

Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Validating body / Awarding body</b>	N/A
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Speech and Language Therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	22-23 September 2009

Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7
Commendations .....	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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Speech and language therapist' or 'Speech 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 4 November 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 25 November 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 21 October 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 November 2009.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider issues raised by the previous year's annual monitoring process. The issues raised by annual monitoring affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. 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 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 professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	101
Initial approval	12 October 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Stuart Brand (Birmingham City University)
Secretary	Tessa Clarke (Birmingham City University)
Members of the joint panel	Tony Whittle (Birmingham City University) Tracey Marsh (Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists) Rubana Hussein (Royal College of Speech and Language 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"/>
Cohort progression statistics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Induction materials	<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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 66 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the 1 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

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must implement formal written protocols to obtain consent when students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation and through meetings with the programme team and students, consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in clinical and practical teaching. However, there was no indication of the protocols in place which govern this process, the frequency with which it is applied, and how records are maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the current system in place gained informed consent from students.

The visitors require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students. In particular any formal protocols must include obtaining written consent from students when they are participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching. Also any formal protocols must also inform students of the opportunity to withdraw from any such activities which require them to participate as service users.

## Recommendations

### **3.5 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 filling the vacant positions on the programme team with appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in meeting with the programme team there are vacant positions on the team which are yet to be filled. The visitors were satisfied there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. However, the visitors recommend the vacant positions be filled as soon as possible to ensure any potential staffing changes in the future do not affect the delivery of the programme.

### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revising the programme specification benchmarks to include reference to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** The visitors noted on page 2 of the programme specification the programme benchmarks did not reference the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Although the visitors were satisfied this standard is met, they recommend the programme team revise the programme specification benchmarks to include the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

### **5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should continue to carefully monitor independent practice placement providers to ensure practitioners are appropriately registered.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the programme relied on practice placement educators in independent practice settings as part of placement provision for the programme.

Although the visitors were satisfied the SET has been met, they recommend the programme team continue to apply appropriate monitoring procedures to ensure these placements continue to provide placement educators who are appropriately registered.

## Commendations

**Commendation:** The programme team are commended on the development and successful implementation of speech and language clinic simulation software to the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the simulation software which was successfully developed and integrated into the curriculum. This software provided students with a rich learning experience of the clinical settings and the decision making process speech and language therapists would typically be presented with on a regular basis.

The visitors agreed this software was of best practice and innovation in the education of speech and language therapists and other education providers would benefit students by integrating this software into their own curriculum.

Information about this can be found by contacting Claire Hartley, the Head of Department Speech and Language Therapy, Birmingham City University.

Aileen Patterson  
Gillian Stevenson

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Validating body / Awarding body</b>	N/A
<b>Programme name</b>	Pg Dip Radiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Date of visit</b>	28 – 29 October 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title '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 November 2009 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 November 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 reviewed 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 all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. 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	Russell Hart (Radiographer) Helen Best (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Neil Strevett
HPC observer	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	10
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2010
Chair	Julie Walton (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Ann Nibbs (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Noreen Sinclair (External Panel Member) Spencer Goodman (External Panel Member) Kathy Johnson (University of Liverpool) Stuart Marshall-Clarke (University of Liverpool) Lynne Crook (University of Liverpool)

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the External examiners reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new and there were no reports to review.

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) Radiotherapy 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 59 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 2 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 admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme and update it to clarify both the title of the programme and any references to the protected title of 'Radiographer', and ensure that the use of the protected title is consistent throughout the documentation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference to a number of practitioner titles throughout and was not consistent in referring to the protected title. Therefore the visitors requested that the education provider revise the programme documentation and all advertising materials to ensure that applicants and students had the information they needed to make an informed choice on whether to accept an offer of a place on the programme.

### **2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the procedures relating to selection and entry criteria, particularly the process enacted for checking applicants for criminal convictions, is clearly stated.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the education provider had in place clear admissions procedures and entry criteria in relation to the programme, including a clear process for checking applicants for previous criminal convictions. However, the processes as detailed within the documentation were judged by the visitors not to accurately represent the procedures as described, and were thus judged to be potentially confusing. The visitors therefore required the education provider to revise their documentation to accurately reflect the processes as described by the programme team during the visit.

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide documentary evidence to show how the resources at practice placements will effectively support student learning.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors were confident that the resources were in place to support student learning in all settings, including the practice placements that students would undertake. However, the visitors judged that this was not evident from the documentation the education provider had submitted. Therefore, the visitors requested documentary evidence to show how this standard would be met, particularly in relation to practice placements.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide documentary evidence to show how they effectively approve and monitor all practice placements.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider effectively approves and monitors all radiotherapy practice placements. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that education provider does have effective systems in place to approve and monitor placements. Therefore, the visitors requested that the education provider provides documentary evidence to show how this standard will be met.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide documentary evidence to show that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all radiotherapy placements.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider ensured that there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all radiotherapy placements. Curriculum Vitae had been supplied for each of the clinical tutors at each practice placement. However, the visitors could not judge how the education provider met this standard in relation to other staff involved in the delivery of this programme at the placements, particularly the clinical assessors. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that education provider had in place adequate systems to ensure that there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at each practice placement. Therefore, the visitors requested that the education provider provides documentary evidence to show how this standard will be met.

#### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide documentary evidence to show that all practice placement educators have undertaken appropriate training.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider ensured that staff involved in the delivery of the programme at all practice placements had undertaken appropriate training. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that education provider had in place adequate systems to ensure that staff at practice placements were appropriately trained and would undertake refresher training as appropriate. Therefore, the visitors requested that the education provider provides documentary evidence to show how this standard will be met.

#### **6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit a number of module descriptors and the programme specifications to ensure that the learning outcomes on the modules match the assessment methods.

**Reason:** The education provider had submitted as part of the programme documentation a number of module descriptors that dealt with the application of radiotherapy theory into practice. The visitors judged that a number of the module descriptors detailed assessment methods which would assess the application of theory in clinical practice but this was not detailed in the learning outcomes for the modules. Therefore the visitors requested that the education provider revise the following module descriptors to ensure that a learning outcome in relation to the application of theory to clinical practice is added to the existing module learning outcomes: Clinical Radiotherapy: theory to practice, RADT 701, 702 and 705; Integrated Professional Practice Studies module, RADT 707.

#### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the course documentation and clarify either that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme are HPC registered, or if external examiners are yet to be appointed to the programme, to include a statement on how this standard will be met.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors judged that it was not clear whether external examiners had been appointed to the programme and, if so, whether this standard had been met. The documentation submitted also made no reference as to how the appointment of external examiners would contain at least one external examiner who was HPC registered, or what other arrangements would be agreed. Therefore, the visitors requested that the education provider submit revised documentation to show how this standard would be met.

## Recommendations

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider how to gain students' consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching sessions in a more informed way.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider contained an appropriate consent form which students' were required to sign prior to participation in a practical clinical simulation sessions. From discussions with the students on the existing BSc Radiotherapy programme and subsequently with the programme team, it emerged that students signed the consent form at the start of their studies, as part of the general induction programme, but the students had little or no recollection of doing this or the implications. Though the actual number of practical sessions where students would be required to act as service users was small, the visitors recommend that the programme team should consider gaining students' consent at appropriate points during the programme where such teaching occurs.

### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and all relevant student documentation and ensure that they are revised to contain reference to the most up to date HPC guidance, particularly the new guidance on conduct and ethics for students, and that students are made aware and referred to the new student area of the HPC website as appropriate.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were confident that the education provider had put in a place a process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and the programme would meet this standard. However, the documentation submitted by the education provider did not reference the latest HPC guidance and no provision had been made to direct students to the new student area of the HPC website. Therefore, the visitors requested that the programme documentation and all relevant student documentation be updated to reflect this.

Russell Hart  
Helen Best

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Prosthetists and Orthotists
<b>Date of visit</b>	8 – 9 October 2009

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7
Commendations .....	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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'prosthetist' or 'orthotist' 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 24 November 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 25 November 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 18 December 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 2 February 2010.

## 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, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme although both bodies were represented at the visit. Therefore 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.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist) Dugald MacInnes (Lay Visitor)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	30
Initial approval	12 January 1998
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	20 September 2010
Chair	Debbie Whittaker (University of Salford)
Secretary	Clare Wolstenholme (University of Salford)
Members of the joint panel	Kay Hack (Internal Panel Member) Steve Mottram (British Association of Prosthetists and Orthotists)

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit advertising material, including website material, to demonstrate that current information is supplied to applicants to the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors received advertising material for the existing programme and therefore were unable to determine that applicants are given appropriate information to make an informed choice about whether to join the revised programme. The visitors felt that in order to fully assess whether the programme meets this standard updated advertising material and information provided to applicants must be submitted.

### **6.9 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, so that it is clear that aegrotat awards would not enable students to be eligible to apply to the Register to ensure that this standard is being met.

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner 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. The visitors were happy with the current external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see 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

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors wished to support the planned improvements to the plaster room by the education provider. They also wish to support the planned installation of a CAD/CAM suite.

**Reason:** From discussions with the education provider it was clear that there were plans in place to enhance some of the practical facilities on the programme. The visitors wished to support the improvement of the plaster room as a resource to further enhance the student learning experience. The visitors also noted that this facility was appropriate for the current number of students, and would recommend that if the education provider planned to increase student numbers in the future that this facility is reassessed to ensure it continued to be appropriate to student learning.

### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider references the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the programme documentation.

**Reason:** It was evidenced that HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were both taught and assessed in the programme curriculum. The visitors felt that specific references should be made to this publication throughout the programme documentation in order to enhance the student access to this material.

### **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors wished to support the continued work by the education provider to expand the range of placements on offer to students within the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the work done so far by the education provider in identifying different placement areas in order to provide students with a wider range of experience and access to emerging placements. The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider continues in their efforts to pursue a variety of placement settings to provide students with a greater range of placement experiences.

## Commendations

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

**Commendation:** The visitors wished to commend the education provider for the level of consultation of relevant stakeholders in redesigning the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors felt that the level and nature of consultation that the education provider entered into so far in advance of the planned date to implement changes to the programme, demonstrated a best practice level of appraisal that the visitors had not seen on the same scale at other institutions. The process behind the programme review was rigorous, involved a broad range of stakeholders and ensured that a comprehensive consultation was obtained and the detail fed into the redesign of the programme.

Elaine McCurrach  
Dugald MacInnes