Health Professions Council
Education & Training Panel – 28 March 2007

PROGRAMME APPROVAL

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

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

Education provider	Programme name	Delivery mode
University of Central England in Birmingham	Non-medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	Part -time
University of Central Lancashire	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of East Anglia	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of East London	BSc (Hons) Podiatric Medicine	Full-time
University of East London	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Full-time
University of Hertfordshire	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science	Full-time Full-time
University of Hertfordshire	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology	Full-time
St Martin's College	Non-Medical Prescribing	Part -time

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

Background information
None

Resource implications
None

Financial implications
None

Appendices
Visitors reports (8)

Date of paper
21 May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central England, Birmingham
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non –Medial Prescribing Course for Health Professions
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT & PT
Date of Visit	03 April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jane Topham – Staff Development Officer – Yorkshire Ambulance Service (Educationalist) Mark Woolcock – South Western Ambulance Service (Clinician/Educationalist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar Katherine Lock (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Neil Staunton, Undergraduate Programme manager, Faculty of Law, Humanities, Development and Society (Chair) Marion Thompson, Director of Academic Quality, Faculty of Health (Secretary) Kuldip Bharj, NMC Reviewer, Head of midwifery and womens health, University of Leeds Margaret Abbott, External Adviser (Academic), Senior Lecturer, St Martins College/University of Cumbria Barbara Novak, External Adviser (Academic), Lecturer in applied biological sciences/Lead for nurse prescribing, Institute of Health Sciences/City University, London Lisa Hill, External Adviser (Practitioner), Kingswinford Fiona Copland, University Representative, Course Director, Cert HE:FE, Faculty of Education Lucy Land, Faculty Representative, Research Teaching Facilitator,/Field Co-ordinator, Faculty Centre

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

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	**15**

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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 must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the APEL process in the programme documents.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it became clear that particular details relating to the types of experience and qualification that would normally be permitted for use for exemption from teaching session were not outlined in the documentation.

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 definitive documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must be appropriately registered with the HPC unless otherwise arranged.

Reason: A suitable external examiner who is in compliance with this standard must be appointed to this programme. In order to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard, the definitive documentation will need to be amended to include the stipulation on the appointment of a suitable external examiner.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **Monday 7 May 2007**

Expected dates for submission to ETP: **Tuesday 31st May 2007 (Report)**
                                             Tuesday 31st May 2007 (Approval)

Commendations

The visitors commend the Physiology component of the programme. Positive comments were received from colleagues and students and the Visitors were impressed by the supporting document and the comprehensive web resources.

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

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

Visitors' signatures:

> **Jane Topham**
> **Mark Woolcock**

Date: 13 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	12-13 December 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount (ODP Visitor) Colin Keiley (ODP Visitor)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Daljit Mahoon Osama Ammar (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ken Mason (Chair, Academic Quality and Standards Unit)
	Lorna Marie Burrow (Secretary, Quality Team, Faculty of Health)
	Roger King (External Assessor, Thames Valley University)
	Andrew Taaffe (Internal panel member)
	Vicki Culpin (Internal panel member)
	Nick Clark (AODP representative, HSHS Ltd)
	Liz Edwards (Observer, Quality Team)

ALL CONDITIONS MET *(watermark)*

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
New profession	☒
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	**20**

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to remove references to the HPC in relation to English language entry requirements.

Reason: In the submitted documentation reference is made to a list of various English language qualifications that are acceptable for entry to the programme, but describes them as being approved by the HPC. Though the HPC requirement for registration is an IELTS score of 7.0 with no less than 6.5 in any component, the entry requirements for pre-registration programmes of study are not specified as the documentation suggests.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising material used for the programme to clearly articulate students are subject to an 'enhanced' Criminal Records Bureau check. The programme team should also include in the documentation information relating the process of monitoring criminal records and how it is undertaken.

Reason: In the submitted documentation information is provided about criminal records checks but does not clearly indicate that it would be an 'enhanced' check. The Visitors also felt through discussion that appropriate protocols for monitoring criminal records were in place but needed to be made explicit in the documentation.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to include further information on the health check requirement and make explicit in the Course handbook that students' health will be a requirement for registration with the HPC and that changes in health status should be reported to the programme team through the appropriate channel.

Reason: The Visitors felt the Course handbook provided information about self-declaration of changes to criminal records and that similar information should be provided on matters of occupational health to ensure students are able to meet the Standards of Proficiency at the end of the programme.

2.2.4 apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to clearly articulate the qualifications required for entry to the programme.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent that further study may be required to provide the relevant academic background in the case of the NVQ qualifications listed as meeting entry requirements. In order to make any additional requirements clear to applicants, the Visitors felt this should be made explicit 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 submit the AP(E)L policy applied to the programme for non-standard entry.

Reason: Through discussion, the re-validation panel required changes to the wording applied to the programme to bring the policy in line with that of the wider University. The Visitors considered that as a result of these changes the AP(E)L policy will require perousal as it has not yet been seen in its final draft.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must submit role profiles and information of the subjects and modules which the members of staff will be teaching/delivering on the DipHE programme. Details of the intended clinical link areas and personal tutor workload should also be provided.

Reason: Although students indicated the programme team were readily available to support students, the Visitors felt that in order to avoid key staff dependency the workload on staff needs to be determined.

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 definitive documentation to include the form utilised to obtain consent from students.

Reason: Though the team indicated a consent process was in place, no documentary evidence was provided to the panel to allow the Visitors to consider this standard has been met.

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 re-submit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate the process for monitoring attendance in the University and placement setting.

Reason: The documentation indicated that attendance is required for 100% of the programme, and through discussion the protocol for monitoring sickness and non-attendance was outlined; however, the Visitors felt the process should be made explicit in the documentation.

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 definitive documentation, including the mapping document for the Standards of Proficiency. The redrafted mapping document should clearly indicate where the Standards of Proficiency are being met in the attainment of clinical competencies.

Reason: It became apparent the assessment tool used in placement for the second and third year students has not been fully developed to become a finalised document. Further, some issues of delivery in years two and three were also not in a final state. Accordingly, the Visitors did not feel able at this time to effectively state whether the learning outcomes ensured the Standards of Proficiency were being met.

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 definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to amend misuse of terminology related to the HPC and the AODP.

Reason: In some instances the documentation did not clearly indicate the programme led to "eligibility" to register with the HPC. There were also instances of referencing "statutory" registration and the registration of the qualification rather than the

individual. Finally, the distinction between the regulatory and professional body was not made clear in several instances in the documentation.

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 definitive documentation to include an indication of the IPL strategy and current implementation in the programme.

Reason: In order to be able to determine accurately the impact of the inter-professional learning on the programme, the Visitors feel a clearer indication of how the strategy is implemented for the programme will need to be assessed.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must submit the list of available mentors at each placement.

Reason: The Visitors were unable to view the list of available mentors at the approval event and feel unable to make a determination of the adequacy of the number, qualifications and experience of the mentors without this information.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate the process of monitoring and recording placement experience.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent the process for recording this information is subject to change as it moves to fall in line with a divisional process. As a result, the Visitors feel unable to consider this standard as met until able to assess the new process of record keeping.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit the list of available mentors at each placement.

Reason: The Visitors were unable to view the list of mentors available at each placement at the approval event and feel unable to make a determination whether mentors had attended the placement educator training.

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 audit tool used for placement environments to include confirmation that placement environments operate under appropriate equal opportunities and anti-discrimination polices.

Reason: The audit tool was submitted to the Visitors at the end of the approval event and after subsequent analysis it has been determined that the document does not currently ensure that a placement environment has in place appropriate equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation for the programme to include updated module descriptors and placement assessment schedules for all three years of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent that the placement assessment schedules for the second and third years of the programme were being drafted. The Visitor's felt unable to assess the above standards as the learning outcomes could not be definitively linked to assessment. Further, the Visitors wished to determine how tutors would ensure in some modules that students, when given choice, would be directed to evidence appropriate additional learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards will not lead to eligibility to register with the HPC

Reason: Through discussion, it became clear University of Central Lancashire regulations permitted aegrotat awards, but that the documentation did not clearly state that this award would not lead to registration.

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 definitive documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must be appropriately registered with the HPC.

Reason: Though the current external examiner is registered with the HPC, in order to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard, the definitive documentation will need to be amended to include the stipulation for registration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 16th April 2007
Date Visitors' Report submitted to Panel for approval: 28th March 2007
Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

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 review the resource requirements in the clinical skills laboratories to enhance student learning opportunities.

Reason: The Visitors recognised that budgetary restrictions made certain resource purchases difficult; however, it was considered that alternatives to expensive equipment, such as an anaesthetic machine or operating table, can be located to enhance student learning opportunities.

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider redrafting the course handbook to replicate information from the nursing handbook that has relevance to ODP students.

Reason: Though the documentation provided to students was considered effective in providing information, the Visitors felt the identity of the ODP students would be strengthened by producing a key document for them to use and reference for all matters.

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:

       Alan Mount

       Colin Keiley

Date: 15/12/06

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	19 – 20 December 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount - Operating Department Practitioner Stephen Wordsworth - Operating Department Practitioner
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Daljit Mahoon Abigail Creighton (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Geoff Moore, Chair (School of Chemical Sciences and Pharmacy, UEA) Malcolm Adams (School of Medicine, Health Policy and Practice, UEA) Catherine Wells (School of Allied Health Professions, UEA) Helen Booth, (External Panel Member, University of Surrey)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
New Profession	☒
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	☒	☐	☐

	Yes	No	N/A
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	**20**

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

> **SET 3 Programme Management and Resource Standards**
> **3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**
>
> **Condition:**
> The programme team must redraft and submit documentation to include a form utilised to obtain consent from students prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, e.g. role plays, practicing profession-specific techniques.
>
> **Reason:**
> The documentation lacked evidence which insured that this standard is met. A consent mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that potential candidates are aware of the expectations of the programme regarding the level of participation expected by and from the student.

Condition 2

> **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 submit evidence that students completing the programme are meeting our Standards of Proficiency There needs to be clear indication that on completion of the learning outcomes, our Standards of Proficiency are being achieved, both in theory and in practice.
>
> **Reason:**
> There is no clear indication within the documentation that every student completing the programme can meet all of the Standards of Proficiency.

Condition 3

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.7.2 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Condition:
In relation to the statement of 'Conditions for Pre-registration' of the programme in Volume B, it needs to be more explicit in relation to twenty four hour care, identifying where students are required to work outside normal working hours. The programme team must redraft and submit evidence of this.

Reason:
The information presented in the documentation in relation to the requirement for students to gain experience of delivering care out of hours is vague. Students need to have a clearer understanding of the extent of out of hours work which would be involved within the programme.

Condition 4
5.8.2 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

Condition:
The programme team must ensure that any reference to Operating Department Practitioner is removed where a practitioner is not registered with the HPC

Reason:
Operating Department Practitioner is a protected title which can only be used when a practitioner is registered with the HPC. Within the documentation it became apparent that a number of staff members are represented as Operating Department Practitioners when in fact they were not registered practitioners with the HPC.

Condition 5
6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Condition:
The programme team must redraft and submit evidence within the learning outcomes which clearly indicates the progression from level 1 to level 2.

Reason:
The learning outcomes lacked clarity of the differences between the
levels.   Students need to be provided with a clearer indication of their
progression through the learning outcomes.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 13th April 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.
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

Recommendation:
To continue developing a suitable course leader who is an ODP on the
register.

Reason:
The current course director is not an Operating Department Practitioner
however they are appropriately qualified to undertake the role of a
programme leader. In order to develop the programme and its
profession specific knowledge and skills, the Visitors felt the
appointment of an Operating Department Practitioner with the relevant
academic qualifications and experience would be more appropriate.

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

Recommendation:
The programme team should ensure that if the number of students'
increases then so should an adequate number of appropriately
qualified and experience staff.

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

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

Recommendation:

The programme team should continue to achieve their own identified action plan in relation to providing equality of I.T. resources across all practice sites

Reason:
There should be parity of IT access for all students on the programme, regardless of the practice site they are based in. This has already been considered by the programme team through their action plan which we encourage

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 may wish to review the way in which IPL is delivered and credited.

Reason:
In light of student comments, it was felt that the additional workload and the way in which the IPL is structured within the programme, students found difficulties in coping with the pressure of the workload and the timings of the IPL sessions.

5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must have relevant qualifications and experience.

Recommendation:
To ensure that there is a balance between the number of Operating Department Practitioners and nurses acting as mentors.

Reason:
At present there is a bias toward nurses acting as mentors. Attempts should be made to balance this with more Operating Department Practitioners to ensure that students in practice placements have equal opportunity to have a mentor with relevant qualifications and experience from both professions.

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:

Alan Mount

Stephen Wordsworth

Date: 15/1/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatric Medicine
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT
Date of Visit	8th February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	28/09/2006
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Anne Green (Physiotherapist) Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Pam Sabine (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mr Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Judith Burnett, Panel Chair (Associate Head, School of Social Sciences and Cultural Studies)

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 Annual Monitoring concerns in relation to SET 3, SETs 4.3, 4.7, SET 5 and SET 6	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	60

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make explicit the selection procedure for the part time route.

Reason: The selection procedures for the full time and situated learning route are given within the documentation but the information about the part time route is not.

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 explicit how evidence of spoken English will be established in the selection process.

Reason: The course team do not routinely interview all applicants but evidence is required to demonstrate command of spoken English. This is not explicit within the documentation.

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 documentation should be revised to make explicit that the assessment of the practical competence in Local Analgesia is at Level 3.

Reason: This is not clear from the paperwork.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make it explicit that students must pass the modules at 40%, rather than be subject to 'compensation'.

Reason: This is not made clear in the paperwork.

6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make explicit that the students must have completed successfully the theoretical component of the Pharmacology module prior to commencing the practical component for Local Analgesia.

Reason: This is not made clear in the paperwork

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **Monday 12 March 2007**

Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **Wednesday 28 March 2007**

COMMENDATIONS

The feedback from the Clinical Educators was extremely positive, in that they felt that the University communicates very well with them, and that this makes their role much clearer.

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: **Pam Sabine**
          Ann Green
          Carol Lloyd

Date: **9th February 2007**

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT
Date of Visit	8th February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	28/09/2006
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Anne Green (Physiotherapist) Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Pam Sabine (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mr Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Judith Burnett, Panel Chair (Associate Head, School of Social Sciences and Cultural Studies)

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	☒	☐	☐

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1 Annual Monitoring concerns in relation to SET 3, SETs 4.3, 4.7, SET 5 and SET 6	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**110**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make explicit the selection procedure for the part time route.

Reason: The selection procedures for the full time and situated learning route are given within the documentation but the information about the part time route is not.

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 explicit how evidence of spoken English will be established in the selection process.

Reason: The course team do not routinely interview all applicants but evidence is required to demonstrate command of spoken English. This is not explicit within the documentation.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make explicit that the part time route follows the standard format of the full time route but that there is flexibility for the part time students to 'step on' and 'step off' the programme.

Reason: The documentation is not clear in relation to how part time students may progress and integrate theory and practice components.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that when the placement experience is not the standard delivery of 5 weeks, the student experience must equate in time to the same experience, even if it is experienced in a more flexible way.

Reason: The documentation is written to suggest that where a placement cannot start on time, a 4 week rather than a 5 week placement will be offered.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: For summative assessment on practice placements, the final decision must rest with the practice placement educator

Reason: The documentation suggests that the final mark for a placement is derived in collaboration with the student. Though it is acknowledged that engagement with the student in this process is helpful, the final decision must lie with the clinician who is an HPC registrant.

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make it explicit that students must pass the modules at 40%, rather than be subject to 'compensation'.

Reason: This is not made clear in the paperwork.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **Monday 12 March 2007**

Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **Wednesday 28 March 2007**

COMMENDATIONS

The situated learning route is innovative and well received by therapy managers, practice placement educators and 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: **Pam Sabine**
                              Ann Green
                              Carol Lloyd

Date: **9th February 2007**

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name and titles of programme(s)	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT FT
Date of Visit	7th – 8th March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr R. J Cartwright - Divisional Manager - West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust Ms Sue Boardman - Paramedic Course Leader - Sheffield Hallam University
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Ms Catherine Rendell - Chair**, Associate Dean (Academic Quality), Faculty of Humanities, Law and Education, University of Hertfordshire **Mrs Clare Serafinowicz** - Clerk, Academic Quality Officer, University of Hertfordshire **Mr Peter Stanbury** - Faculty Member - School of Life Sciences - Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire. **Mrs Jan Turner -** Associate Dean (Academic Quality), Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire **Mr Paul Nicholas Brown -** Representative from Health Profession Council, Visitor, Assistant Director, Cardiff University **Ms Jo Cahill -** Deputy Associate Dean, Quality Assurance & Enhancement, Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire. **Ms Lesley Forsyth -** External Specialist - Approval and Accreditation assessor/advisor for the College of Radiographers. Department of Radiography, The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen **Ms Madge Heath -** Representative from Health Profession Council, Visitor, Principle Lecturer, University of Portsmouth **Miss Gemma Howell -** Clerk, Academic Quality Officer, University of Hertfordshire

	Mr Stuart Mackay - External Specialist - External Specialist - Approval and Accreditation assessor/advisor for the College of Radiographers, Department of Radiography, University of Salford
	Ms Nicole Smith - Representative from Health Profession Council, Visitor, Private Practitioner Physiotherapists
	Ms Nina Thomson - External Specialist - Representative from The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, Quality Assurance 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	35

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 3 Programme Management and Resource Standards
3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent

Condition:
Appropriate documentation is required for all areas within practical and clinical teaching in relation to consent and Health & Safety Issues.

Reason:
The university needs to provide evidence that it has the necessary policies and forms to document student consent to participate as simulated patients. It also needs to provide evidence that students are provided with policies/procedures that document their understanding of Health & Safety requirements within the course e.g. manual handling, defibrillation and cannulation such as a sharps policy.

Condition 2

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:
Evidence needs to be provided to ensure a more robust attendance and monitoring mechanism is in place within the University.

Reason:
In discussion with current students it became obvious that there was not a workable and auditable system to ensure students attended for the requisite time.

Condition 3

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

Condition:
From Student feedback it would appear that there are not enough Paramedic specific journals and textbooks available for students. This needs to be addressed to bring it in line with similar levels provided for other profession. Evidence needs to be submitted to ensure that this condition has been met.

Reason:
It would appear from student feedback that although the course committee has made a request for more profession specific journals and books no action has been taken to alleviate this issue.

Condition 4:

SET 6. Assessment standards
6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition:
Evidence needs to be provided prior to the start of the new programme, of the appointment of an external examiner from the relevant part of the register.

Reason:
The Health Professions Council requires the External Examiner to be from the relevant part of the register i.e. a paramedic.

Condition 5

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition:
Evidence needs to be provided to ensure that a system is put in place within the new programme that the education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements.

Reason:
From student feedback it would appear that some students are not receiving appropriate placement supervision and that no workable scheme is in place to monitor this. It is also a requirement that they is a system in place for auditing the placements and this was currently in a draft document, which was a questionnaire for the students, this needs to be a more robust method for monitoring of the placements.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 30 April 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31 May 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 12 June 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2.5 Accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Recommendation:
We would encourage the university to plan for the potential Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) of students on to the new programmes pending the demise of the IHCD technician and Paramedic Award scheduled for March 2008.
We also encourage the university to clarify within the documentation the APL for candidates wishing to apply to the course from other allied health professions.

Reason:
There seems to be some confusion around what will be the position of current first year students who would take their IHCD course after March 2008 when the course is planned lose its accreditation.

Recommendation 2:

SET 6. Assessment standards
6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Recommendation:
To the review the assessment strategies for the new programme using student and staff evaluation, in relation to the inconsistencies between credit rating and assessment.

Reason:
The credit rating for some modules does not seem to reflect the amount of work required by the student. Some modules require the same level of student effort although the credits achieved are less.

Recommendation 3:

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation:
To encourage the continual development of a combined university and Ambulance Trust, Practice Placement Educator course and qualification.

Reason:
The University needs to develop in conjunction with the placement providers an accredited course for Practice Placement Educators.

COMMENDATIONS

1) The visitors commend the excellent working relationship between the University and Ambulance Trusts

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

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

Visitors' signatures:

      Mrs Susan Boardman

      Mr R. J Cartwright

Date: 27/3/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full-time
Date of Visit	7/8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Paul Brown (Radiographer) Madge Heath (Radiographer) Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Ms Catherine Rendell - Chair**, Associate Dean (Academic Quality), Faculty of Humanities, Law and Education, University of Hertfordshire **Mrs Clare Serafinowicz** - Clerk, Academic Quality Officer, University of Hertfordshire **Mr Peter Stanbury** - Faculty Member - School of Life Sciences - Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire. **Mrs Jan Turner -** Associate Dean (Academic Quality), Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire **Ms Jo Cahill -** Deputy Associate Dean, Quality Assurance & Enhancement, Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire. **Ms Lesley Forsyth -** External Specialist - Approval and Accreditation assessor/advisor for the College of Radiographers. Department of Radiography, The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen **Miss Gemma Howell -** Clerk, Academic Quality Officer, University of Hertfordshire **Mr Stuart Mackay -** External Specialist - External Specialist - Approval and Accreditation assessor/advisor for the College of Radiographers, Department of Radiography, University of Salford **Ms Nina Thomson -** External Specialist - Representative from The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, Quality Assurance Officer **Mr R. J Cartwright** - Representative from

	Health Profession Council, Visitor, Paramedic, Divisional Manager - West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust **Ms Sue Boardman** - Representative from Health Profession Council, Visitor, Paramedic, Course Leader - Sheffield Hallam 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	**Min. 12** **Max. 40**

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS
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 review the wording used in the level descriptors in assessment for the placement components.

Reason: Currently the pass mark criterion in the placement components allows a student to pass but require support. This means that they would not meet the standards of proficiency and be able to apply to enter the professional register. The wording in the level descriptors must be reviewed to ensure that all students who pass the placement modules meet the standards of proficiency and can begin to practise without supervision.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 30 April 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31 May 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 12 June 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The programme team should review the module documentation to make clearer where complementary and alternative medicine is included in the curriculum.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the Visitors learnt of examples where students were exposed to complementary and alternative medicines. The Visitors felt that the programme team should make it more explicit in the documentation where students can expect to be introduced to these approaches and their relevance to radiography.

COMMENDATIONS

- Well prepared and transparent review of the programme, which was engaging with a wide range of stakeholders.
- Good interprofessional learning ideas
- Good level of interprofessional working across the School, which was evidence in the individual programmes

- Excellent personal interaction with the 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:

Paul Brown
Madge Heath
Nicola Smith

Date: 27/3/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	St Martins College – Carlisle
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT / Flexible
Date of Visit	25th January 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	October 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Dr Brian Ellis – Head of Radiography, School of Health & Social Care – Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of HPC Visitor unable to attend	Mr Marcus Bailey – participated via correspondence
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon – Executive Officer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Tony Ewens - Head of Division, Education Studies - Chair Caron Jackson - Quality Assurance & Standards Unit - Secretary Sam Sherrington - NHS North West

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
New Profession	☐
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	**60**

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

Condition

> **SET 6. Assessment Standards**
> **6.7.5 Assessment Regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.**
>
> **Condition:**
> In line with Set 6.7.5, evidence must be provided that demonstrates compliance with the standard governing the appointment of an external examiner.
>
> **Reason:**
> Within the Sets mapping document it stated that the process for appointing a suitable external examiner is being carried out but has not yet been fulfilled. A suitable external examiner who is in compliance with this standard must be appointed prior to the start of this programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

> **SET: 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;**
> **5.7.2 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.**
>
> **SET: 5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**
>
> **Recommendation:**
> Review the level of engagement involved with the mentors induction programme and identify way of enhancing it.

Reason:
Evidence was provided of mentor induction and support which fulfilled the standards for Sets 5.7 and 5.8.3. However, improvements could be made to strengthen communication, support and training for mentors which would enhance the programme further.

Commendations

1) **Clear evidence of genuine partnership between the Strategic Health Authority and the Higher Education Institution.**

2) **Clear evidence of a cohesive and supportive team with a strong commitment to student support**

3) **A commitment to extending the practice of non-medical prescribing to other health professionals**

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).

Deadline for condition to be met: 4th May 2007

Visitors' signatures:

Dr Brian Ellis

Mr Marcus Bailey **- By Correspondence**

Date: 29/1/07