicit the options available to students and explain the process of credit transfer and at which points it is possible.

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 external examiner appointed to the programme must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register unless otherwise agreed.

Reason: The programme team evidenced the appointment of an external examiner from the relevant part of the Register and understood this to be a requirement of the HPC. However, in order to meet the standard of education and training the stipulation must be clearly stated in the documentation

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: 5th July 2007

Commendations

The Visitors commend the implementation of the "training the trainers" programme and the high level of collaboration between the University, placement educators, employers and external lecturers. The Visitors felt the programme exhibited a sound model of collaboration.

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:

Robert Williams

Mary Macdonald

Date: 4th May 2007

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	16th 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	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	24

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	Sheffield Hallam University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	24th – 25th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Tracey Huggins - Operating Department Practitioner David Bevan - Operating Department Practitioner
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock Abigail Creighton (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Roger New - Chair (Head of Quality and Enhancement, Faculty of Arts, Computing Engineering and Sciences) Jenny Shelton - (Faculty Head of Quality and Enhancement) Eleanor Willcocks - Secretary (Faculty Validation Officer, Academic Approvals, Registry) Helen Booth - College of Operating Department Practitioners (CODP) Visitor (University of Surrey)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New profession	☒
New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐

	Yes	No	N/A
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**38**

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 information; the redrafted information should clearly reflect the HPC registration guidelines.

Reason: The submitted information did not clearly articulate that completion of the Dip HE leads to eligibility rather than entitlement for registration with the Health Professions Council.

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit programme information to give clear guidelines on the health requirements for registration with the Health Professions Council

Reason: The submitted information included health requirements which did not clearly reflect the Health Professions Council's guidelines. Examples of specific Illnesses were outlined which gave the impression these may hinder an applicants chances of registering. The programme team were advised to read the 'Information about a health reference' and 'A disabled person's guide to becoming a health professional' publications.

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 information to clearly outlined the APEL criteria

Reason: The submitted information did not clearly articulate that the Health Professions Council is not involved in the university's APEL system. It also did not make clear the differences between the professional body and the regulatory body.

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 confirm the maintenance of the 5 full time staff or provide a contingency plan if there are difficulties within the time frame. Recruitment of a new member of staff must have relevant expertise and knowledge applicable to the Dip HE in Operating Department Practice.

Reason: The programme team are in the process of recruiting a new member of staff onto the programme team. Presently it appears that there are not enough staff in place to adequately support the student cohort until this member has been recruited. The programme team are confident that they can recruit a fifth team member to start in September 2007, and explained that they would recruit visiting lecturers and part-time staff if they were unsuccessful.

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 ensured 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.

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
4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession
4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice

Condition: The programme team must submit evidence that students completing the programme meet all of our standards of proficiency. There needs to be clear indication that on completion of the learning outcomes, the HPC standards of proficiency are being achieved, both in theory and in practice.

Reason: In the documentation and through discussion it became clear that the learning outcomes did not ensure that all standards of proficiency were met. The visitors were

unclear where the standards of proficiency 1a5, 2a1, 2b1, 2b2, 2b4, 3a1 were met as students have limited exposure to emergency situations and post anaesthesia care. There was flexibility for students as to whether they met learning outcomes. The programme team did not demonstrate assessment of practical skills and knowledge in all clinical areas as articulated in the standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The programme team must up date mentors on the use of reflective accounts by redrafting and submitting documentation to include a planned agenda or programme of subjects taught during mentor training.

Reason: In discussion it became apparent that mentors did not feel comfortable asking students to complete reflective accounts as part of their portfolio assessment, even though the programme team felt that placement coordinators would find this a useful part of assessment for students. In the meeting with students, it became apparent that they had completed limited reflective accounts and the visitors felt that the mentors needed to receive training to allow them to use reflection more confidently. In turn, this would allow students to develop as autonomous and reflective thinkers.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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; and
5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placements educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

Condition: The programme team are to submit an up to date and comprehensive mentor database which reflects their qualifications, experience, registered status and the mentor training they have received. The database must include all practice placement areas.

Reason: Although a list of mentors was produced, it did not cover all placement sites or provide updated information on all mentors qualifications and registered status. There was also no clear mechanism to effectively monitor, on a regular basis, the number of appropriately qualified, registered and experienced staff during student placement.

5.3.2 The practice placement settings must provide 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 need to provide evidence to show there is a mechanism in place for students to both confidentially and formally evaluate practice placements.

Reason: The documentation does not give clear advice on the communication channels for the student whilst on placement. Detail on the student's workplace assessment is not adequate to ascertain that the student will, on completion of the placement, have achieved the learning outcomes and the skills to practise safely and effectively. A mechanism needs to be in place for students to confidentially feedback on their placement experience. Although informal mechanisms are in place between individual students and mentors, there is no formal mechanism whereby the education provider can receive and action (where necessary) feedback from students.

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.
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 redraft and resubmit documentation to provide evidence that practice placements are monitored by way of clinical placements audits and an action plan for future audits.

Reason: Although evidence was provided to indicate a system was in place to audit placement settings the visitors felt it did not clearly articulate that a thorough and effective system for approval and monitoring placements was in place

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;
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 redraft and resubmit mentor handbooks.

Reason: The HPC does not visit practice placements and therefore needs to be assured that mentors have accessible information as to their responsibilities and what is expected of them. Even though mentor handbooks were asked for throughout the visit and provided at the end of the visit, as the visitors did not have time to look through them, they could not be confident that this standard was met by the time the conditions were made.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.
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.
6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to show re-evaluation of assessment methods used in practice placements.

Reason: Throughout discussion during the visit the HPC representatives were not assured that mechanisms are in place to monitor and review the quality and consistency in the questioning and observation by placement mentors, to ensure students are always fit to practice. The programme did not demonstrate assessment of practical skills and knowledge in all clinical areas as articulated in the standards of proficiency.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 25th June 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team re-validate the programme within the time scale given by the education provider.

Reason: The programme team expressed a need for this due to recent changes in the professional body and the new approval by the Health Professions Council.

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

Recommendation: There is a need, in light of the forthcoming appointment of another permanent member of staff, to review the module leads.

Reason: It was not clear during the visit as to what members of staff are leading which modules. Through discussion, the team confirmed that modules are currently led by existing staff due to the unfilled position. The visitors were confident that the existing staff has the relevant expertise and knowledge to teach the modules, but recognised that the modules would need to be re-allocated once a fifth member of staff joined the team.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The university and faculty are to be commended for the high level of support for the programme team and the programme.

2. The HPC representatives thought the resource infrastructure for the student experience was excellent.

3. There was a clear show of support for students by the programme team and placement providers which has created an effective system of development and support 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:

Tracey Huggins

David Bevan

Date: 16ᵗʰ May 2007

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	22nd – 23rd 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	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

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