

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme name	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Operating Department Practitioner
Date of visit	12 - 14 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details.....	4
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome.....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	8

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 13 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and FdSc Paramedic Science. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Anne Shomefun
Proposed student numbers	35
Initial approval	1 September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2009
Chair	Catherine Symonds (Bournemouth University) Adam Biscoe (Bournemouth University/Operating department practice chair)
Secretary	Nikki Finnes (Bournemouth University) Jo Forsyth (Bournemouth University/Operating department practice secretary)
Members of the joint panel	Nigel Conway (External panel member) Hannah Abbott (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HPC did not see the learning resources or the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the major change did not affect learning resources or specialist teaching accommodation, so there was no requirement to visit them

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the admissions documentation to clarify whether direct entry applicants are eligible to apply for student loans.

Reason: From the submitted documentation and discussions with the programme team and students the visitors noted that there was some contradiction about whether applicants on secondment from the NHS and those receiving an NHS bursary were eligible to apply for student loans. The visitors, therefore, require the programme team to clarify the eligibility ODP students to apply for student loans in the admissions documentation, so as to enable applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up the offer of a place.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which identifies the clinical qualifications and relevant experience of practice placement educators.

Reason: From documentation submitted during the visit the visitors noted that the database is incomplete and does not consistently identify the clinical qualifications and relevant experience of the respective practice placement educators. This may result in students being allocated to practice placement educators who are insufficiently qualified and experienced to provide appropriate student support. The visitors, therefore, require the programme team to submit full and up to date evidence which identifies the clinical qualifications and relevant experience of all the practice placement educators.

...

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms used to ensure that practice placement educators receive appropriate programme specific training.

Reason: From discussions with the students the visitors learnt about the disparity between practice placement educators in their interpretation of clinical assessment standards. The students expressed concern about this disparity and requested that it be addressed. It emerged that mentor training is offered at several local universities and it was unclear whether preparation of mentors in the completion of assessment documentation was always addressed. To ensure consistency in assessment among practice placement educators, the visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate the mechanisms used to ensure that practice placement educators receive appropriate programme specific training.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider improving communication between the programme team and its practice placement providers regarding the attendance of NHS seconded students.

Reason: From submitted documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors noted that, although there is a mechanism for monitoring the attendance of students both in class and on placement, issues surrounding absenteeism amongst employed/seconded students do not appear to be routinely communicated to NHS service partners. This is especially pertinent to seconded students as attendance at university is part of a paid working day. . The visitors, therefore, recommend the programme team to put in place a mechanism to formally monitor the attendance of seconded students and for this to be communicated to practice placement providers.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider increasing the use of basic classroom-based clinical skills simulation whilst awaiting the planned purpose built skills laboratory facility to become operational.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and students, the visitors heard concerns regarding the limited opportunity to hone practical/ clinical skills (e.g. gloving, gowning, airway management etc) in a safe environment prior to 'live' clinical practice. The programme team clarified that clinical skills simulation did take place and that to enhance this within the programme, a dedicated operating department practice skills laboratory has been commissioned. The visitors recommend the programme team optimise the use of classroom based clinical skills simulation opportunities in a consistent manner until the planned skills laboratory becomes operational so as to enhance student learning.

Andrew Steel
Julie Weir

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme name	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	12 – 14 May 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitor on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 13 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitor's recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 July 2009. The visitor will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and Dip HE Operating Department Practice. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitor and profession	Vincent Clarke (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	30
Initial approval	September 2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Catherine Symonds (Bournemouth University) Linda Byles (Chair for Paramedic Meetings)
Secretary	Nikki Finnes (Bournemouth University)
Members of the joint panel	Gary Venstone (External Panel Member), Bob Willis (College of Paramedics)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The visitor only received one external examiner report as there had been only been one report issued for the programme so far.

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

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

The HPC did not see the learning resources or the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the major change did not affect learning resources or specialist teaching accommodation, so there was no requirement to visit them.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitor agreed that 58 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

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

The visitor also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

The visitor did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a signed copy of the service level agreement for the programme.

Reason: The service level agreement received by the visitor as evidence at the visit was unsigned. Therefore the visitor would like to receive a revised service level agreement to clearly demonstrate the partnership arrangement between the education provider and South West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (SWAST).

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant expertise and knowledge.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it became clear that the curriculum vitae (CVs) received prior to the visit by the visitor were abridged. Therefore it was difficult for the visitor to determine if the CVs clearly demonstrated that staff had the relevant expertise and knowledge relevant to the subject areas taught. The visitor would like to receive revised documentation to demonstrate that this standard is met.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation that demonstrates how the following standards of proficiency are met.

Registrant Paramedics must:

3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice

- know the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice
- understand the following aspects of biological science:
 - human growth and development across the lifespan
 - the main sequential stages of normal development, including cognitive, emotional and social measures of maturation through the human lifespan
 - normal and altered anatomy and physiology throughout the human lifespan

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was clear that through the system of teaching and learning the area of “the human lifespan” was covered. However there were no indicative learning outcomes (ILOs) or indicative content within any of the modules for the programme seen by the visitor prior to the visit.

Therefore the visitor would like to receive revised documentation to demonstrate this SOP is met.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide revised documentation to demonstrate how the following standards of proficiency are met.

Registrant Paramedics must:

3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice

- know the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice
- understand the following aspects of clinical science:
- understand relevant pharmacology, including pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it was evident that in the module “Foundation Knowledge and Practice” the relevant pharmacology, including pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics, was delivered to only specific “technician” drugs level. Therefore the visitor would like to receive revised documentation which demonstrates the teaching of pharmacology to paramedic level throughout the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must remove reference to any HPC requirement stating the number of hours for practice placements.

Reason: The documentation received by the visitor prior to the visit stated that the HPC required 1500 hours of practice to be completed during placement. This is not the case as the HPC does not make such statements. During discussions with the programme team, it was acknowledged that this statement had been erroneously attributed to the HPC and would be removed from the relevant documents. Therefore the visitor would like to receive revised documentation that this statement has been removed.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation that identifies the number and range of placements undertaken by the students.

Reason: The documentation received prior to the visit did not detail the number, duration and range of placements to be undertaken by students. During discussions with the programme team it was clear that students would be required to undertake a number and range of different placements in various healthcare settings, including drug rehabilitation and mental health in the community. Therefore the visitor would like to receive documentation that details

the information regarding the placements to ensure that students receive parity of experience throughout their placement activity.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation to demonstrate that the assessment methods employed measure the required learning outcomes.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it became apparent that the use of Objective Structured Clinical Examinations to assess certain learning outcomes for modules as detailed in the documentation received prior to the visit was inappropriate. Therefore the visitor would like to receive revised documentation that clearly identifies appropriate assessment methods for ILOs.

Recommendations

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 education provider should consider updating the key texts on reading lists to include all relevant core paramedic books.

Reason: The students and the programme team stated that Nancy Caroline's "Emergency Care in the Streets" was a key text. The text was issued to students, but it did not appear on any key text lists for any of the module descriptors. The visitor felt that the lists should be updated to reflect that this book and other key texts that were part of the indicative reading material for the students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revising the title of the module "Advanced Paramedic Practice".

Reason: The visitor considered that the current title of this module did not reflect the content of the module. Advanced paramedic is a level of practice recognised by the College of Paramedics, which was not represented by the current content of the module described. In discussions with the programme team, it was recognised that the title of this module should be revised to reflect more appropriately the content currently contained within the module.

Vincent Clarke

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	12 – 13 May 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 June 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 July 2009.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	David Whitmore (Paramedic) James Petter (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	20 Year 1 entry per year 20 Year 2 entry per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Mark Flinn (Edge Hill University) Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Susan Davies- Roper (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Fiona Syson (Internal Panel Member) Barry Williams (Internal Panel Member) Jacqui Gladwin (External Panel Member) Sharon Hardwick (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review a practice placement or student handbook prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it.

The HPC did not review curriculum vitae for relevant staff prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, they did table it at the visit itself.

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

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

The HPC met with students from the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 45 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 18 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must submit advertising material, including website information, and all information that is supplied to applicants to the programme.

Reason: The visitors did not receive the advertising material for the programme and therefore were unable to determine that applicants are given appropriate information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and that the material complied with the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, advertising material and information provided to applicants must be submitted.

2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must provide details of the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning procedures in relation to the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors could not fully determine the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning policy in place. The visitors require further details of the procedures in place and how students are supported in the process. The education provider must also provide evidence of how it ensures that applicants entering on to Year 2 of the programme are at the appropriate level. At the visit the education provider stated that they would map the IHCD Technician programme against the learning outcomes of the Level 4 of the programme. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates that the education provider ensures that academic and/or professional entry standards are appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide confirmation of the arrangements in place in relation to the delivery site of the programme.

Reason: From the submitted documentation and discussions with the education provider it was clear that plans for the delivery location of the programme were not yet complete. The education provider stated that by the start of the academic year it was intended that the programme would be delivered at a site in Central Manchester. The location of this site had not been decided at the time of the visit and therefore the full details of the resource were not available for the visitors to review.

In order to ensure resources are available to support student learning on the programme the visitors require confirmation of the resources in place for the new site including details of the funding and the facilities and equipment that will be in place. The education provider stated that if the new location was not ready in time for the start of the programme that existing resources would be utilised at Ormskirk campus. These resources were viewed by the visitors and they were happy with the facilities available. The visitors will also require confirmation of the alternate resource plans in place to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to update all references to HPC Standards of Proficiency and HPC Standards of Education and Training to the current versions of these documents.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was clear that there were references within the material that did not refer users to the current versions of the HPC Standards of Proficiency and Standards of Education and Training. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must be updated to reference the current standards in order to reflect current practice and guidelines for students on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit programme documentation, including the programme/student handbook that supports the students understanding of the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the education provider at the visit it was clear that much of the programme documentation would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that students are given appropriate information about the programme. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted. The further evidence provided should also include a finalised programme timetable which was not available at the visit.

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 education provider must submit programme documentation, including the programme/student handbook that communicates to students the attendance requirements for the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the education provider at the visit it was clear that much of the programme documentation would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that students are given appropriate information about the attendance requirements and the process if these are not met on the programme. The visitors felt that, in order to

fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide confirmation of the arrangements in place in relation to the delivery site of the programme.

Reason: From the submitted documentation and discussions with the education provider it was clear that plans for the delivery location of the programme were not yet complete. The education provider stated that by the start of the academic year it was intended that the programme would be delivered at a site in Central Manchester. The location of this site had not been decided at the time of the visit and therefore the full details of the resource were not available for the visitors to review.

In order to ensure resources are available to support student learning on the programme the visitors require confirmation of the resources in place for the new site including details of the funding and the facilities and equipment that will be in place. The education provider stated that if the new location was not ready in time for the start of the programme that existing resources would be utilised at Ormskirk campus. These resources were viewed by the visitors and they were happy with the facilities available. The visitors will also require confirmation of the alternate resource plans in place to ensure that this standard is being met.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to update the HPC Standards of Proficiency mapping of the programme to the current version of this document.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was clear that the cross-referencing mapping document of the programme to HPC Standards of Proficiency did not use the most up to date version of the Standards of Proficiency. The visitors felt that the programme mapping must be updated to reference the current standards in order to demonstrate current practice for the students on the programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit practice assessment documentation that demonstrates how the learning outcomes ensure that students meet the Standards of Proficiency on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the

education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine fully that the learning outcomes for practice placements ensured that the Standards of Proficiency would be met. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the system used for the approval and monitoring of all placements on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was not clear what system was in place to approve and monitor the placements on the programme. At the visit the education provider demonstrated the audit tool and processes that are utilised across all of their allied health professional programmes, and stated that all placements on the paramedic programme would be audited and monitored by the same system. During the visit, some documentation was given to the visitors but there was insufficient time to be able to fully assimilate the information. The visitors require documentary evidence of the approval and monitoring processes for placements to support the discussions at the visit in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Condition: The education provider must submit practice assessment and supporting placement documentation that demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are informed about the learning outcomes on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that information regarding the learning outcomes for practice placements would ensure that both students and placement staff had all the details they require. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

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 education provider must submit practice assessment and supporting placement documentation that demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are informed about the timings and duration of placements and the records requiring completion for this part of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that information relating to practice placements would ensure that both students and placement staff had all the details they require. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

5.7.3 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct.

Condition: The education provider must submit practice assessment and supporting placement documentation that demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are informed about the expectations of professional conduct for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that information relating to practice placements would ensure that both students and placement staff had all the details they require. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit practice assessment and supporting placement documentation that demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are informed about assessment procedures for this part of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that information relating to practice placements would ensure that both students and placement staff had all the details they require. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The education provider must submit practice assessment and supporting placement documentation that demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are informed about the lines of responsibility and methods of communication for this part of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that information relating to practice placements would ensure that both students and placement staff had all the details they require. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit practice assessment and supporting placement documentation that demonstrates how the education provider ensures that information required is supplied to the practice placement educators.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that information relating to practice placements would be communicated to placement staff. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit practice assessment and supporting placement documentation that demonstrates how the learning outcomes are assessed and the assessment regulations in place for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine fully the assessment of the learning outcomes for practice placements and the assessment regulations that are specific to the programme. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the assessment design for Module 2094 Exploring the Scope of Paramedic Practice.

Reason: From a review of the module descriptors the visitors noted that, whilst legal, ethical and professional frameworks were covered in the programme, assessment on the subject appeared to be lacking. From a review of the learning outcomes and the assessments of Module 2094 Exploring the Scope of Paramedic Practice the visitors felt that in order to ensure that this subject is adequately assessed the assessment of this module needs to be revised to ensure that student understanding of this area is demonstrated.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit practice assessment and supporting placement documentation that demonstrates how the students are informed and are assessed on professional aspects of practice in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit it was clear that the practice placement documentation was not finalised. From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that this would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to fully determine the assessment of professional aspects of practice in the programme. The visitors felt that, in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for aegrotat awards for the programme. The visitors need to see evidence that this policy is clearly communicated within the documentation to ensure that this standard is being met.

6.7.4 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Condition: The education provider must submit programme documentation, including the programme/student handbook, which communicates the procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Reason: From discussions with the education provider at the visit it was clear that much of the programme documentation would not be produced until after the approval event. The visitors therefore were unable to determine that students are given appropriate information about the right of appeal. The visitors felt that, in

order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard, further programme documentation must be submitted.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy for the programme. The visitors require further evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider reviewed the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology used throughout is current.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors felt that some of the terms utilised could be confusing to students on the programme. The visitors recommend that terminology such as 'Paramedic Practitioner' and 'Paramedic Technicians' should be removed to aid student understanding of the profession.

James Petter
David Whitmore

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Date of visit	11 - 13 March 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic Radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 July 2009

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Work Practice), BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Psychosocial Interventions), BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Ageing and Well-being), MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and BSc (Hons) Podiatry. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Kathy Strachan (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Jenny Malcolm (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Anna McGee (Internal Panel Member) Erica White (College of Radiographers) Maryann Hardy (College of Radiographers)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 61 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: In the submitted documentation, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to the registered status of individuals such as “state registered”. It should also be made clear throughout all documentation that HPC approval of a programme does not automatically lead to HPC registration for those who complete the programme but rather to ‘eligibility to apply for HPC registration’. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that the planned additional radiography staff member to the division is funded and evidence, including the job description for this post, to demonstrate that the education provider is seeking to recruit this staff member.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit and from discussions with the staff, students and placement providers it was clear that there were concerns regarding the current staff numbers for this programme. At the visit it was stated that the division was seeking funding for an additional member of staff and was due to hear from this bid shortly. In order to determine if this standard is being met the visitors require evidence that the funding resources are in place to secure this additional member of staff and confirmation that the division is advertising this role before the start date of the programme and seeking to recruit this person as soon as possible.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to encourage that the education provider reviews the staff numbers within the radiography division with a recommendation for the staff numbers to be increased.

Reason: From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that there were plans to increase the staff numbers in the division. The visitors have supported this increase with a condition detailed earlier in this report, and wish to recommend further increases in personnel for the programme team in order to further aid staff development and student support on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to support the education providers continuing efforts to work towards parity of access for students for the library and IT resources throughout all placement sites.

Reason: From discussions with the students it was apparent that there were currently problems at some of the placement sites with accessing on-site IT facilities and libraries. The education provider acknowledged that they were aware of this issue and were seeking to address access in both these areas on a number of different levels. The visitors wish to support this ongoing work in order to ensure that students have a parity of experience at their placement sites.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the unit descriptor content to fully reflect the learning and progression that takes place throughout the course of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the documentation did not fully reflect all of the learning outcomes and the full development of skills over the programme. The visitors were happy that the Standards of Proficiency were being met on the programme but felt that further clarity within the unit descriptors to reflect the learning and progression taking place would be helpful for students undertaking the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to support the plans to provide further training for the clinical staff that support students during their placement experience.

Reason: From information received at the visit it was apparent that NHS Education for Scotland (NES) had agreed to fund any training required by clinical staff to ensure that their skills were being updated. The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider organise this training at the earliest opportunity in order to update the clinical staff regarding the terminology and practice changes within the profession that may impact on present and future students, such as commentary on film.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to encourage the programme team to revisit the assessment strategy for the programme in relation to the number of assessments conducted and the weightings that the clinical assessments are given.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the visitors felt that the overall number of formative and summative assessments throughout the programme appeared high and that the weightings attributed to clinical practice, given the importance of clinical skills for student development, were relatively low. Whilst they felt that this standard was currently being met the visitors wish to encourage that the programme team considers these factors during further development and reviews of the programme.

Derek Adrian-Harris
Linda Mutema

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Work Practice), BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Psychosocial Interventions), BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Ageing and Well-being)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational Therapy
Date of visit	11 - 13 March 2009

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	8
Commendations	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational Therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 July 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Podiatry, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Nicola Spalding (Occupational Therapist) Vivien Kilgour (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	70-75
Initial approval	5 January 1996
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Elaine McFarland (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Gill Paterson (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists) Ruth Heames (College of Occupational Therapists) Susan Griffiths (College of Occupational Therapists)

	Paul Flowers (Internal Panel Member) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not view the learning resources or the specialist teaching accommodation as this had been reviewed at a visit made by both visitors to the education provider in October 2008.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining SET.

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide revised documentation that clearly articulates how assessment of musculo-skeletal anatomy is measured against the learning outcomes for the module HSCO163 Occupational Performance 2.

Reason: In reading the documentation the visitors could not clearly see how the learning outcomes for the module HSCO163 Occupational Performance 2 were to be assessed. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation that clearly links the assessment to the learning outcomes for musculo-skeletal anatomy in this module to ensure safe and effective practice.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider enhancing the admissions documentation so that applicants to the programme know the requirements for proficiency in English clearly from the application documentation.

Reason: Whilst the visitors noted that the admission procedure set out the entry criteria for the evidence of a good command of written and spoken English they felt it could be enhanced to show the proficiency in English clearly. The English proficiency requirement was clear in the documentation provided to the visitors but they considered that the application pack could make it clearer that IELTS 7 is required on graduation so that the applicant knows what the final standard in English is required.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider the implementation of the business case for two additional staff with the University.

Reason: The visitors were pleased to see that whilst there is sufficient staff in place to run the programme, the programme team had a business case for further staff for the continued effective running of the programme and that this should be pursued with the University. The visitors were happy to support the business plan for two further staff as part of the future development of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider at least one more comprehensive anatomical text to support student learning within the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors noted that there was only one comprehensive text on anatomy in the indicative reading lists and recommend that a further text would enhance student learning within the curriculum. The visitors recognised that the text recommended was appropriate to the curriculum but felt that additional texts would further aid student reading on the programme.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The divisional support for students in respect of the transitional process from pre entry to the programme to beyond graduation.

Reason: The level of support afforded by the division to its students from the moment of application through to graduation is seen as innovative and best practice. The visitors considered that the level of support was excellent and the fact that the staff invested so much time with the students from the moment they entered the programme until graduation was to be commended. The evidence of this support was seen in the meeting with the students and graduates who spoke highly of the support they were given throughout the programme and since graduation.

Commendation: The collaborative working with clinical colleagues, particularly in respect of research project supervision and the delivery of placement education courses.

Reason: The visitors considered that the involvement in the research projects carried out by the students and the delivery of the placements was very positive and the clinical placement providers felt that this was a critical part of the delivery of the programme. The collaborative working especially in relation to project supervision is seen as innovative best practice and can be found by contacting the School of Health and Social Care.

Nicola Spalding
Vivien Kilgour

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Date of visit	11 - 13 March 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Radiographer' or 'Therapeutic Radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 July 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Work Practice), BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Psychosocial Interventions), BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Ageing and Well-being), MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and BSc (Hons) Podiatry. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Kathy Strachan (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Jenny Malcolm (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Anna McGee (Internal Panel Member) Erica White (College of Radiographers) Maryann Hardy (College of Radiographers)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 61 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: In the submitted documentation, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to the registered status of individuals such as “state registered”. It should also be made clear throughout all documentation that HPC approval of a programme does not automatically lead to HPC registration for those who complete the programme but rather to ‘eligibility to apply for HPC registration’. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that the planned additional radiography staff member to the division is funded and evidence, including the job description for this post, to demonstrate that the education provider is seeking to recruit this staff member.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit and from discussions with the staff, students and placement providers it was clear that there were concerns regarding the current staff numbers for this programme. At the visit it was stated that the division was seeking funding for an additional member of staff and was due to hear from this bid shortly. In order to determine if this standard is being met the visitors require evidence that the funding resources are in place to secure this additional member of staff and confirmation that the division is advertising this role before the start date of the programme and seeking to recruit this person as soon as possible.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to encourage that the education provider reviews the staff numbers within the radiography division with a recommendation for the staff numbers to be increased.

Reason: From discussions with the education provider it was apparent that there were plans to increase the staff numbers in the division. The visitors have supported this increase with a condition detailed earlier in this report, and wish to recommend further increases in personnel for the programme team in order to further aid staff development and student support on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to support the planned purchase of the Virtual Environment for Radiotherapy (VERT) system by the education provider.

Reason: From discussions with the education provider it was clear that there were plans in place to purchase the VERT system as a resource for utilisation on the programme. The visitors wished to support the acquisition of this resource to further enhance the student learning experience, and to further support the radiotherapy imaging module and the teaching of cross sectional anatomy in the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to support the education providers continuing efforts to work towards parity of access for students for the library and IT resources throughout all placement sites.

Reason: From discussions with the students it was apparent that there were currently problems at some of the placement sites with accessing on-site IT facilities and libraries. The education provider acknowledged that they were aware of this issue and were seeking to address access in both these areas on a number of different levels. The visitors wish to support this ongoing work in order to ensure that students have a parity of experience at their placement sites.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the unit descriptor content to fully reflect the learning and progression that takes place throughout the course of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the documentation did not fully reflect all of the learning outcomes and the full development of skills over the programme. The visitors were happy that the Standards of Proficiency were being met on the programme but felt that further clarity within the unit descriptors to reflect the learning and progression taking place would be helpful for students undertaking the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to support the plans to provide further training for the clinical staff that support students during their placement experience.

Reason: From information received at the visit it was apparent that NHS Education for Scotland (NES) had agreed to fund any training required by clinical staff to ensure that their skills were being updated. The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider organise this training at the earliest opportunity in order to update the clinical staff regarding the terminology and practice changes within the profession that may impact on present and future students, such as commentary on film.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to encourage the programme team to revisit the assessment strategy for the programme in relation to the number of assessments conducted and the weightings that the clinical assessments are given.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the visitors felt that the overall number of formative and summative assessments throughout the programme appeared high and that the weightings attributed to clinical practice, given the importance of clinical skills for student development, were relatively low. Whilst they felt that this standard was currently being met the visitors wish to encourage that the programme team considers these factors during further development and reviews of the programme.

Derek Adrian-Harris
Linda Mutema

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational Therapist
Date of visit	11 - 13 March 2009

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	7
Commendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational Therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 July 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Work Practice), BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Psychosocial Interventions), BSc (Hons) in Occupational Therapy (Ageing and Well-being), MSc Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Podiatry, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Nicola Spalding (Occupational Therapist) Vivien Kilgour (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	15-20
Initial approval	1 August 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Elaine McFarland (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Gill Paterson (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists) Ruth Heames (College of Occupational Therapists) Susan Griffiths (College of Occupational Therapists)

	Paul Flowers (Internal Panel Member) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not view the learning resources or the specialist teaching accommodation as this had been reviewed at a visit made by both visitors to the education provider in October 2008.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 61 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide revised documentation which clearly articulates the learning outcomes in relation to musculo-skeletal anatomy within the programme.

Reason: In reading the documentation it was unclear to the visitors how students demonstrated their understanding of musculo-skeletal anatomy throughout the programme. During the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed with the team how the students showed their understanding of musculo-skeletal anatomy. The team described how the students achieved their understanding of this skill through the various themes running through the programme. The visitors would therefore like to receive documentation to show how students demonstrate their understanding of musculo-skeletal anatomy throughout the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide revised documentation which clearly articulates the assessment methods employed to ensure student understanding of musculo-skeletal anatomy.

Reason: In reading the documentation it was unclear to the visitors how students were assessed on their understanding of musculo-skeletal anatomy throughout the programme. During the meeting with the students it was clear that there was no direct summative assessment of musculo-skeletal anatomy. In the meeting with the programme team it was confirmed that previously there had been a viva to assess the musculo-skeletal anatomy component of the programme. The assessment was now formative and assessed in practical sessions. The student knowledge of musculo-skeletal anatomy was also assessed via the personal development portfolio and any shortcoming would be seen and addressed quickly.

The visitors determined that the assessment of musculo-skeletal anatomy could be more clearly demonstrated in the programme documentation. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation that articulates how musculo-skeletal anatomy will be assessed throughout the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider enhancing the admissions documentation so that applicants to the programme know the requirements for proficiency in English clearly from the application documentation.

Reason: Whilst the visitors noted that the admission procedure set out the entry criteria for the evidence of a good command of written and spoken English they felt it could be enhanced to show the proficiency in English clearly. The English proficiency requirement was clear in the documentation provided to the visitors but they considered that the application pack could make it clearer that IELTS 7 is required on graduation so that the applicant knows what the final standard in English is required.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider the implementation of the business case for two additional staff with the University.

Reason: The visitors were pleased to see that whilst there is sufficient staff in place to run the programme, the programme team had a business case for further staff for the continued effective running of the programme and that this should be pursued with the University. The visitors were happy to support the business plan for two further staff as part of the future development of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider at least one more comprehensive anatomical text to support student learning within the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors noted that there was only one comprehensive text on anatomy in the indicative reading lists and recommend that a further text would enhance student learning within the curriculum. The visitors recognised that the text recommended was appropriate to the curriculum but felt that additional texts would further aid student reading on the programme.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The MSc pre entry module taken by all applicants to the programme.

Reason: The pre entry module for the MSc programme allowed the students to attain skills to enhance their learning when on the programme. It also allowed the students to bond together as a group and this enhanced the learning experience for the students during the programme. The visitors felt that this was an excellent example of innovation and best practice. This module can be viewed as part of the programme information on the School of Health and Social Care website.

Commendation: The divisional support for students in respect of the transitional process from pre entry to the programme to beyond graduation.

Reason: The level of support afforded by the division to its students from the moment of application through to graduation is seen as innovative and best practice. The visitors considered that the level of support was excellent and the fact that the staff invested so much time with the students from the moment they entered the programme until graduation was to be commended. The evidence of this support was seen in the meeting with the students and graduates who spoke highly of the support they were given throughout the programme and since graduation.

Commendation: The collaborative working with clinical colleagues, particularly in respect of research project supervision and the delivery of placement education courses.

Reason: The visitors considered that the involvement in the research projects carried out by the students and the delivery of the placements was very positive and the clinical placement providers felt that this was a critical part of the delivery of the programme. The collaborative working especially in relation to project supervision is seen as innovative best practice and can be found by contacting the School of Health and Social Care.

Nicola Spalding
Vivien Kilgour

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Keele University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	12 – 13 May 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 17 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 02 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 July 2009.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Robert Munro (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	60 (Year 2) 4 – 6 (Year 2)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Stuart Egan (Keele University)
Secretary	Debbie Goodall (Keele University)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Nicky Fleming (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Jim Cunningham (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 12 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must revisit all programme documentation (including publications and websites) to more clearly articulate the selection process for prospective students considering the Applied Biomedical Science (ABMS) pathway.

Reason: The programme documentation advises prospective students that the availability of the ABMS pathway is limited to placement availability and student selection to this pathway is conducted using a selection procedure during the first year of study. The ABMS Clinical Placement document provides further detail regarding the selection process and how placement availability is determined for the following year.

The visitor considered that this detailed information regarding student selection to the ABMS pathway was not provided to prospective students and therefore the visitor was not satisfied that an applicant could make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. The visitor therefore requires all the programme documentation available to prospective students to more clearly articulate the selection procedures for entry onto the ABMS pathway.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how the admissions procedures apply selection criteria to evidence a good command of written and spoken English for students applying to the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation details the entry requirements for students entering Keele where applicants are required to have a minimum GSCE grade C in English Language or the equivalent. However, the programme documentation did not specify how applicants, who applied on the basis of holding equivalent qualifications, would be assessed to ensure that they had a good command of written and spoken English.

The visitor requires all the programme documentation available to prospective students to clearly articulate the admission procedures in place for assessing whether or not a student has a good command of written and spoken English.

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

Condition: The education provider must implement formal procedures for conducting criminal convictions checks prior to students entering the ABMS pathway.

Reason: Through reviewing the programme documentation and from the various meetings held at the approvals visit, it was clear that the programme had no formal procedure for conducting criminal conviction checks prior to entry onto the ABMS pathway. Instead students were advised that this may be a requirement of certain placement providers and that the HPC set a criminal conviction check as a requirement for entry to the register.

The visitor requires the education provider to implement formal procedures for conducting criminal convictions checks that are carried out prior to a student entering the ABMS pathway. These procedures must include provisions to account for students that may have a criminal record and clear processes as to how this would be managed. Furthermore, the visitor also require that the programme documentation be updated to reflect the requirements for criminal convictions checks prior to entry onto the ABMS pathway. This is to ensure that prospective students are aware of this requirement prior to accepting a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate any health requirements that students will be required to comply with in order to complete the programme.

Reason: Through reviewing the documentation and from various meetings held at the approval visit, the visitor was clear that the programme had specific health requirements, including the requirement for vaccinations, which students needed to comply with.

However, the visitor was concerned that documentation made available to prospective students did not articulate the requirements for vaccinations and any other health requirements that are specific to the programme. The visitor therefore requires the education provider to revisit all the programme documentation (including publications and website) to ensure that the health requirements are clearly articulated.

2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the accreditation of prior learning policies are clearly articulated within the admission procedures.

Reason: Through meeting with the programme team, the visitor noted that the programme did apply selection and entry criteria that specifically addressed the accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

However, the visitor was not satisfied that the programme documentation articulated the policies and procedures that govern the accreditation of prior learning. Therefore, the visitor requires the education provider to revisit all the programme documentation to ensure that the accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms are clearly communicated to students.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the systems used to ensure that placement components of the programme are managed effectively.

Reason: Following discussion with the programme team and practice placement educators, it was apparent to the visitor that the education provider was not taking ultimate responsibility for placements. In particular the visitor was concerned that the education provider had relied on IBMS accreditation of placements and that there was also a reliance on the West Midlands Network to ensure that the approval and monitoring of placements was being carried out.

The lack of formal auditing and monitoring (reflected in the conditions later in the report) meant that the visitor was not assured that placements were managed effectively. Systems, such as placement evaluations, audits, and partnership meetings, were either not in place or were not developed and managed by the education provider to monitor and enhance placement learning.

The visitor requires further evidence that the education provider does maintain overall responsibility for placement provision. Furthermore, the visitor also requires further evidence to be satisfied that appropriate procedures are in place to ensure that the approval, monitoring, training and assessment of placements and the placement experience are managed effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the module 'Applied Biomedical Science Placement' to ensure that this module must be passed in order for student to be eligible to receive the ABMS award.

Reason: The visitor noted in the programme documentation and through meetings with the programme team that it was proposed that students could potentially fail the module 'Applied Biomedical Science Placement' and still receive the ABMS award. The visitor noted that students were only required to pass the placement portfolio assessment set for this module in order to be eligible to receive the ABMS award.

The visitor was concerned that, in potentially failing the module, the student would not pass the reflective and research assessments, which link directly to the placement experience and to the placement module itself. The visitor felt that successful reflection on the placement experience and the completion of the research report was an important element in assisting autonomous, reflective thinking and evidence-based practice. Therefore the visitor requires the education provider to revisit the 'Applied Biomedical Science Placement' module and amend it to ensure that students pass this module in order to be eligible for the ABMS award.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme design and documentation to articulate clearly that placements are integral to the programme.

Reason: The visitor noted in the programme documentation and through meetings with the programme team and practice placement educators that the integration of placement experience into the programme was not evident.

In particular, the visitor was concerned about the emphasis throughout the programme documentation that a student's opportunity to meet the relevant standards of proficiency was solely provided through the placement experience. Further to this, the visitor was also concerned that this placement experience was not sufficiently approved, monitored and managed by the education provider. The lack of formal auditing and monitoring (reflected in the conditions later in the report) meant that the visitor was not assured that placements were managed effectively. Systems, such as placement evaluations, audits, and partnership meetings, were either not in place or were not developed and managed by the education provider to monitor and enhance placement learning.

In reviewing the modules for the programme, the visitor could clearly identify many instances outside of the placement experience where students are required to demonstrate how they meet certain standards of proficiency. However, the over emphasis on the placement experience to meet the standards has not provided sufficient evidence to the visitor as to how the practice placement learning outcomes and progression are in line with the rest of the

programme. Furthermore, the documented placement structure does not demonstrate that the placement experience is integral to the programme, but rather that it is an additional element that is solely relied upon for students to demonstrate how they meet the standards of proficiency and that it is not sufficiently managed by the education provider.

The visitor requires further evidence from the education provider to be satisfied that practice placements are indeed an integral part of the programme.

5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment.

Condition: The education provider must evidence the formal arrangements for ensuring that placement settings provide a safe environment, both initially and on an ongoing basis.

Reason: The visitor noted that the programme documentation did not clearly articulate the formal arrangements in place that ensure a safe environment within the practice setting. However, the visitor also noted that the Academic Placement Co-ordinator did conduct regular visits of placements to ensure that, amongst other things, a quality placement experience was being provided.

However, the visitor was unclear as to the formal procedures that were in place to ensure that placement settings were safe. Systems such as a formal audit tool, developed and implemented by the education provider, were not provided along with further documentation as to how these tools are used and fed back into the programme on an on-going basis. Therefore the visitor requires further documentation to evidence the formal arrangements in place that ensure that practice placement settings provide a safe environment, both initially at approval and also on an ongoing basis.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that a thorough and effective system is in place for the approving and monitoring of all placements.

Reason: The visitor noted through meeting with the programme team and the practice placement providers that an informal system of monitoring and approving placements was in place. Furthermore, it was also noted that this system was historically based on the IBMS accreditation of placements. However the visitor was not provided with any documentation that specifically addresses how these systems are operated, the relevant audit tools that may be used and how the system feeds back into the continual development of placements on the programme.

The visitor therefore requires further documentation to evidence that a formal system for approving and monitoring placements is in place across all placements and that this system is initiated and managed by the education provider.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the placement assessment portfolios to demonstrate that the education provider has effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: The visitor noted in meeting with programme team and through the programme documentation that the education provider relied on locally trained assessors to provide a final assessment of student practice placement portfolios. The visitor also noted that the education provider did not have any mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards of this assessment and that this responsibility was currently deferred to the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS).

The visitor was concerned that, in deferring this responsibility to the IBMS, the education provider did not have effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards for the assessment of the placement portfolio. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence that the education provider has developed effective mechanisms to be responsible for the assurance of appropriate standards of the placement portfolio assessment.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must provide a CV of the current external examiner for the ABMS programme.

Reason: The visitor noted that the education provider had recently appointed a new external examiner to the ABMS programme, who was not from the relevant part of the HPC register.

The visitor requires the CV of the current external examiner to be assured that the appointment is appropriate to the programme and to meeting this SET.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the current provision of full time (and/or full time equivalent) staff on the programme to continue to ensure the delivery of an effective programme.

Reason: The visitor noted through the programme documentation and through meetings with the programme team that there was a reliance on temporary staff, employed from local trusts within the West Midlands network, to delivery certain aspects of the programme.

Whilst the visitor is satisfied that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme, the education provider should consider reviewing these current provisions with a view to appointing more full time or full time equivalent staff from the appropriate part of the register.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to more clearly articulate the portfolio assessment options available to students on placement.

Reason: The programme documentation articulated that students who failed the placement portfolio were referred back to the Biomedical Science award programme. The visitor also noted through the meeting with the programme team, that students could potentially reschedule additional placement time in order to complete the portfolio assessment. However this option was not clearly communicated through the documentation.

The visitor recommends that the programme documentation be reviewed to more clearly articulate all the options available to students regarding the portfolio assessment, including the provision to reschedule additional placement time in order to successfully complete it.

Robert Munro

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Validating body/Awarding body	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme name	Certificate in Local Analgesia
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Chiropody and Podiatry
Relevant entitlement(s)	Local Analgesia
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2009

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	4
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Commendation	8

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Chiropodist' or 'Podiatrist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 June 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 July 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider and awarding body did not review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Philip Mandy (Podiatrist) James Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Anne Shomefun
HPC observer	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Ian Burns (New College Durham)
Secretary	Susan Gamble (New College Durham)

Sources of evidence

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

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

External examiners' reports have not been produced as the programme is new.

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 61 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must provide applicants with information about practice placements and indemnity insurance.

Reason: The submitted documentation did not provide sufficiently clear information to applicants about practice placements and indemnity insurance. The visitors therefore were concerned that applicants would not have sufficient information about the programme in order to make an informed choice. The visitors therefore require the programme team to clarify the information surrounding practice placements and indemnity insurance.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit documentation clarifying entry criteria relating to health requirements.

Reason: The submitted documentation did not appear to include admission procedures relating to health requirements. The lack of this information may confuse applicants about expected entry requirements. The visitors, therefore, require the programme team to clarify the health entry requirements, so as to enable applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up the offer of a place on the programme.

Commendations

Commendation: The visitors commended the excellent relationship that the programme team had developed with local health practitioners.

Reason: From discussions with the senior team, the programme team and the students, the visitors learnt about the excellent relationship that the programme team had developed with local health practitioners. This relationship enabled the Bishop Auckland Podiatry Clinic to have a steady volume of patients for clinical practice and for student learning. The visitors wished to commend this excellent relationship as innovative best practice worthy of emulation by other education providers.

Philip Mandy
James Pickard

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	27 – 29 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome.....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 August 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 September 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Podiatry, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Podiatry (pre-registration), MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration), Pg Dip Podiatry (pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (pre-registration) and Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational Therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Rachel Greig
Proposed student numbers	50
Initial approval	November 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Nick Maguire (Internal panel member) Tom Randell (Internal panel member) Carolyn Blundell (Internal panel member)

	member) Debbie Hearle (College of Occupational Therapists) Jo-Anne Supyk (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation and advertising materials to follow the guidance provided in the HPC 'Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers'.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Currently there is reference to the term 'licence to practice' in several documents. This term does not reflect the independence of the HPC or its role as a regulatory body which functions by protecting professional titles. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used in programme documentation and advertising must be amended.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors' felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to 'eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC'.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must include HPC's Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the learning resources for the appropriate modules.

Reason: The visitors noted that HPC's Standards of conduct, performance and ethics were not included in the learning resources for the modules on the programme. In order to meet standard of proficiency (SOP) 1a Professional autonomy and accountability and so that students are made aware of the HPC

standards of conduct, performance and ethics it is necessary for this publication to be included in the resource materials for the appropriate modules.

6.7.2 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme specification to clearly articulate which awards provide eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: The education provider offers a number of programmes, some of which are exit awards from the occupational therapy programmes (eg Dip HE Allied Health). The visitors noted that in some cases it was not explicitly documented that these awards do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register. The visitors felt the programme specification should be updated to make it clear when specific programmes do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Recommendations

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: The programme team should revisit the programme documentation to clearly state who the programme leader is.

Reason: Following discussions with the programme team and when reviewing some of the programme documentation it was clear that there was a named programme leader who is appropriately qualified and experienced and the visitors were satisfied with this. However, in some of the documentation submitted by the programme team this information was not clear. The visitors felt that this information should be clearly stated in the programme documentation to avoid any confusion to students or staff.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to develop the system for monitoring and auditing placement settings.

Reason: Since the merging of the school of nursing with other allied health professions a new system for approving and monitoring placements has been put in place. Because this system is in its early stages its effectiveness is yet to be determined. The visitors were satisfied that this approving system was appropriate but wish for the education provider to continue to monitor its effectiveness. By doing this the education provider can ensure that the objectives and strategy of the monitoring system are being met and they will be alerted to any problems that may require attention.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider encouraging more practice placement educators to undertake a recognised clinical educators training programme.

Reason: The visitors recognised that placement staff were being offered and undertaking a clinical educators training programme and were satisfied that an appropriate number of trained placement educator staff existed. The visitors however felt that if the uptake of staff training was greater this would offer benefits to both students and staff.

Claire Brewis
Joanna Goodwin

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	27 – 29 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome.....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical Therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 August 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 September 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Podiatry, MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Podiatry (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) and Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	70 (BSc & MSc)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Initial approval	02 January 1999
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Nick Maguire (University of Southampton) Tom Randell (University of Southampton) Carolyn Blundell (University of

	Southampton) Susan Richardson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation and advertising materials to follow the guidance provided in the HPC 'Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers'.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Currently there is reference to the term 'licence to practice' in several documents. This term does not reflect the independence of the HPC or its role as a regulatory body which functions by protecting professional titles. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used in programme documentation and advertising must be amended.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors' felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to 'eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC'.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the systems used to ensure that placement components of the programme are managed effectively.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators that there were systems in place to manage placements. In particular, a new audit tool was currently being piloted and due to be implemented across all programmes in the school. However, the programme documentation did not

include an example of the audit tool and further documentation detailing how this tool is used to manage placements.

The visitors require further evidence of the audit tool and how this tool and the associated systems in place ensure that the approval, monitoring and assessment of placements and the training of practice educators are managed effectively. Furthermore, the visitors require specific evidence addressing the feedback mechanisms in place for placements including how feedback is collated from various sources, addressed and then fed back into the development of the placement experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentation detailing the planned staff numbers and each staff members proposed input into the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation that the external examiner and students had commented on the staffing levels in place to deliver the programme. In particular, it was noted that practical sessions delivered throughout the programme were, at times, crowded with high student to staff levels. The visitors also noted in meeting with the programme team, that the issue of staffing levels was being addressed and that it was indicated that the school had adequate resources in place to deliver any current and future programmes.

The visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme. The visitors require detailed evidence which addresses each staff member and their individual responsibilities across the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and MSc/Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) programmes and any other award pathways.. The documentation addressing this condition should also include any research/extra-curricular commitments which would have a direct impact on the ability of staff to deliver the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that a thorough and effective system is in place for the approving and monitoring of all placements.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through meetings with the programme team and practice placement providers that the school was piloting the use of a new audit tool. However, the programme documentation did not include an example of the audit tool and further documentation detailing how this tool is used to approve and monitor placements.

The visitors require further evidence of the audit tool and the associated systems in place to be satisfied there is a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements. Furthermore, the visitors require specific evidence addressing the feedback mechanisms for placements including how feedback is collated from various sources, addressed and then fed back into the development of the placement experience.

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 education provider must provide further evidence of the assessment criteria that is applied to each level of the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation supplied prior to and at the visit itself, addressed assessment criteria for specific modules and pieces of assessment. The visitors were satisfied that specific assessment criteria applied throughout the programme was appropriate to their respective modules and pieces of assessment.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that students were provided with clear assessment criteria outlining how they were assessed at each level of the programme.

The visitors require further evidence of the assessment criteria governing how students are assessed at each level of the programme. In particular, the visitors would expect to see how the assessment criteria applied within each module is consistent with the assessment criteria pertaining to each level of the programme. Furthermore, they would also expect to see how the assessment criteria reflects and impacts on the overall progression of a student to be satisfied that the measurement of student progression is an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the assessment criteria that is applied to each level of the programme

Reason: The programme documentation supplied prior to and at the visit itself, addressed assessment criteria for specific modules and pieces of assessment. The visitors were satisfied that specific assessment criteria applied throughout the programme was appropriate to their respective modules and pieces of assessment.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that students were provided with clear assessment criteria outlining how they were assessed at each level of the programme.

The visitors require further evidence of the assessment criteria governing how students are assessed at each level of the programme. In particular, the visitors would expect to see how the assessment criteria applied within each module is consistent with the assessment criteria pertaining to each level of the programme. Furthermore, they would also expect to see how the assessment criteria reflects and impacts on the overall progression of a student to be satisfied that the measurement of student progression is an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider monitoring the future resource provisions for one to one academic and pastoral support.

Reason: The visitors noted whilst touring the facilities that the programme team will be using an open plan workspace in the near future. The open plan workspace will require students to book time in advance in order to meet one on one with members of the team. This requirement is in place to ensure rooms are available at the requested meeting time to provide privacy.

Although the visitors are satisfied that this SET has been met, they recommend these proposed arrangements are carefully monitored to ensure an appropriate level of academic and pastoral support continues to be provided to students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the resources available within placements to accommodate the facilitation of interprofessional learning.

Reason: The visitors noted from meeting with placement educators that the resources required to facilitate a group of interprofessional students on placement were often difficult to access or provide. In particular, the lack of additional meeting space available within most placements meant that facilitating a large group of students, who were working towards common pieces of assessment, was challenging. Furthermore, the time restraints placed on placement educators, due to the nature of interprofessional learning and the need to facilitate group dynamics, also proved challenging to manage.

The visitors were satisfied that this SET was met, however recommend a review of interprofessional learning within placements to ensure the prescribed assessment tasks are appropriate to the resources available within particular placement settings.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the learning outcomes across all modules within the programme to further ensure that they are indicative of the actual learning outcomes for students.

Reason: The visitors noted the learning outcomes listed across all modules were generic and it was not clear how they specifically aligned with the skills assessments. The programme team addressed this issue and advised that the

learning outcomes were designed to be as flexible as possible in order to allow innovation in teaching and assessment.

The visitors were satisfied that the SET had been met, however recommend that the programme team review the learning outcomes across all modules within the programme to further ensure that they are indicative of the actual learning outcomes for students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider continuing its efforts to expand the range of placements on offer to placements outside of a traditional NHS setting.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through the meeting with the programme team there had been a systematic approach adopted by the School to pursue the provision of placements experiences outside those traditionally supplied in NHS settings.

The visitors acknowledge the work already done in this area and recommend the programme team continue to pursue non-traditional placement settings to provide students with a greater range of placement experiences.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider monitoring non-traditional placements to further ensure they have equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies in place.

Reason: As mentioned above in the recommendation for SET 5.5, the visitors noted the work carried out by the programme team in securing a greater range of placements in non-traditional settings.

The visitors recommend the programme team continue to monitor the acquisition of further non-traditional placements to further ensure these placement providers have equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored

Margaret Curr
Katie Bosworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Relevant modality	Podiatry
Date of visit	27 – 29 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Podiatrist' or 'Chiropodist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 August 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 September 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Podiatry (pre-registration), MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration), Pg Dip Podiatry (pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (pre-registration) and Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Frowen (Podiatrist) Brian Ellis (Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	35
Initial approval	29 June 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton) Carolyn Blundell Chair for Podiatry meetings (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Wilfred Foxe (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alison Hart (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

	Nicola McLarnon (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 61 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation and advertising materials to follow the guidance provided in the HPC 'Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers'.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Currently there is reference to the term 'licence to practice' in several documents. This term does not reflect the independence of the HPC or its role as a regulatory body which functions by protecting professional titles. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used in programme documentation and advertising must be amended.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors' felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to 'eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC'.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide revised documentation to make explicit those elements of the modules that are formative and summative in assessment.

Reason: The documentation received by the visitors prior to the visit was not clear and suggested that formative assessment counted towards the summative assessment. During the meeting with the programme team the professional lead for Podiatry explained that the formative assessment was used to guide the

students to know what would be expected of them during the summative assessment for the modules. Therefore it was difficult to determine if the assessments measured the skills required to practice safely and effectively. As this was unclear the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly sets out what the formative assessment for modules will be and what the summative assessment will be.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide revised documentation to clarify the assessment weightings across all modules within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation received by the visitors prior to the visit, it was clear that there were inconsistencies in the assessment weightings within the module descriptors for the programme. During the programme team meeting it was discussed how the assessment weightings had been arrived at. The programme team reflected that the weightings might not mirror the student effort across all modules. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation that shows equity of student effort across all modules to ensure that the assessments measure the skills to practice safely and effectively.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider adopting the proposed attendance model proposed by the university for the revised programme.

Reason: The programme team informed the visitors that the system currently in place had perceived weaknesses. However the programme team proposed to introduce the university wide system that ensures attendance is monitored successfully. Whilst the visitors were content that this standard was met, they were happy to support the team in their desire to operate the proposed model for the revised programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider formalising the recording of the attendance of practice placement educators at the development sessions.

Reason: The visitors were happy that the training of the practice placement educators took place and recognised that the education provider had a database of practice placement educators who had attended the development sessions. However the database currently did not record the date of attendance. The visitors recommended that this date was recorded to enhance the value of the database.

Paul Frowen
Brian Ellis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	27 – 29 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical Therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 August 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 September 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Podiatry, MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Podiatry (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) and Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	70 (BSc & MSc)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Initial approval	02 November 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Nick Maguire (University of Southampton) Tom Randell (University of Southampton) Carolyn Blundell (University of

	Southampton) Susan Richardson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit admissions documentation to clarify the circumstances in which a student will be awarded the Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) with eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly indicates that students on the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) could not elect to avoid the critical inquiry module and still be awarded the Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration). It must be made clear that the award of Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) is a fallback award only. This will therefore provide applicants with the correct information and allow them to make an informed choice about whether or not to join the programme.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation and advertising materials to follow the guidance provided in the HPC 'Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers'.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Currently there is reference to the term 'licence to practice' in several documents. This term does not reflect the independence of the HPC or its role as a regulatory body which functions by protecting professional titles. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used in programme documentation and advertising must be amended.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon

successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors' felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to 'eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC'.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the systems used to ensure that placement components of the programme are managed effectively.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators that there were systems in place to manage placements. In particular, a new audit tool was currently being piloted and due to be implemented across all programmes in the school. However, the programme documentation did not include an example of the audit tool and further documentation detailing how this tool is used to manage placements.

The visitors require further evidence of the audit tool and how this tool and the associated systems in place ensure that the approval, monitoring and assessment of placements and the training of practice educators are managed effectively. Furthermore, the visitors require specific evidence addressing the feedback mechanisms in place for placements including how feedback is collated from various sources, addressed and then fed back into the development of the placement experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentation detailing the planned staff numbers and each staff member's proposed input into the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation that the external examiner and students had commented on the staffing levels in place to deliver the programme. In particular, it was noted that practical sessions delivered throughout the programme were, at times, crowded with high student to staff levels. The visitors also noted in meeting with the programme team, that the issue of staffing levels was being addressed and that it was indicated that the school had adequate resources in place to deliver any current and future programmes.

The visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme. The visitors require detailed evidence which addresses each staff member and their individual responsibilities across the BSc and MSc/Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) programmes and any other award pathways. The documentation addressing this condition should also include any research/extra-curricular commitments which would have a direct impact on the ability of staff to deliver the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that a thorough and effective system is in place for the approving and monitoring of all placements.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through meetings with the programme team and practice placement providers that the school was piloting the use of a new audit tool. However, the programme documentation did not include an example of the audit tool and further documentation detailing how this tool is used to approve and monitor placements.

The visitors require further evidence of the audit tool and the associated systems in place to be satisfied there is a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements. Furthermore, the visitors require specific evidence addressing the feedback mechanisms for placements including how feedback is collated from various sources, addressed and then fed back into the development of the placement experience.

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 education provider must provide further evidence of the assessment criteria that is applied to each level of the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation supplied prior to and at the visit itself, addressed assessment criteria for specific modules and pieces of assessment. The visitors were satisfied that specific assessment criteria applied throughout the programme was appropriate to their respective modules and pieces of assessment.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that students were provided with clear assessment criteria outlining how they were assessed at each level of the programme.

The visitors require further evidence of the assessment criteria governing how students are assessed at each level of the programme. In particular, the visitors would expect to see how the assessment criteria applied within each module is consistent with the assessment criteria pertaining to each level of the programme. Furthermore, they would also expect to see how the assessment criteria reflects and impacts on the overall progression of a student to be satisfied that the measurement of student progression is an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the assessment criteria that is applied to each level of the programme

Reason: The programme documentation supplied prior to and at the visit itself, addressed assessment criteria for specific modules and pieces of assessment. The visitors were satisfied that specific assessment criteria applied throughout the programme was appropriate to their respective modules and pieces of assessment.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that students were provided with clear assessment criteria outlining how they were assessed at each level of the programme.

The visitors require further evidence of the assessment criteria governing how students are assessed at each level of the programme. In particular, the visitors would expect to see how the assessment criteria applied within each module is consistent with the assessment criteria pertaining to each level of the programme. Furthermore, they would also expect to see how the assessment criteria reflects and impacts on the overall progression of a student to be satisfied that the measurement of student progression is an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider monitoring the future resource provisions for one to one academic and pastoral support.

Reason: The visitors noted whilst touring the facilities that the programme team will be using an open plan workspace in the near future. The open plan workspace will require students to book time in advance in order to meet one on one with members of the team. This requirement is in place to ensure rooms are available at the requested meeting time to provide privacy.

Although the visitors are satisfied that this SET has been met, they recommend these proposed arrangements are carefully monitored to ensure an appropriate level of academic and pastoral support continues to be provided to students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the resources available within placements to accommodate the facilitation of interprofessional learning.

Reason: The visitors noted from meeting with placement educators that the resources required to facilitate a group of interprofessional students on placement were often difficult to access or provide. In particular, the lack of additional meeting space available within most placements meant that facilitating a large group of students, who were working towards common pieces of assessment, was challenging. Furthermore, the time restraints placed on placement educators, due to the nature of interprofessional learning and the need to facilitate group dynamics, also proved challenging to manage.

The visitors were satisfied that this SET was met, however recommend a review of interprofessional learning within placements to ensure the prescribed assessment tasks are appropriate to the resources available within particular placement settings.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the learning outcomes across all modules within the programme to further ensure that they are indicative of the actual learning outcomes for students.

Reason: The visitors noted the learning outcomes listed across all modules were generic and it was not clear how they specifically aligned with the skills assessments. The programme team addressed this issue and advised that the

learning outcomes were designed to be as flexible as possible in order to allow innovation in teaching and assessment.

The visitors were satisfied that the SET had been met, however recommend that the programme team review the learning outcomes across all modules within the programme to further ensure that they are indicative of the actual learning outcomes for students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider continuing its efforts to expand the range of placements on offer to placements outside of a traditional NHS setting.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through the meeting with the programme team there had been a systematic approach adopted by the School to pursue the provision of placements experiences outside those traditionally supplied in NHS settings.

The visitors acknowledge the work already done in this area and recommend the programme team continue to pursue non-traditional placement settings to provide students with a greater range of placement experiences.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider monitoring non-traditional placements to further ensure they have equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies in place.

Reason: As mentioned above in the recommendation for SET 5.5, the visitors noted the work carried out by the programme team in securing a greater range of placements in non-traditional settings.

The visitors recommend the programme team continue to monitor the acquisition of further non-traditional placements to further ensure these placement providers have equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored

Margaret Curr
Katie Bosworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Relevant modality	Podiatry
Date of visit	27 – 29 May 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Podiatrist' or 'Chiropodist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 21 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 August 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 September 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Podiatry, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Podiatry, MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration), Pg Dip Podiatry (pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (pre-registration) and Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Frowen (Podiatrist) Brian Ellis (Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	Between 5 and 10
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton) Carolyn Blundell Chair for Podiatry meetings (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Wilfred Foxe (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alison Hart (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Nicola McLarnon (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review external examiners reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 61 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit admissions documentation to clarify the circumstances in which a student will be awarded the Pg Dip Podiatry (pre-registration) with eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly indicates that students on the MSc Podiatry (pre-registration) could not elect to avoid the critical inquiry module and still be awarded the Pg Dip Podiatry. It must be made clear that the award of Pg Dip Podiatry is a fallback award only. This will therefore provide applicants with the correct information and allow them to make an informed choice about whether or not to join the programme.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation and advertising materials to follow the guidance provided in the HPC 'Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers'.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Currently there is reference to the term 'licence to practice' in several documents. This term does not reflect the independence of the HPC or its role as a regulatory body which functions by protecting professional titles. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used in programme documentation and advertising must be amended.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain

registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors' felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to 'eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC'.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions information regarding appropriate academic and or appropriate professional entry standards to the programme.

Reason: In the documentation received by the visitors prior to the visit it was unclear what the entry requirements for mature students to the programme were. The visitors pointed out to the programme team that any student wishing to apply to the programme who held a first degree would be by definition mature. The programme team indicated at the meeting with the visitors that mature students may come from within a clinical setting (eg as an assistant practitioner) and this is why the entry criteria had been set out so as not to preclude such applicants from applying to the programme. In order for any potential applicant to make an application to the programme the visitors would like to receive revised admissions documentation that clearly sets out the appropriate academic and or appropriate professional entry standards to the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider formalising the recording of the attendance of practice placement educators at the development sessions.

Reason: The visitors were happy that the training of the practice placement educators took place and recognised that the education provider had a database of practice placement educators who had attended the development sessions. However the database currently did not record the date of attendance. The visitors recommended that this date was recorded to enhance the value of the database.

Paul Frowen
Brian Ellis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	27 – 29 May 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical Therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 August 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 September 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Podiatry, MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Podiatry (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) and Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	70 (BSc & MSc)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Nick Maguire (University of Southampton) Tom Randell (University of Southampton) Carolyn Blundell (University of Southampton) Susan Richardson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit admissions documentation to clarify the circumstances in which a student will be awarded the Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) with eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly indicates that students on the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) could not elect to avoid the critical inquiry module and still be awarded the Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration). It must be made clear that the award of Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) is a fallback award only. This will therefore provide applicants with the correct information and allow them to make an informed choice about whether or not to join the programme.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation and advertising materials to follow the guidance provided in the HPC 'Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers'.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Currently there is reference to the term 'licence to practice' in several documents. This term does not reflect the independence of the HPC or its role as a regulatory body which functions by protecting professional titles. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used in programme documentation and advertising must be amended.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon

successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors' felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to 'eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC'.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the systems used to ensure that placement components of the programme are managed effectively.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators that there were systems in place to manage placements. In particular, a new audit tool was currently being piloted and due to be implemented across all programmes in the school. However, the programme documentation did not include an example of the audit tool and further documentation detailing how this tool is used to manage placements.

The visitors require further evidence of the audit tool and how this tool and the associated systems in place ensure that the approval, monitoring and assessment of placements and the training of practice educators are managed effectively.. Furthermore, the visitors require specific evidence addressing the feedback mechanisms in place for placements including how feedback is collated from various sources, addressed and then fed back into the development of the placement experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentation detailing the planned staff numbers and each staff members proposed input into the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation that the external examiner and students had commented on the staffing levels in place to deliver the programme. In particular, it was noted that practical sessions delivered throughout the programme were, at times, crowded with high student to staff levels. The visitors also noted in meeting with the programme team, that the issue of staffing levels was being addressed and that it was indicated that the school had adequate resources in place to deliver any current and future programmes.

The visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme. The visitors require detailed evidence which addresses each staff member and their individual responsibilities across the BSc and MSc/Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) programmes and any other award pathways. The documentation addressing this condition should also include any research/extra-curricular commitments which would have a direct impact on the ability of staff to deliver the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that a thorough and effective system is in place for the approving and monitoring of all placements.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through meetings with the programme team and practice placement providers that the school was piloting the use of a new audit tool. However, the programme documentation did not include an example of the audit tool and further documentation detailing how this tool is used to approve and monitor placements.

The visitors require further evidence of the audit tool and the associated systems in place to be satisfied there is a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements. Furthermore, the visitors require specific evidence addressing the feedback mechanisms for placements including how feedback is collated from various sources, addressed and then fed back into the development of the placement experience.

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 education provider must provide further evidence of the assessment criteria that is applied to each level of the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation supplied prior to and at the visit itself, addressed assessment criteria for specific modules and pieces of assessment. The visitors were satisfied that specific assessment criteria applied throughout the programme was appropriate to their respective modules and pieces of assessment.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that students were provided with clear assessment criteria outlining how they were assessed at each level of the programme.

The visitors require further evidence of the assessment criteria governing how students are assessed at each level of the programme. In particular, the visitors would expect to see how the assessment criteria applied within each module is consistent with the assessment criteria pertaining to each level of the programme. Furthermore, they would also expect to see how the assessment criteria reflects and impacts on the overall progression of a student to be satisfied that the measurement of student progression is an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the assessment criteria that is applied to each level of the programme

Reason: The programme documentation supplied prior to and at the visit itself, addressed assessment criteria for specific modules and pieces of assessment. The visitors were satisfied that specific assessment criteria applied throughout the programme was appropriate to their respective modules and pieces of assessment.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that students were provided with clear assessment criteria outlining how they were assessed at each level of the programme.

The visitors require further evidence of the assessment criteria governing how students are assessed at each level of the programme. In particular, the visitors would expect to see how the assessment criteria applied within each module is consistent with the assessment criteria pertaining to each level of the programme. Furthermore, they would also expect to see how the assessment criteria reflects and impacts on the overall progression of a student to be satisfied that the measurement of student progression is an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider monitoring the future resource provisions for one to one academic and pastoral support.

Reason: The visitors noted whilst touring the facilities that the programme team will be using an open plan workspace in the near future. The open plan workspace will require students to book time in advance in order to meet one on one with members of the team. This requirement is in place to ensure rooms are available at the requested meeting time to provide privacy.

Although the visitors are satisfied that this SET has been met, they recommend these proposed arrangements are carefully monitored to ensure an appropriate level of academic and pastoral support continues to be provided to students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the resources available within placements to accommodate the facilitation of interprofessional learning.

Reason: The visitors noted from meeting with placement educators that the resources required to facilitate a group of interprofessional students on placement were often difficult to access or provide. In particular, the lack of additional meeting space available within most placements meant that facilitating a large group of students, who were working towards common pieces of assessment, was challenging. Furthermore, the time restraints placed on placement educators, due to the nature of interprofessional learning and the need to facilitate group dynamics, also proved challenging to manage.

The visitors were satisfied that this SET was met, however recommend a review of interprofessional learning within placements to ensure the prescribed assessment tasks are appropriate to the resources available within particular placement settings.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the learning outcomes across all modules within the programme to further ensure that they are indicative of the actual learning outcomes for students.

Reason: The visitors noted the learning outcomes listed across all modules were generic and it was not clear how they specifically aligned with the skills assessments. The programme team addressed this issue and advised that the

learning outcomes were designed to be as flexible as possible in order to allow innovation in teaching and assessment.

The visitors were satisfied that the SET had been met, however recommend that the programme team review the learning outcomes across all modules within the programme to further ensure that they are indicative of the actual learning outcomes for students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider continuing its efforts to expand the range of placements on offer to placements outside of a traditional NHS setting.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through the meeting with the programme team there had been a systematic approach adopted by the School to pursue the provision of placements experiences outside those traditionally supplied in NHS settings.

The visitors acknowledge the work already done in this area and recommend the programme team continue to pursue non-traditional placement settings to provide students with a greater range of placement experiences.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider monitoring non-traditional placements to further ensure they have equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies in place.

Reason: As mentioned above in the recommendation for SET 5.5, the visitors noted the work carried out by the programme team in securing a greater range of placements in non-traditional settings.

The visitors recommend the programme team continue to monitor the acquisition of further non-traditional placements to further ensure these placement providers have equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored

Margaret Curr
Katie Bosworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	Pg Dip Podiatry (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Relevant modality	Podiatry
Date of visit	27 – 29 May 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Podiatrist' or 'Chiropodist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 21 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 August 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 September 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Podiatry, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration), MSc Podiatry (pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (pre-registration) and Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Frowen (Podiatrist) Brian Ellis (Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	Between 5 and 10
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton) Carolyn Blundell Chair for Podiatry meetings (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Wilfred Foxxe (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alison Hart (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Nicola McLarnon (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review external examiners reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 61 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit admissions documentation to clarify the circumstances in which a student will be awarded the Pg Dip Podiatry (pre-registration) with eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly indicates that students on the MSc Podiatry (pre-registration) could not elect to avoid the critical inquiry module and still be awarded the Pg Dip Podiatry. It must be made clear that the award of Pg Dip Podiatry is a fallback award only. This will therefore provide applicants with the correct information and allow them to make an informed choice about whether or not to join the programme.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation and advertising materials to follow the guidance provided in the HPC 'Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers'.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Currently there is reference to the term 'licence to practice' in several documents. This term does not reflect the independence of the HPC or its role as a regulatory body which functions by protecting professional titles. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used in programme documentation and advertising must be amended.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain

registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors' felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to 'eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC'.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions information regarding appropriate academic and or appropriate professional entry standards to the programme.

Reason: In the documentation received by the visitors prior to the visit it was unclear what the entry requirements for mature students to the programme were. The visitors pointed out to the programme team that any student wishing to apply to the programme who held a first degree would by definition be mature. The programme team indicated at the meeting with the visitors that mature students may come from within a clinical setting (eg as an assistant practitioner) and this is why the entry criteria had been set out so as not to preclude such applicants from applying to the programme. In order for any potential applicant to make an application to the programme the visitors would like to receive revised admissions documentation that clearly sets out the appropriate academic and or appropriate professional entry standards to the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider formalising the recording of the attendance of practice placement educators at the development sessions.

Reason: The visitors were happy that the training of the practice placement educators took place and recognised that the education provider had a database of practice placement educators who had attended the development sessions. However the database currently did not record the date of attendance. The visitors recommended that this date was recorded to enhance the value of the database.

Paul Frowen
Brian Ellis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	1 – 2 April 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 June 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 July 2009.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Robert Cartwright (Paramedic) Claire Brewis (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
HPC observer	Natasha Williams
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Anita Eves (University of Surrey)
Secretary	Amy Cox (University of Surrey)
Members of the joint panel	Adrian Halls (University of Surrey) Fraser McFarland (University of Surrey)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review external examiners reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

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

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing, Dip HE Adult Nursing and Dip HE Operating Department Practice programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must ensure the advertising materials for the programme follow the guidelines provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Currently the title of the programme does not comply with the HPC regulatory status in the advertising and programme documentation. Therefore, to provide applicants with full and clear information in order to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors would like to receive amended documentation that accurately describes the correct title for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide clearly articulated documentation that detail of the expertise and knowledge of the paramedic staff teaching on the programme.

Reason: From the visitors reading of the documentation prior to the visit it was unclear as to the teaching input to the programme from paramedics. During discussions with the programme team it was clear that there would be paramedics teaching on the programme. The paramedics would be employed as visiting lecturers and would teach the specialist paramedic areas of the programme. The visitors would therefore, like to receive revised documentation that details the paramedic visiting lecturing staff, their expertise and knowledge.

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 education provider must ensure the protocols used to gain student consent are clearly articulated.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and students it was clear that all students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching. The documentation reviewed by the visitors had a policy for consent, which discussed a form for the students to sign. However there was no form included in the documentation received by the visitors so it was not clear how the policy would be monitored if a student opted out of participating as a patient or client. Therefore the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that shows how student consent is obtained.

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 education provider must ensure that all documentation regarding attendance does not say that the HPC stipulates the number of hours that have to be achieved in theory and practice for the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided by the education provider stated that the HPC says that in order to meet the attendance policy students need to complete 1,500 hours of theory and 1,500 hours of practice. This is not the case as the HPC does not make such statements. During discussions with the programme team it became clear that the statement should have been attributed to the British Paramedic Association. In order for the visitors to be assured that the attendance policy is appropriate the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that indicates where attendance is mandatory and does not make reference to the HPC.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation that clearly articulates a thorough and effective system of how practice placements are approved and monitored.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team it was clear that there was an audit tool in place that was used to approve and monitor placements. However this document was not provided with the documentation submitted for the visit. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation that articulates how placements are approved and monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation that clearly articulates that all practice placement educators have the relevant qualifications and experience.

Reason: From their reading of the documentation the visitors could not determine if the practice placement educators involved in the practice training for the students had the relevant qualifications and experience. During the meeting with the programme team and practice placement educators it was stated that the practice placement educators at ambulance stations and in acute hospital settings had the appropriate qualifications and experience. However the visitors did not receive evidence detailing this information. The visitors would like to receive documentation that articulates the qualifications and experience held by those involved in practice placement training.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation that clearly shows that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

Reason: From their reading of the documentation the visitors could not determine if all placement educators were appropriately registered. During the meeting with the programme team and the practice placement educators the visitors were told that all practice placement educators were on the appropriate registers for their profession. The visitors did not receive evidence detailing this information. Therefore visitors would like to receive revised documentation that details the registration details for the practice placement educators for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must produce revised documentation that articulates that practice placement educators have undertaken appropriate placement educator training prior to the commencement of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation the visitor could not determine if all the practice placement educators for the programme had undertaken the appropriate practice placement educator training. In the meeting with the programme team and practice placement educators the visitors were informed that all practice placement educators will undergo the Level 3 Mentor training course. Therefore visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly articulates that the practice placement educators would have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training prior to the commencement of the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue with its planning for future paramedic staff within the programme.

Reason: Whilst the visitors were happy that the staffing for the programme was appropriate, they were pleased to see that the education provider was planning to employ two paramedics as teacher practitioners on the programme from the start of year two. The visitors were happy to support the programme team's further succession planning for the programme.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider adding further information into the student and practice placement educator documents to include information on communication and lines of responsibility.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the current student and practice placement educator information was satisfactory, but considered that it could be enhanced as the programme develops to provide the student and practice placement educators with a wider range of contact information to enhance the understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Robert Cartwright
Claire Brewis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	6 – 8 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome.....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	9
Commendations.....	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer) Stephen Boynes (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	40
Initial approval	1 July 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	28 September 2009
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Paul Taylor (Teesside University Diagnostic Radiography chair)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Katherine Sanderson (Internal panel member) Paul Stephenson (External panel member) Mary Baker (College of

	Radiographers) Helen Jones (College of Radiographers)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the English language requirements are clearly articulated within the admission procedures.

Reason: From the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the English language requirement for the programme. During the visit, the visitors received a print out from the education provider website entitled 'English Language Courses and Requirements'. This print out stated that for Health programmes, the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level required was 6.0 – 7.0. The visitors were therefore unsure of the English language requirement for entry to the programme and would like to receive documentation which clarifies this.

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 education provider must ensure the protocols used to gain student consent are clearly articulated.

Reason: From the discussions with the students, the visitors learnt that they are asked to sign a consent form during their induction week. The students stated that they were not asked at any other point during the programme to provide their consent before participating as a patient or client. The feedback from students was that they felt obliged to participate in this type of activity. The visitors discussed this with the programme team who confirmed that students are asked to complete a consent form during the induction week but that any student can withdraw their consent at any time during the course of the programme. The visitors felt that this was not sufficiently communicated to students and would therefore like to receive documentation which clearly articulates the protocol used to gain student consent, which includes information about opting out at a later date.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms which ensure that a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring the negotiated summer placements is undertaken.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that students undertake a negotiated summer placement between years 2 and 3. This could be in the students' base hospital but could be, if the student organised it, in a different country. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider's standard

educational audit does not apply to these negotiated summer placements. The visitors were therefore unsure of the systems used to approve these placements before use and monitor them on an ongoing basis, if it was necessary. The visitors would therefore like to receive further documentation which details the mechanisms used.

Recommendations

5.7.3 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within their programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors' are satisfied that students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement, including information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct. However, the visitors could find no reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the documentation and would like to recommend this as an enhancement to the programme.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The visitors' would like to commend the education provider on their commitment to maintaining service user involvement with the programme.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team and service users, the visitors learnt that the education provider has employed a Projects Officer who has specific responsibility for ensuring continued service user involvement in the programme. The visitors felt that this was highly unusual and should be commended as best practice.

Shaaron Pratt
Stephen Boynes

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	6 – 8 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	8
Commendations	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Anne Shomefun
Proposed student numbers	40
Initial approval	6 November 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	28 September 2009
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Jill Morgan (Teesside University/sub group Chairman)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University) Fiona Terry (Teesside University/sub group Secretary) Joanne Almond (Teesside University/sub group Secretary)
Members of the joint panel	Karen Edmensen (Teesside University)

	Siobhan Simpson (Teesside University) David Morris (Teesside University/ Service User) Nicola Spalding (College of Occupational Therapists) Pat McClure (College of Occupational Therapists) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the academic entry requirements for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme are clearly articulated within the admission procedures.

Reason: From the documentation received before and during the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the academic entry requirements for the programme. The visitors were, therefore, unable to determine if academic entry requirements were appropriate and require documentation to clarify how this standard is met.

Recommendations

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing its decision to not make the European Computer Driving Licence (ECDL) a core course requirement.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that ECDL is not a core requirement for this programme. This is not the case with all the other health professional programmes in the School of Health and Social Care. The visitors recognised that those who complete the programme would have relevant IT skills to meet the standards of proficiency. However, the visitors recommend the introduction of the ECDL, so as to further enhance the IT skills of students who successfully complete this programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the timing and length of the final year practice placement with a view to changes that might improve the employability of students who successfully complete the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the placement providers and the students, the visitors noted that the final year placement was fewer and shorter than those in the preceding 2 years. The visitors were unsure of the reason for this placement structure and suggest it to be changed with a view to improving the employability of students who successfully complete this programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider introducing a system of anonymous marking.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the students it was clear that, though the assessment mechanisms were appropriate, a system of anonymous marking was not used by this education provider. The visitors noted that student feedback expressed support for the system. The visitors, therefore, wish the education provider to consider introducing anonymous marking, so as to promote equitable assessment standards.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the programme team for involving service users and carers in all aspects of the programme's work throughout the student cycle.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team, service users and carers the visitors learnt that the programme team has employed a Projects Officer who has specific responsibility for ensuring continued service user and care involvement in the programme. The programme team has also carried forward the NHS led service user and carer engagement initiative by involving service users and carers in all aspects of its work including development and review of courses, in teaching, recruitment and assessment of students and research. The visitors commended this as best practice worthy of emulation by other education providers. More information about this practice is available on the education provider's website at www.tees.ac.uk

Bernadette Waters
Joanna Goodwin

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	6 – 8 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction	2
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	7
Commendations	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) and Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Rachel Greig
Proposed student numbers	46
Initial approval	1 September 1998
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	28 September 2009
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Judith Poch (Chair of sub-group, Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University) Janice Turner (Secretary of sub-group, Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Johnson (Internal panel member) Nicola Phillips (External panel member) Steve Pett (External panel member)

	Diana Davis (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must clearly state in their assessment regulations that the appointed external examiner for the programme must be from the relevant part of the HPC register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: Upon consulting the external examiner framework document the visitors were satisfied that the appropriate measures were in place when appointing an external examiner however felt this process should be clearly defined within the programme assessment regulations.

Recommendations

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider should carefully monitor the service user and carer engagement strategy.

Reason: The implementation of the service user and carer engagement strategy is still in its early stages within this programme so its effectiveness within the programme is yet to be determined. By closely monitoring this system the programme team can ensure that the stated objectives of the strategy are being met and that they will be alerted to any problems that may require attention.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider monitors the outcome of the new inter-professional learning strategy to ensure that profession specific skills and knowledge continue to be adequately addressed.

Reason: The programme team have made a number of changes to the teaching of inter-professional learning throughout the programme and the implementation of these changes is still in their early stages. By closely monitoring this new strategy of teaching the programme team can determine the level of effectiveness these changes have had on its programme and can ensure that profession specific skills are addressed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should continue to explore widening the range of placements to respond effectively to changing patterns of employment.

Reason: Discussions with the programme team stated that although there was no formal policy in place to seek out different placements for students the team were in negotiations to widen their range of practice placements. The visitors noted the importance of this as they felt the range of physiotherapy placements offered, although sufficient to meet the SET, were quite narrow. In order to respond to changes in the market place the visitors felt it would be beneficial for the education provider to widen their range of placements to include opportunities in non-traditional areas.

Anthony Power
Valerie Maehle

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	6 – 8 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome.....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	8
Commendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Anne Shomefun
Proposed student numbers	40
Initial approval	1 September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	4 January 2010
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Jill Morgan (Teesside University/sub group Chairman)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University) Fiona Terry (Teesside University/sub group Secretary) Joanne Almond (Teesside University/sub group Secretary)
Members of the joint panel	Karen Edmensen (Teesside University)

	Siobhan Simpson (Teesside University) David Morris (Teesside University/ Service User) Nicola Spalding (College of Occupational Therapists) Pat McClure (College of Occupational Therapists) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the academic entry requirements for the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) programme are clearly articulated within the admission procedures.

Reason: From the documentation received before and during the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the academic entry requirements for the programme. The visitors were, therefore, unable to determine if academic entry requirements were appropriate and require documentation to clarify how this standard is met.

Recommendations

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing its decision to not make the European Computer Driving Licence (ECDL) a core course requirement.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that ECDL is not a core requirement for this programme. This is not the case with all the other health professional programmes in the School of Health and Social Care. The visitors recognised that those who complete the programme would have relevant IT skills to meet the standards of proficiency. However, the visitors recommend the introduction of the ECDL, so as to further enhance the IT skills of students who successfully complete this programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider introducing a system of anonymous marking.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the students it was clear that, though the assessment mechanisms were appropriate, a system of anonymous marking was not used by this education provider. The visitors noted that student feedback expressed support for the system. The visitors, therefore, wish the education provider to consider introducing anonymous marking, so as to promote equitable assessment standards.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the programme team for involving service users and carers in all aspects of the programme's work throughout the student cycle.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team, service users and carers the visitors learnt that the programme team has employed a Projects Officer who has specific responsibility for ensuring continued service user and care involvement in the programme. The programme team has also carried forward the NHS led service user and carer engagement initiative by involving service users and carers in all aspects of its work including development and review of courses, in teaching, recruitment and assessment of students and research. The visitors commended this as best practice worthy of emulation by other education providers. More information about this practice is available on the education provider's website at www.tees.ac.uk

Bernadette Waters
Joanna Goodwin

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	6 – 8 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction	2
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Commendations	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Pg Dip Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) and Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Rachel Greig
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	1 September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 January 2010
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Judith Poch (Chair of sub-group, Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University) Janice Turner (Secretary of sub-group, Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Johnson (Internal panel member) Nicola Phillips (External panel member) Steve Pett (External panel member)

	Diana Davis (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must clearly state in their assessment regulations that the appointed external examiner for the programme must be from the relevant part of the HPC register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: Upon consulting the external examiner framework document the visitors were satisfied that the appropriate measures were in place when appointing an external examiner however felt this process should be clearly defined within the programme assessment regulations.

Recommendations

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider should carefully monitor the service user and carer engagement strategy.

Reason: The implementation of the service user and carer engagement strategy is still in its early stages within this programme so its effectiveness within the programme is yet to be determined. By closely monitoring this system the programme team can ensure that the stated objectives of the strategy are being met and that they will be alerted to any problems that may require attention.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider monitors the outcome of the new inter-professional learning strategy to ensure that profession specific skills and knowledge continue to be adequately addressed.

Reason: The programme team have made a number of changes to the teaching of inter-professional learning throughout the programme and the implementation of these changes is still in their early stages. By closely monitoring this new strategy of teaching the programme team can determine the level of effectiveness these changes have had on its programme and can ensure that profession specific skills are addressed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should continue to explore widening the range of placements to respond effectively to changing patterns of employment.

Reason: Discussions with the programme team stated that although there was no formal policy in place to seek out different placements for students the team were in negotiations to widen their range of practice placements. The visitors noted the importance of this as they felt the range of physiotherapy placements offered, although sufficient to meet the SET, were quite narrow. In order to respond to changes in the market place the visitors felt it would be beneficial for the education provider to widen their range of placements to include opportunities in non-traditional areas.

Anthony Power
Valerie Maehle

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	6 – 8 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome.....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	8
Commendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Anne Shomefun
Proposed student numbers	40
Initial approval	1 September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	4 January 2010
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Jill Morgan (Teesside University/sub group Chairman)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University) Fiona Terry (Teesside University/sub group Secretary) Joanne Almond (Teesside University/sub group Secretary)
Members of the joint panel	Karen Edmensen (Teesside University)

	Siobhan Simpson (Teesside University) David Morris (Teesside University/ Service User) Nicola Spalding (College of Occupational Therapists) Pat McClure (College of Occupational Therapists) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the academic entry requirements for the Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) programme are clearly articulated within the admission procedures.

Reason: From the documentation received before and during the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the academic entry requirements for the programme. The visitors were, therefore, unable to determine if academic entry requirements were appropriate and require documentation to clarify how this standard is met.

Recommendations

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing its decision to not make the European Computer Driving Licence (ECDL) a core course requirement.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that ECDL is not a core requirement for this programme. This is not the case with all the other health professional programmes in the School of Health and Social Care. The visitors recognised that those who complete the programme would have relevant IT skills to meet the standards of proficiency. However, the visitors recommend the introduction of the ECDL, so as to further enhance the IT skills of students who successfully complete this programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider introducing a system of anonymous marking.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the students it was clear that, though the assessment mechanisms were appropriate, a system of anonymous marking was not used by this education provider. The visitors noted that student feedback expressed support for the system. The visitors, therefore, wish the education provider to consider introducing anonymous marking, so as to promote equitable assessment standards.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the programme team for involving service users and carers in all aspects of the programme's work throughout the student cycle.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team, service users and carers the visitors learnt that the programme team has employed a Projects Officer who has specific responsibility for ensuring continued service user and care involvement in the programme. The programme team has also carried forward the NHS led service user and carer engagement initiative by involving service users and carers in all aspects of its work including development and review of courses, in teaching, recruitment and assessment of students and research. The visitors commended this as best practice worthy of emulation by other education providers. More information about this practice is available on the education provider's website at www.tees.ac.uk

Bernadette Waters
Joanna Goodwin

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside
Programme name	Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	6 – 8 May 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) and Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Rachel Greig
Proposed student numbers	15
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 January 2010
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Judith Porch (Chair of sub-group, Teesside University)
Secretary	Janice Turner (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Johnson (Internal panel member) Nicola Phillips (External panel member) Steve Pett (External panel member) Diana Davis (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the approval of the programme is confirmed.

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must clearly state in their assessment regulations that the appointed external examiner for the programme must be from the relevant part of the HPC register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: Upon consulting the external examiner framework document the visitors were satisfied that the appropriate measures were in place when appointing an external examiner however felt this process should be clearly defined within the programme assessment regulations.

Recommendations

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider should carefully monitor the service user and carer engagement strategy.

Reason: The implementation of the service user and carer engagement strategy is still in its early stages within this programme so its effectiveness within the programme is yet to be determined. By closely monitoring this system the programme team can ensure that the stated objectives of the strategy are being met and that they will be alerted to any problems that may require attention.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider monitors the outcome of the new inter-professional learning strategy to ensure that profession specific skills and knowledge continue to be adequately addressed.

Reason: The programme team have made a number of changes to the teaching of inter-professional learning throughout the MSc programme (from which the Pg Dip is a step off award) and the implementation of these changes is still in their early stages. By closely monitoring this new strategy of teaching the programme team can determine the level of effectiveness these changes have had on its programme and can ensure that profession specific skills are addressed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should continue to explore widening the range of placements to respond effectively to changing patterns of employment.

Reason: Discussions with the programme team stated that although there was no formal policy in place to seek out different placements for students the team were in negotiations to widen their range of practice placements. The visitors noted the importance of this as they felt the range of physiotherapy placements offered, although sufficient to meet the SET, were quite narrow. In order to respond to changes in the market place the visitors felt it would be beneficial for the education provider to widen their range of placements to include opportunities in non-traditional areas.

Anthony Power
Valerie Maehle

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Relevant entitlement(s)	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Date of visit	29 – 30 April 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Chiropodist' or 'Podiatrist' or must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 29 July 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 15 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Emma Supple (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Rachel Greig
HPC observer	Osama Ammar
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	1 September 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	21 September 2009
Chair	Jim Allen (University of Ulster)
Secretary	Catherine Avery (University of Ulster)
Members of the joint panel	Kathy Sinclair (Internal panel member) Robert Ashton (External panel member) Paul Frowen (External panel member) Wilfred Foxe (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Jackie Campbell (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 9 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must review the statement in the admissions criteria to stress that the Health Professions Admissions Test (HPAT) is applicable to anyone wishing to enter the programme including those entering the programme through Accreditation of Prior Learning routes.

Reason: Although the documents state that applicants who demonstrate accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL) can apply for admission onto the programme the visitors felt that their requirement to undertake the Health Professions Admissions Test was not explicit. The visitors would therefore like to see evidence that this requirement is made clear in the documentation.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the documentation to illustrate the management structure within the programme.

Reason: The visitors felt that the documents did not clearly outline the management structure of the programme. From the documentation it was unclear how the roles of subject coordinator and course director differed and who was in overall control of the programme. In discussions with the senior team these roles were explained along with an indication that the management structure was subject to recent change. The visitors were satisfied with the changed but wish for this to be reflected in the documentation so to outline that the programme is effectively managed.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must review the documentation relating to the teaching of local anaesthesia and prescription only medicine to better articulate how the related standards of proficiency under 2b.4 are discrete elements of the programme and clearly lead to annotations on the Register.

Reason: Completion of modules relating to local anaesthesia and prescription only medicine will lead the successful student to have a separate annotation on the HPC Register. The visitors wished to see evidence as to how these standards of proficiency are delivered and assessed within the programme as discrete elements to ensure that all appropriate learning outcomes are sufficiently attained.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must remove reference to supplementary prescribing in any module descriptors.

Reason: The education provider submitted module descriptors that made reference to supplementary prescribing. The visitors noted that Department of Health guidelines indicated individuals undertaking supplementary prescribing programmes should have three years post qualifying experience. In the meeting with the programme team, it was indicated that the references to supplementary prescribing were made in error. The visitors therefore require the updated module descriptors to be submitted for scrutiny.

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

Condition: The education provider must remove reference to the HPC when referring to the requirement of a student to undertake a minimum of 1000 hours of clinical practice throughout their three year programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation indicated the number of hours required in practice was a requirement of the regulator and not of the professional body. Accordingly, the visitors felt that the programme documentation must be updated to clearly articulate the requirement for completion of a set number of hours for clinical practice is a requirement of the Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the documentation relating to the delivery of local anaesthesia and prescription only medicine to clearly articulate how theory and practice are integrated.

Reason: The visitors noted that the elements of academic delivery, assessment and clinical practice related to prescription only medicines and local anaesthetics were separated across multiple modules. The visitors felt that clarity was required to illustrate that theory and practice are appropriately integrated to ensure that individuals once registered and annotated will be able to practice safely and effectively. The visitors noted that the current structure of integration may be appropriate, but that it must be made more explicit in the documentation.

5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Condition: The programme team must review the practice placement assessment documentation to ensure that all placement learning outcomes relate back to those of the module and are measurable.

Reason: The visitors felt that the learning outcomes stated in the assessment tool were very broad and that accordingly students and placement educators may not be entirely clear of the requirements for teaching, learning and assessment of

learning outcomes. The visitors felt that a review of the practice placement assessment tool would work to enhance how the learning outcomes as stated in the module descriptors are translated for delivery and assessment in the practice environment.

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

Condition: The programme team must review the practice placement assessment documentation to ensure that all learning outcomes must be achieved before a module can be passed.

Reason: The visitors noted that it was not stated clearly that a student must pass all learning outcomes in practice before progressing. The visitors therefore require evidence to show that a student must pass each learning outcome in a module before progression can occur. This will result in the students and placement educators being fully aware of the assessment requirements and the implications of the failure of a learning outcome.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit the final policy on condonement for programmes at University of Ulster.

Reason: In the discussions with the senior management team and programme team it was apparent that there had been recent changes to the institutional assessment regulations in relation to condonement. The visitors require the finalised assessment regulations to ensure that the procedures will continue to assure that a student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit all module descriptors relating the programme.

Reason: In the discussions with the programme team it was clear that there are likely to be changes made to the assessment methods of the programme as a result from the recommendations of the validation panel. In order to ensure that the assessment methods will measure the learning outcomes required for safe and effective practice, the visitors will need to scrutinise the updated versions of the module descriptors.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should review the impact on equality and diversity as a result of the Health Professions Admissions Test (HPAT) and how this impacts programme entry.

Reason: The visitors noted that the HPAT was used as an additional entry requirement in order to determine an individual's appropriateness for the profession and so took into account factors not normally accounted for in traditional entry qualifications. The visitors indicated that the HPAT test may have an impact on the diversity of applicants on the programme and encouraged the programme team to review this impact.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue the training of practice placement educators as a result of the new practice placement assessment tool.

Reason: After meetings with the programme and placement teams the visitors were satisfied that appropriate training was in place for the placement team to accurately measure a student's competence related to different learning outcomes and that placement staff had an accurate expectation of the student. The visitors noted the importance of this training and in order for the new assessment processes to succeed the visitors recommend that placement educator training continues at its current rate so the marking of learning outcomes remains at a consistent and appropriate level.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to develop their relationship with the placement staff so they have a similar level of support as the programme team in terms of development opportunities.

Reason: In the meetings with the placement team and programme team it was discussed that the practice educator focus group and practice educator committee were useful to the collaboration between education provider and placement providers. The visitors noted that the new involvement of practice educators in assessment would allow increased collaboration and wished to support this work. The visitors felt that practice educators would benefit from the increased opportunities to develop as a result of the collaboration.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should monitor and review the new practice assessment tool on an ongoing basis.

Reason: The visitors recognised the challenges associated with changes to practice assessment. In particular, the visitors felt that this new model of practice assessment may lead to inflation of classifications as a result of the new input of practice educators in the assessment process. However, the visitors also stated that the programme team had an awareness of the potential challenges they faced. Accordingly the visitors wished to support the ongoing review of the new assessment tool with this recommendation.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should review the curriculum structure to reflect academic level objectives at levels 4, 5 and 6.

Reason: It was clear that the programme met this standard as progression and achievement were clearly articulated. The visitors felt though that this programme would benefit both students and the programme team if it were designed to allow exit awards at levels 4, 5 and 6 which would be linked to competencies useful to a range of healthcare career options.

Emma Supple
Paul Blakeman