

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	28 – 30 April 2009

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
<b>Visit details .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>7</b>

## 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 May 2009 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

## 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 visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography & Dip HE Operating Department Practice. 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 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, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

**Visit details**

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Stephen Oates (Operating Department Practitioner) Nick Clark (Operating Department Practitioner)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	30
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Keith Gwilym (Canterbury Christ Church University) Robert Melville (Canterbury Christ Church University Operating Department Practice Pathway Chair)
Secretary	Suzanne Collins (Canterbury Christ Church University) Ms Carole Whitehead (Canterbury Christ Church University Operating Department Practice Pathway Secretary)
Members of the joint panel	Ms Susan Lord (External Panel Member, Anglia Ruskin University) Maureen Morgan (Internal Member, Canterbury Christ Church University)

## Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Inter professional Learning 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 Dip HE Operating Department Practice 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 the programme is approved.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

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 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.

## Recommendations

### **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 updating the mandatory placement diagram currently in the programme documentation to reflect the current curriculum guidance for the profession.

**Reason:** Whilst the visitors were happy that the curriculum guidance was being reflected throughout the programme, they felt that the diagram showing how placements work could be updated. It was clear through the discussions with the programme team and the students that the placements clearly reflected the curriculum guidance for the profession. Therefore the visitors recommended that the diagram in the programme documentation could be updated to show the May 2006 version in the College of Operating Department Practice curriculum guidance.

Stephen Oates  
Nick Clark

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme name</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	28 – 30 April 2009

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
<b>Visit details .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>7</b>

## 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 29 May 2009 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

## 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. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice & BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography. 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 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, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

**Visit details**

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Stephen Oates (Operating Department Practitioner) Nick Clark (Operating Department Practitioner)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	30
Initial approval	2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Keith Gwilym (Canterbury Christ Church University) Robert Melville (Canterbury Christ Church University Operating Department Practice Pathway Chair)
Secretary	Suzanne Collins (Canterbury Christ Church University) Ms Carole Whitehead (Canterbury Christ Church University Operating Department Practice Pathway Secretary)
Members of the joint panel	Ms Susan Lord (External Panel Member, Anglia Ruskin University) Maureen Morgan (Internal Member, Canterbury Christ Church University)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

## 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 the programme is approved.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

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

## Recommendations

### **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 updating the mandatory placement diagram currently in the programme documentation to reflect the current curriculum guidance for the profession.

**Reason:** Whilst the visitors were happy that the curriculum guidance was being reflected throughout the programme, they felt that the diagram showing how placements work could be updated. It was clear through the discussions with the programme team and the students that the placements clearly reflected the curriculum guidance for the profession. Therefore the visitors recommended that the diagram in the programme documentation could be updated to show the May 2006 version in the College of Operating Department Practice curriculum guidance.

Stephen Oates  
Nick Clark

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiography
<b>Date of visit</b>	28 – 30 April 2009

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome .....	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', 'Diagnostic Radiographer' or 'Therapeutic Radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 May 2009 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

## 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 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. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice & DipHE Operating Department Practice. 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 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, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

### Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	60 (30 Canterbury Campus, 30 Medway Campus)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Initial approval	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Keith Gwilym (Canterbury Christ Church University) Chris Stevens (Radiography Pathway)(Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Suzanne Collins (Canterbury Christ Church University) Annie Hayford (Radiography Pathway) (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	David Bradshaw (Internal Panel Member) (Canterbury Christ Church University)

	Margaret Summerlin (External Panel Member) (University of Derby)
--	------------------------------------------------------------------

## 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"/>
University Regulations, IPL Scheme Protocols	<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 the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

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 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.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to communicate more clearly the academic support systems available to students including the provision of a personal tutor.

**Reason:** The Pre-Registration Interprofessional Learning Document outlined that a range of academic and pastoral services were available to students. However, the visitors' noted that the students were not always aware of the support that was available to them, and in particular, the availability of a personal tutor to assist them academically. The visitors' recommend that programme documentation is revisited to further enhance the communication of the academic support systems that are available to students.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the Interprofessional Audit of Practice Placements tool to further ensure that action plans created are appropriately prioritised and followed up.

**Reason:** The documentation supplied by the education provider provided an example of a placement audit that was carried out at The Sommerfield Hospital. This audit indicated that a number of criteria set out within the audit tool were not met by the placement. The document indicated that the audit was carried out in January 2008 and was not reviewed again until January 2009. Furthermore, the visitors noted that the programme team had still not followed up on the areas identified as requiring more action since the initial audit was conducted.

The visitors' were satisfied that, although there were deficiencies in placement monitoring as identified through this audit, the education provider still continued to meet the SET by providing a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements.

However, the visitors do recommend that the programme team review the audit tool and system of approving and monitoring placements to ensure that action plans created as a result of placement audits are appropriately prioritised and followed up.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the marking and feedback systems that measure student performance and progression to further ensure that feedback is delivered in a timely, efficient and consistent manner.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that feedback given to students for completed pieces of assessment was not always delivered in a timely manner. Furthermore, the visitors also noted that feedback was not always consistently applied across students' submissions.

The programme team added that marking and feedback to students had been identified by the education provider as an issue that was common across most programmes. The visitors' recommend that continued efforts be employed by the education provider to further enhance the marking and feedback systems in place to ensure that students receive feedback in a timely, efficient and consistent manner.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to further ensure that the assessment regulations which specify student progression and achievement are more clearly articulated.

**Reason:** The IPL and Diagnostic Radiography programme documentation did not clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme. However, the programme specification contained within the Programme Quality Monitoring and Enhancement Report 2007/2008 did specify the requirements.

The visitors were content that the information regarding student progression and achievement, contained within the programme specification, was appropriate to meet the SET. However, the visitors recommend that this information be more clearly articulated within the IPL and Diagnostic Radiography programme documentation to ensure that students are aware of these requirements.

Martin Benwell  
Linda Mutema

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational Therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	28 - 30 April 2009

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Visit details .....	4
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	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 '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 29 May 2009 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

## 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 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. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Operating Department & DipHE Operating Department Practice. 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 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 outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational Therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Neil Strevett
Proposed student numbers	98 (59 Canterbury Campus, 39 Medway Campus)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Keith Gwilym (Canterbury Christ Church University) Dave Lewis (Canterbury Christ Church University, Chair of Occupational Therapy Pathway)
Secretary	Suzanne Collins (Canterbury Christ Church University) Tina Hagger (Canterbury Christ Church University, Occupational Therapy Pathway)
Members of the joint panel	Claire Brewis (External Panel Member) (University of Teeside) Lynda Saunders (Internal Panel Member) (Canterbury Christ Church University)

## Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University Policies and Regulations, IPL Scheme Protocols	<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 the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Jennifer Caldwell  
Jane Grant