

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Tavistock & Portman NHS Foundation Trust
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Essex
Programme name	Doctorate in Child, Community and Educational Psychology (D.Ch.Ed.Psych.)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	13 -14 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Educational psychologist' 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 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 1 June 2010. 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 7 July 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. 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	Judi Bamford (Educational Psychologist) Claire Brewis (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	10
Initial approval	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Carolyn Cousin (Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust)
Secretary	Louis Taussig (Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust)
Members of the joint panel	John Franey (British Psychological Society) Peter Lloyd-Bennett (British Psychological Society) Nick Durbin (British Psychological Society) Julia Hardy (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society)

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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 56 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 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.

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 the advertising material on the website to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The website information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the website to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

Judi Bamford
Claire Brewis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Drama therapy
Date of visit	11 – 12 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Art therapist' or 'Dramatherapist' 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 22 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 9 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

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	Dianne Gammage (Drama therapist) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Robin Jennings (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Richard Monk (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Andy Stevens (Internal Panel Member) Jon Svensson (Internal Panel Member) Madeline Andersen-Warren (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 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"/>
Practice Placement Handbook for MA Music Therapy Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Handbook for MA Music Therapy Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years for MA Music Therapy Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the Practice Placement Handbook prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. The document will be based on the existing MA Music Therapy Practice Placement Handbook. The final document will not be produced until after the education provider has completed the internal validation process.

The HPC did not review the Student Handbook prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. The document will be based on the existing MA Music Therapy Student Handbook. The document will not be produced until after the education provider has completed the internal validation process.

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 BA (Hons) Drama, MA Music Therapy and PhD Music Therapy 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 51 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

3.5 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 clear information on the named pathway leader for this programme.

Reason: The named person who has professional responsibility for this programme as required by the HPC has already been named, the visitors are satisfied that this person is appropriately qualified and experienced and is on the relevant part of the register. This programme leader in liaison with a pathway leader will have day to day responsibility for the programme. At the time of the visit, recruitment for the pathway leader position had not taken place. The notice for advertising the post was due to go out but had not done so. The visitors require the education provider to submit information (such as the curriculum vitae or other information on qualifications and experience) about the pathway leader for this programme to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit programme specific documentation that accurately reflects the HPC's position regarding mandatory attendance requirements of the programme as specified in the handbook.

Reason: Some of the documentation provided prior to the visit was for an existing MA Music Therapy programme already running. This documentation had incorrect information in the Student handbook in that it stated "The Health Professions Council, The Association of Professional Music Therapists and the University require that all music therapy students are involved in individual personal therapy whilst training" (Page 54 and 55). The HPC does not make this requirement for students and this therefore gives students incorrect information. The visitors therefore require the education provider submit programme specific documentation that does not make this statement for students in this important resource.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit programme specific documentation that includes information that clearly articulates the meaning of "personal therapy" and includes associated information.

Reason: Some documentation provided prior to the visit was for an existing MA Music Therapy programme already running. The documentation provided to students is a valuable resource of information for the students to use throughout the programme. The documentation made mention of personal therapy that students must undertake which did not explain in detail what this entailed or other associated information. The visitors considered information such as what the personal therapy entails, when and where it takes place in the programme, if and

when it is compulsory, what the education provider will contribute and any associated costs, to be important for students when considering all aspects of the programme. For greater clarity, the visitors therefore require the education provider to submit programme specific documentation which includes information such as the above to clearly articulate the meaning of “personal therapy” and associated information.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must submit programme specific documentation that clearly articulates the procedures for communication, lines of responsibility and descriptions of the roles of all persons involved in the supervision and placement experience for students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators.

Reason: Some of the documentation provided prior to the visit was for an existing MA Music Therapy programme already running. Within this documentation it was unclear who would hold clinical responsibility for students under supervision bearing in mind there could be several different types of supervision occurring (at the placement, at the education provider and externally outside of placements or education provider). Discussions with the students and practice placement educators highlighted the procedures were not fully communicated causing confusions with the issue of clinical responsibility for clients/patients. During discussions, the education provider highlighted a placement contract between the supervisor, student and education provider. The differing roles held at the placements and by the supervisors caused further confusion as to who was supposed to sign the contract and take on clinical responsibility for patient-related work undertaken by the student (roles such as the placement managers, placement supervisors, external supervisors, personal tutors and the pathway leader). The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit programme specific documentation that clearly articulates the procedures for communication, lines of responsibility and descriptions of the roles of all persons involved in the supervision and placement experience of the students.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must submit programme specific documentation that includes information regarding their exit award policy.

Reason: Some of the documentation provided prior to the visit was for an existing MA Music Therapy programme already running. This documentation had no clear mention of any exit award policies. Upon further discussions at the visit it became clear that the education provider did not intend to use exit awards for this programme, they intended to present those who did not complete all aspects of the programme with a certificate of credits. This information should be communicated to students. For clarity for the students the visitors require programme specific documentation to be submitted that clearly includes this information.

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 submit programme specific documentation that includes information regarding their aegrotat award policy.

Reason: Some of the documentation provided prior to the visit was for an existing MA Music Therapy programme already running. This documentation had no clear mention of any aegrotat award policies. Upon further discussions at the visit it became clear that the education provider did not intend to use aegrotat awards for this programme. This information should be communicated to students. For clarity for the students the visitors require programme specific documentation to be submitted that clearly includes this information.

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 submit programme specific documentation to clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register or propose alternative arrangements with the HPC.

Reason: Some of the documentation provided prior to the visit was for an existing MA Music Therapy programme already running. In this documentation there was insufficient detail regarding the appointment requirements for external examiners. Discussions at the visit clarified that the planned external examiner for this programme would be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors were satisfied with this information but for clarity require the education provider to submit the programme specific documentation to include clear reference to this standard of education and training.

Recommendations

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend the education provider continually review how admissions procedures for this programme apply selection and entry criteria including a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit detailed the admissions procedures selection and entry criteria for this programme including a good command of reading, writing and spoken English. The discussions at the visit with the programme team highlighted they anticipated a significant number of overseas applicants to the programme. Discussions with students from other similar programmes running highlighted that English language support was available for students. In light of the potentially high number of applicants who do not have English as their first language the visitors recommend the education provider keep the selection and entry criteria and the English language support for this programme under review.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend the education provider continually review the IT facilities on campus and consider highlighting more prominently the IT facilities available to students within the faculty building.

Reason: Discussions with the students at the visit indicated they found the number of computers held at the library for personal study insufficient for the number of students and this limited the amount of access they had. Discussions with the programme team indicated there were other rooms in the faculty building dedicated for computers which students could use for personal study whenever they wished. The visitors wish to recommend the education provider continually review the access to existing IT facilities on campus and consider highlighting more prominently the IT facilities available to students within the faculty building.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend the education provider consider including a mentoring system for students of this programme in both the education and the placement setting.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit was for an existing MA Music Therapy programme already running. In this documentation and confirmed at the visit there was a system in place for mentoring students within the education setting. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme team were thinking of running this again for this new programme and also of extending this to the placement setting too. The visitors noted that in the education setting this

would be considered good practice in academic and pastoral support and would positively encourage the education provider to consider extending this mentoring to include the placement setting also.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend the education provider continually review the application of the interprofessional learning aspects of the programme.

Reason: The introduction of this new programme is to be taught alongside an already existing MA Music Therapy programme with four of the five modules to be taught interprofessionally with the existing programme. The visitors were satisfied the taught content as described in the module descriptors will adequately address the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group. In light of the long standing existing MA Music Therapy programme the visitors wish to recommend the education provider continually review the interprofessional taught aspects of the programme. Reviewing the interprofessional teaching will help the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group to be equally taught whilst the newer programme becomes more established. Continually reviewing will also help both professions to maintain the equal level as they continue to be taught in the future.

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 wish to recommend the education provider consider using the model of the community based clinic as managed in the existing MA Music Therapy programme.

Reason: During the visit the visitors were shown the community based clinic located on the campus which could be used by students from the already existing MA Music Therapy programme as a placement experience. Discussions with the programme team indicated they were keen to introduce this to the new programme either as a separate drama therapy clinic or as a combined music and drama therapy clinic. The visitors were impressed by the clinic being open to the local community, giving the opportunity for access to this type of service which they otherwise would not have had. They felt the clinic also served to bring the community into the programme benefiting the service users, the students, the education provider and the local community as a whole. The visitors wish to recommend the education provider continue with its deliberations on how to introduce this clinic to this new programme as a placement and support the education providers endeavour to run the clinic on site at the campus.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend the education provider consider reviewing the role of the external examiner in assessment and

highlighting more prominently the roles of the external examiner in the programme documentation.

Reason: The module descriptors provided at the visit indicated there was to be an assessment carried out by the external examiner (MDF – AF460001D Clinical Placements & Experiential Development (1)). Discussions at the visit indicated that this statement was incorrect and the external examiner would be assessing alongside a team member. From reading the documents the visitors were concerned the moderating role of the examiner would be conflicting with the assessment role. The visitors recommend the education provider explain more clearly within the documentation the roles of the external examiner to avoid confusion. The visitors also recommend the education provider review their use of external examiners in assessment to avoid any potential conflicts of interest that the current use may incur.

Dianne Gammage
Simon Willoughby-Booth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bristol
Programme name	Doctorate of Educational Psychology (D.Ed.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	21 – 22 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Educational psychologist' 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 15 June 2010 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 07 July 2010. 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 31 August 2010. 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 21 October 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. 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	Angela Duxbury (Radiotherapist) Judith Bamford (Practitioner Psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	12
Chair	Jan Noyles (University of Bristol)
Secretary	Naomi Williams (University of Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Rendall (British Psychological Society) Charan Peter Hobbs (British Psychological Society) Simon Gibbs (British Psychological Society) Kath Fingleton (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society)

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"/>
Pre Course details and pre-course selected reading	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Annual programme review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Business plan and financial information (2009/2010)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dissertation handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
End of year evaluations	<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 49 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

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that a clear trainee declaration procedure is in place for criminal conviction checks, supported by a clear procedure to manage and document the process. The education provider must also ensure that applicants are clearly aware of the requirement to undertake a criminal conviction check during the admissions procedure.

Reason: From a review of the advertising material the visitors noted that the requirement to undertake a criminal conviction check is not clearly outlined. From a review of the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team and trainees it was also clear that no formal procedure was in place to ensure that trainees were made aware of the requirement to continually disclose criminal convictions throughout the duration of the programme. The visitors also noted that the education provider did not have a mechanism in place to record any such disclosure or formal procedure in place to deal with an applicant or trainee who declares a criminal conviction. The visitors require the education provider to inform trainees about the policy and their right to confidentiality. The visitors also require the education provider to make it clear within the advertising material that a criminal conviction check is a pre-requisite of entry on to the programme. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure that this standard is met.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms are clearly explained and articulated to applicants and trainees.

Reason: From the documentation provided and from discussions with the programme team the visitors could not determine the mechanisms that were in place to inform applicants and trainees of the inclusion mechanisms that the education provider has in place, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning. The visitors could see no evidence of a policy and procedure for agreeing and awarding credits, no indication of how much prior experience and learning the education provider will accept. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure that this standard is met.

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 ensure that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not find any evidence of a consent procedure in place to mitigate any risk involved in trainees participating as service users. The visitors require further evidence to show the consent policy in place, how the education provider will collect consent and also how they will inform students about this policy and their right to confidentiality.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and clearly articulate the monitoring mechanism used to ensure that practice placement educators receive current training.

Reason: From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team it was not made clear that there were sufficient recording and monitoring mechanisms in place to demonstrate that all new practice placement educators are receiving both initial training and regular refresher training. The visitors require clarification on how the education provider records and monitors the training of new practice placement educators. The visitors also require information on how it is determined if a practice placement educator needs refresher training and how this is articulated to the relevant parties. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation clearly articulate the monitoring mechanism used to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

Reason: From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors could find no evidence that the education provider has mechanisms in place to demonstrate that all practice placement educators are appropriately registered. The visitors require clarification on how the education provider records and monitors the registration status of its practice placement educators. The visitors also require clarification on the process and procedure in place if the education provider chooses to utilise practice placement educators who are not registered with the HPC. The visitors would require details on the mechanism in place to collect information about their experience, qualifications and training relevant to the practice placement. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and clearly articulate the programme assessment regulations, specifying requirements for trainee progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with trainees it was clear that trainees are not informed of the education providers' general assessment regulations and code of practice for research degree programmes.

The programme documentation states that there is no step-off or exit award for the programme. However within the education providers' general assessment regulations reference is made to a masters, postgraduate diploma and postgraduate certificate in research and professional studies in educational psychology. Step-off or exit awards should be named in a way that makes it clear that they do not lead to the person receiving them being eligible to apply for registration. Any step-off or exit award from an approved programme can not reference the protected title.

The visitors require further information to demonstrate how the education provider decides what prevents a student from progressing and the options that are available to a failing student. The visitors also require information outlining the maximum length of study a trainee could undertake to complete the programme and details of the process used to judge the currency of trainee learning if any form of deferment took place. Therefore the visitors require amendments to be made to the programme documentation to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation, including assessment regulations, or other relevant policies and clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to the HPC protected title.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors noted that in the education providers' assessment regulations reference is made to a masters, postgraduate diploma and postgraduate certificate in research and professional studies in educational psychology. Step-off or exit awards should be named in a way that makes it clear that they do not lead to the person receiving them being eligible to apply for registration. Any step-off or exit award from an approved programme can not reference the protected title. The visitors require the protected title to be removed from the step-off or exit awards title. In addition the visitors require a clear statement that outlines that exit awards do not lead to eligibility to register with the HPC. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

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 clearly state within their programme documentation that trainees awarded with an aegrotat award are not eligible to apply for registration for admission to the Register.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could find no evidence of a policy clearly stating that trainees awarded an aegrotat award are not eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. The visitors could also find no evidence to suggest that a mechanism is in place to communicate this

message to trainees. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

Recommendations

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider should consider readdressing the standards of education and training cross-mapping document to give reference to the areas that are mapped within the standard of proficiency cross-mapping document under 1b.1.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the standards of education and training cross-mapping document presented by the education provider has been mapped as not applicable. The visitors also noted through discussion with the programme team that interprofessional learning was addressed as part of the programme. The visitors noted that no reference was made within the standards of education and training cross-mapping to the mapped areas outlined in the standard of proficiency cross-mapping document under 1b.1. The visitors are happy that this standard is being met but recommend that the standards of education and training cross mapping document is amended to reflect the many opportunities that trainees have to experience and reflect on during this programme, to learn from interprofessional working.

Angela Duxbury
Judith Bamford

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme name	Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Ch.Psychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	13 – 14 April 2010

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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Educational psychologist' 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 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 2 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. 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	Trevor Holme (Educational Psychologist) Harry Brick (Clinical Psychologist) Dugald MacInnes (Lay visitor)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort
Initial approval	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Pam Vallely (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Nicola Lord (University of Manchester)
Members of the joint panel	Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society) Graham Pratt (British Psychological Society) Jane Turner (British Psychological Society) Mary Robinson (British Psychological Society) Elaine Smith (British Psychological Society)

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 38 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 19 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 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 review the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme (including website information) to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, HPC ‘approves’ educational programmes; we do not ‘accredit’ programmes. 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’ and that anyone who wishes to practise using the title ‘Educational Psychologist’ or ‘Practitioner psychologist’ must be on the HPC register.

In addition, the HPC does not revisit programmes every three years; instead programmes once approved are awarded open-ended approval. Finally, in order for applicants to be fully aware of the requirement to successfully complete the full programme and be aware that there are no exit awards from this programme this information should be clearly stated in the programme documentation.

In order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion for students on the programme the programme documentation must be amended.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the health requirements for the programme are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the health requirements were for the programme and how applicants would be informed of these requirements. The visitors could also not fully determine the policy in place and the process for dealing with information regarding health once declared. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the health requirements, the policy on health on admissions and the process for ensuring that all reasonable steps are taken to keep to any health requirements in order to ensure that this standard is met.

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the equality and diversity policies and monitoring processes of these policies are clear.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine the exact equality and diversity policy that was in place for the programme. The policy provided was the 'Positive Equality and Diversity Policy' that was dated from 2005 to 2010, and it was not clear if this policy would continue to be applicable after this time. The visitors were also not clear of the exact process in place for collecting information on the application of the policy and for regularly monitoring the effect of the policy. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure this standard is being met.

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 evidence to show how the education provider ensures that resources at practice placements will effectively support student learning.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that the resources are in place to support student learning in all practice placement settings. From discussions with the students there appeared to be disparity in the resources that were available on placements in year one of the programme, with reports of no access to IT facilities in some cases. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates how the programme team ensures parity of facilities on placements around accessing learning resources including workspace and IT equipment.

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 provide the policy on student consent and demonstrate how they ensure that the participation required in the programme and the protocols used to gain consent for this participation are clearly articulated to students.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the policy for obtaining student consent for participation in programme activities was unclear. Following discussions with the programme team it was apparent that students would be expected to participate in practising techniques, group (such as experiential groups), role play and counselling activities in the programme. Following further discussions with the programme team it was apparent that a protocol to cover this matter was currently in development. The visitors need to receive further evidence in the form of a consent policy, the method of obtaining consent (such as a consent form), and details of how students are informed of the participation requirements in the programme to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is a process in place for dealing with profession-related conduct in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine the exact process for dealing with concerns about profession-related conduct throughout all aspects of the programme. The visitors require clarification of the process that is in place for dealing with student conduct, the guidance outlining this process and the possible outcomes from these actions. The visitors also require further evidence that outlines the ways in which this information will be communicated to students and placement providers.

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 documentation which clearly articulates how the learning outcomes of the programme are linked with the HPC standards of proficiency to demonstrate how students who successfully complete the programme meet these standards.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was not clear that the learning outcomes demonstrated that the HPC standards of proficiency were being met in the programme, and how this information was clearly communicated to students, practice placement educators and the education provider. Within the programme documentation learning outcomes had been linked to the British Psychological Society learning outcomes but HPC requirements were not specified. Therefore it was not clear to all parties involved in the programme that meeting the HPC standards of proficiency was a requirement for successful completion of the

programme. Furthermore, from discussion with students at the visit, it was clear that they were not familiar with the HPC standards of proficiency and the requirement to meet these in the profession. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met explicitly through the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to include reference to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and provide evidence of how these are taught throughout the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted there were no references to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics. It was clarified that there was one session in the programme that covered the standards; however this was done as a comparison exercise with the British Psychological Society Codes of conduct. In addition, there were instances in the documentation where references were made to the codes of conduct of the British Psychological Society and the education provider, but not to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught throughout the programme to ensure that students understand the standards and when they apply. Furthermore, the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics should be referenced where applicable to conduct and ethics matters in the programme in order to direct students to the standards that HPC expects of them once they have joined the profession.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates how they ensure all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit it was not clear how the education provider ensured that students were consistently prepared for placement experience in the programme. There was an indication that inductions were carried out on placements to provide the students with relevant information, however, from discussions with the students it was apparent that these did not always provide information regarding the policies and procedures in place to ensure student safety. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the process in place to ensure that there is a consistent standard of induction across all placements so that students understand the safety policies and procedures at each placement setting.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors could not determine how the education provider approves and monitors all practice placements. In discussions with the programme team it was clear that there were some methods in place to initially approve and monitor placements. In order to ensure that this standard is met the visitors require that the education provider provides documentary evidence to formalise the policies and processes for approving placements and details of the systems for ongoing monitoring of placement providers. This evidence should include the education providers' minimum placement criteria for all placement environments (including minimum resources required) and the process for dealing with placement providers if difficulties arise on placement.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show how they ensure all practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and that students know how to access these.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit it was not clear how the education provider ensures that relevant equality and diversity policies are in place at all practice placements. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the process in place to ensure that this requirement is met by all placements, that students understand how to access these policies and what to do if they experience discrimination.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training before they supervise students on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit there was differing information conveyed regarding the timing requirements for the training of placement educators. The visitors were concerned that the Fieldwork Learning Agreement stated that practice educators should attend training within twelve months of a student commencing the placement. Therefore the visitors require revised documentation to clearly articulate the training requirement for the practice placement educators on the programme. The visitors require this information to ensure the practice placement educators are appropriately trained for taking students on this programme in order to ensure parity of experience for students and equality of assessments in placements.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The education provider must submit documentation which clearly articulates how the learning outcomes of the programme are linked with the HPC standards of proficiency, and demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are fully prepared on the requirements of the placements in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors noted that it was not clear that the learning outcomes demonstrated that the HPC standards of proficiency were being met in the programme, and therefore did not clearly communicate these requirements to students, practice placement educators and the education provider. It was also difficult to determine how all parties involved with placements were provided with information about the assessment procedures on placements, including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure to progress and expectations of professional conduct on placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit documentation which clearly articulates how the learning outcomes assessed on the programme are linked with the HPC standards of proficiency to demonstrate how students who successfully complete the programme meet these standards.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was not always clear how the learning outcomes assessed demonstrated that the HPC standards of proficiency were being met in the programme, and how this information was clearly communicated to students, practice placement educators and the education provider. Within the programme documentation learning outcomes had been linked to the British Psychological Society learning outcomes but HPC requirements were not specified. Therefore it was not clear to all parties involved in the programme that meeting the HPC standards of proficiency was a requirement for successful completion of the programme. Furthermore, from discussion with students at the visit, it was clear that they were not familiar with the HPC standards of proficiency and the requirement to meet these in the profession. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met explicitly through all programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit documentation which clearly articulates how professional aspects of practice are met in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit it was not always clear how professional aspects of practice were integral to the programme and in particular how it is ensured that students understand the nature of professional regulation and the responsibilities this involves. This was mainly due to the lack of clarity that the learning outcomes assessed demonstrated that the HPC standards of proficiency were being met in the programme, and how this information was clearly communicated to students. Therefore it was not clear to all parties involved in the programme that meeting the HPC standards of proficiency was a requirement for successful completion of the programme. Furthermore, from discussions with students at the visit, it was clear that they were not familiar with the HPC standards of proficiency and the requirement to meet these in the profession. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met explicitly through all programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the requirements for student progression and achievement on the programme, and demonstrate how this information is clearly communicated to the students.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitors could not fully determine the assessment regulations for the programme regarding progression and achievement. The visitors require further evidence that clarifies the policy in place and demonstrates how this information is clearly communicated to the students, practice placement educators and the education provider. This information should also clarify the options available with regards to a failing student on the programme.

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 the policy on aegrotat awards, and demonstrate how this information is clearly communicated to the students.

Reason: From the documentation provided 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 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. The visitors were happy with the 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

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider considers providing greater accessibility to the support facilities provided for students on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit it was clear that there was information and provision in place to support student welfare and wellbeing. At the visit some of the students reported difficulties on occasion in accessing the medical and counselling services in place due to the hours that these were available. The visitors therefore wish to recommend that the education provider explores options for providing greater flexibility in accessing the support facilities for students on this programme. Students could also be made more aware of when and where these facilities were available.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider considers further communication and signposting of information on the student complaints process.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit it was clear that there was a student complaints process. At the visit the programme team explained that this information was conveyed to the students but from discussions with the students there were some indications of them not being aware of the process or where to access this information. The visitors therefore wish to recommend that the education provider considers further communication and signposting of information on the student complaints process.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider considers further communication and signposting of information on the right of appeal process.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit it was clear that there was a right of appeal process. At the visit the programme team explained that this information was conveyed to the students but from discussions with the students there were some indications of them not being aware of the process or where to access this information. The visitors therefore wish to recommend that the education provider considers further communication and signposting of information on the right of appeal process.

Trevor Holme
Harry Brick
Dugald MacInnes

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	MSc Art Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time and Part Time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Art therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Art therapy
Date of visit	20 - 21 April 2010

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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Art Therapist' or 'Art Psychotherapist' 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 15 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 24 June 2010. 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 26 August 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 part of a joint event. The education provider and reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Art Psychotherapy (International) and MSc Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins). 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. 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. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Sue Strand (Art Therapist) Margaret Foster (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	30
Initial approval	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Michael Stewart (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Gordon Campbell (Internal Panel Member) Mairghread Ellis (Internal Panel Member) Maciej Czajka (Internal 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 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 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 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 the programme documentation and any advertising material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology such as ‘...currently eligible to achieve HPC registration’ (Doc. A, p2). They also noted the suggestion that the HPC sets certain expectations on attendance (Doc. D, p17). The HPC sets no such attendance requirements. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure that the applicant has the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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 evidence to demonstrate a commitment to resolving the issues around the suitability of the rooms in which the programme is delivered.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation that there are historical and ongoing issues surrounding the suitability of teaching facilities for the programme. These issues were further highlighted on the tour of facilities as well as in discussions with the students, programme team and senior staff. This demonstrated that the studio facilities needed additional work to ensure they effectively supported the learning and teaching activities of the programme. While the education provider recognises that these issues need to be resolved the visitors were unable to identify tangible written plans for this work to go forward. The visitors therefore require a written statement and an indicative timetable of work to demonstrate the education providers’ commitment to address these issues as soon as is practicably possible to ensure that these resources support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register or to propose alternative arrangements.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the documentation provided there was insufficient detail regarding the appointment requirements for external examiners. The visitors were satisfied with the assessment regulations and current external examiner. However they require evidence that the HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners for the programme have been included in the programme documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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 including the HPC guidance on conduct, performance and ethics for students in module bibliographies as well as reviewing documentation to cite it fully to avoid any possible confusion.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the documentation and in discussion with students that the students did understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This was particularly in evidence in the placement modules. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However they recommend that the programme team review the current bibliographies for other taught modules to include the HPC's guidance on standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also recommend that instances where the guidance is referred to in the documentation should use the full title of the HPC's 'Guidance on standards of conduct, performance and ethics' to avoid any possible confusion for students. This would also further embed the standards in learning throughout the curriculum.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the training and support given to non-HPC registered practice placement educators and consider providing additional support and training where necessary

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the students, practice placement providers and programme team that there were some practice placement educators who had not undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training and were not HPC registered practitioners. They also noted that the education provider undertakes regular training days at the University and at various practice locations. They acknowledge the difficulties in acquiring practice placement educators due to the practical difficulties involved in providing a service such as this in this location and the mitigation of this by the support provided by the programme team. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the standard is met. However, to maintain consistency across practice placements the visitors felt that the efforts to train practice placement educators, particularly non-HPC registered practice placement educators, should be monitored and additional support provided where necessary. This would be to ensure that all students continue to achieve their learning outcomes from practice placements especially those placed with non-HPC registered or non traditional practice placement educators.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the progression regulations for students to identify if the generic education provider regulations would be more suitable than those clearly specified in the documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted that on page p 68 (Programme document 2010) of the regulations for re-assessment and progression are clearly stated. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However in discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the regulation in paragraph 10.10.6 may not best suit the students undertaking the programme due to the module structure. It was recommended by faculty staff that this regulation be reviewed and brought in line with the education provider wide regulations. If this occurs the visitors recommend that the documentation is updated straight away to avoid confusion for students and ensure that the programme would continue to meet this standard.

Sue Strand
Margaret Foster

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	MSc Art Psychotherapy (International)
Mode of delivery	Full time and Part Time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Art therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Art therapy
Date of visit	20 - 21 April 2010

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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Art Therapist' or 'Art Psychotherapist' 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 15 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 24 June 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

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 reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Art Therapy and MSc Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins). 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. 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. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Sue Strand (Art Therapist) Margaret Foster (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	30
Initial approval	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Michael Stewart (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Gordon Campbell (Internal Panel Member) Mairghread Ellis (Internal Panel Member) Maciej Czajka (Internal 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 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 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 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 the programme documentation and any advertising material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology such as ‘...currently eligible to achieve HPC registration’ (Doc. A, p2). They also noted the suggestion that the HPC sets certain expectations on attendance (Doc. D, p17). The HPC sets no such attendance requirements. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure that the applicant has the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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 evidence to demonstrate a commitment to resolving the issues around the suitability of the rooms in which the programme is delivered.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation that there historical and ongoing issues surrounding the suitability of teaching facilities for the programme. These issues were further highlighted on the tour of facilities as well as in discussions with the students, programme team and senior staff. This demonstrated that the studio facilities needed additional work to ensure they effectively supported the learning and teaching activities of the programme. While the education provider recognises that these issues need to be resolved the visitors were unable to identify tangible written plans for this work to go forward. The visitors therefore require a written statement and an indicative timetable of work to demonstrate the education providers’ commitment to address these issues as soon as is practicably possible to ensure that these resources support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register or to propose alternative arrangements.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the documentation provided there was insufficient detail regarding the appointment requirements for external examiners. The visitors were satisfied with the assessment regulations and current external examiner. However they require evidence that the HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners for the programme have been included in the programme documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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 including the HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students in module bibliographies as well as reviewing documentation to cite it fully to avoid any possible confusion.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the documentation and in discussion with students that the students did understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This was particularly in evidence in the placement modules. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However they recommend that the programme team review the current bibliographies for other university based modules to include the HPC's guidance on standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also recommend that instances where the guidance referred to in the documentation should use the full title of the guidance on standards of conduct, performance and ethics to avoid any possible confusion for students. This would also further embed the standards in learning throughout the curriculum.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the training and support given to non-HPC registered practice placement educators and consider providing additional support and training where necessary

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the students, practice placement providers and programme team that there were some practice placement educators who had not undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training and were not HPC registered practitioners. They also noted that the education provider undertakes regular training days at the University and at various practice locations and acknowledge the difficulties in acquiring practice placement educators due to the practical difficulties involved in providing a service such as this in this location. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the standard is met. However, to maintain consistency across practice placements the visitors felt that the efforts to train practice placement educators, particularly non-HPC registered practice placement educators should be monitored and additional support provided where necessary. This would be to ensure that all students continue to achieve their learning outcomes from practice placements especially those placed with non-HPC registered or non traditional practice placement educators.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the progression regulations for students to identify if the generic education provider regulations would be more suitable than those clearly specified in the documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted that on page p68 (programme document 2010) of the regulations for re-assessment and progression are clearly stated. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However in discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the regulation in paragraph 10.10.6 may not best suit the students undertaking the programme due to the module structure. It was recommended by faculty staff that this regulation be reviewed and brought in line with the education provider wide regulations. If this occurs the visitors recommend that the documentation is updated straight away to avoid confusion for students and that the programme would continue to meet this standard.

Sue Strand
Margaret Foster

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	MSc Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins)
Mode of delivery	Full time and Part Time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Art therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Music therapy
Date of visit	20 - 21 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8
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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Music 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 15 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 1 July 2010. 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 26 August 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 part of a joint event. The education provider and reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Art Therapy and MSc Art Psychotherapy (International). 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. 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. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Jennifer French (Music Therapist) Margaret Foster (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Michael Stewart (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Gordon Campbell (Internal Panel Member) Mairghread Ellis (Internal Panel Member) Maciej Czajka (Internal 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 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 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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide an indication of the specialist expertise and knowledge provided by visiting lecturers for the 'music therapy studies' module.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussions with the programme team that a number of visiting lecturers (VLs) were responsible for delivering key aspects of the 'music therapy studies' module. This module has been revised and now contains a great deal of taught material which relates directly to several of the standards of proficiency for Arts therapists. While the learning outcomes of the module are well articulated there was no indication in the documentation of which professions the visiting lecturers were from. The professional background of the VLs determines their specialist expertise and knowledge and subsequently impacts on the students' learning and how they may meet the standards of proficiency for Arts therapists. The visitors therefore require an indicative list of visiting lecturers and their professional background. This will allow the visitors to be confident that the staff delivering the module have a sufficient range of expertise and knowledge and those students who successfully complete the module can meet the relevant Standards of Proficiencies (SOPs).

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 demonstrate that the learning outcomes of the 'music therapy studies' and placement modules are adequately described and delivered to demonstrate that students successfully completing these modules have met the relevant standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussions with the programme team that a number of visiting lecturers were responsible for delivering key aspects of the 'music therapy studies' module. The visitors agreed that the learning outcomes of this module allow students who successfully complete it to meet several standards of proficiency including SOP 3a.1 specifically regarding Sub points 6 (understand core processes in therapeutic practice, etc) and 12 (know about normal human development, normal and abnormal psychology, etc). The visitors stated that, as in SET 3.6, the professional background of the visiting lecturers determines their specialist expertise and knowledge and subsequently how the learning outcomes are met. The visitors also noted that the delivery and learning outcomes relevant to SOPs 1b.1, 1b.2 and 1b.4 are not clearly articulated in the module descriptors for placement and supervision (and/or elsewhere). The visitors therefore require documentation to allow the visitors to determine if the staff delivering the 'music therapy studies' module can ensure that the learning outcomes are met and that the learning outcomes relevant to SOPs 1b.1, 1b.2 and 1b.3 are clearly articulated in the relevant module descriptors. This will allow the visitors to be confident that

those students who successfully complete these modules can meet the relevant standards of proficiency for Arts therapists.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the learning outcomes of the 'music therapy studies' module and the learning outcomes relevant to SoPs 1b1, 1b2 and 1b4 are adequately assessed within the placement and supervision module (and/or elsewhere) to demonstrate that students successfully completing these modules have met the relevant standards of proficiency,

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with students and the programme team that while the learning outcomes of the 'music therapy studies module' were sufficient for those successfully completing the module to meet the relevant SOPs for art therapists. They also noted that the assessment strategy would also allow students to meet the learning outcomes if it was delivered correctly. However the delivery of a great deal of the module by visiting lecturers has affected SET 3.6, 4.1 as well as SOP 1b.1, 1b.2 and 3a.1 as outlined above. The visitors also state that the methodology employed to adequately assess the learning outcomes is dependent on the professional background of the visiting lecturers and their specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors also noted that the methodology for assessing learning outcomes with regard to SoPs 1b1, 1b2 and 1b4 are not clearly evidenced in the placement assessments (and/or elsewhere). The visitors therefore require information such as an indicative list of visiting lecturers and their professional background and clear learning outcomes articulated in relevant module descriptors. This will allow the visitors to determine if the visiting lecturers delivering key components of the 'music therapy studies' module can ensure that students are adequately assessed and that the learning outcomes relevant to SoPs 1b.1, 1b.2 and 1b.3 are clearly assessed in the relevant modules. This will allow the visitors to be confident that those students who successfully complete these modules can meet the relevant standards of proficiency for Arts therapists.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including in advertising material and pre interview information clear guidance on the minimum standard of proficiency expected on an harmonic instrument and how applicants utilising non harmonic instruments can provide evidence of their musical skill at interview.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussion with the programme team that the admissions procedures, specifically the interview process, gives both the applicants and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. However the visitors noted that the process emphasised the use of harmonic instruments at interview and very little was mentioned about the use of non-harmonic instruments. The visitors stated that this emphasis on demonstrating skill in the use of harmonic instruments could discourage some students from applying and also could affect the demographics from which students are recruited. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revise the information provided to applicants to clarify the process for those who wish to demonstrate music aptitude in non harmonic instruments at interview, and to make explicit the minimum expectation of proficiency in an harmonic instrument.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider not including practice placement modules in those that can be included in any accreditation of prior experiential learning.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussion with the programme team that there is a mechanism to include accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL). Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However they did note that students when being granted APEL could be accredited for practice placement modules and therefore miss going on some practice placements. They felt that this could impact on a student's ability to meet the relevant SoPs delivered by those modules. Therefore they recommend that when a student is granted APEL that they do not receive accreditation in lieu of any part of the practice placements throughout the programme.

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 should consider clarifying the process for the immediate withdrawal of a student when there is a case of gross misconduct by including it in the programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussion with students, practice placement providers and the programme team that there is a process in place to deal with students' profession related conduct and specifically gross misconduct. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However this process is not articulated in the programme documentation. This may lead to the process being applied differently in different cases and as such leaving the programme team open to appeals. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team include the process for dealing with student misconduct in the documentation to provide clear information for practice placement providers and students.

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 including the HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students in module bibliographies as well as reviewing documentation to cite it fully to avoid any possible confusion.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the documentation and in discussion with students that the students did understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This was particularly in evidence in the placement modules. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However they recommend that the programme team review the current bibliographies for other taught modules to include the HPC's guidance on standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also recommend that instances where the guidance is referred to in the documentation should use the full title of the HPC's guidance on standards of conduct, performance and ethics to avoid any possible confusion for students. This would also further embed the standards in learning throughout the curriculum.

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 education provider should consider ways of increasing students' time spent on placement to over one day a week.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussion with students, practice placement providers and the programme team that students are on placement one day a week for several months across the academic year. The placements are undertaken in tandem with teaching at the education provider and as such the visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However the visitors recommend that the time spent on placement could be increased from one day a week. This would allow students more time in a practical environment and also allow students to get a broader, possibly more

concentrated, experience of practice which may involve them in aspects of practice other than therapy.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the training and support given to non-HPC registered practice placement educators and consider providing additional support and training where necessary

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the students, practice placement providers and programme team that there were some practice placement educators who had not undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training and were not HPC registered practitioners. They also noted that the education provider undertakes regular training days at the University and at various practice locations. They acknowledge the difficulties in acquiring practice placement educators due to the practical difficulties involved in providing a service such as this in this location and the mitigation of this by the support provided by the programme team. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the SET is met. However, to maintain consistency across practice placements the visitors felt that the efforts to train practice placement educators, particularly non-HPC registered practice placement educators should be monitored and additional support provided where necessary. This would be to ensure that all students continue to achieve their learning outcomes from practice placements especially those placed with non-HPC registered or non traditional practice placement educators.

Jennifer French
Margaret Foster

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	30 – 31 March 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
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 15 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 28 May 2010 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) 7 July 2010. 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 1 June 2010. 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 7 July 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 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 programme - Pg Dip Occupational Therapy. 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 programme. 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 was 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) Susan Lloyd (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
HPC observer	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	30
Initial approval	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Alan McDonald (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Lucy Clapson (Internal Panel member) Julia Dixon-Philip (Internal Panel Member) Lindesay Irvine (Internal Panel Member) Jane Hislop (Internal Panel Member) Alison Galloway (Internal Panel

	Member) Helen Kelly (Internal Panel Member) Christine Craik (College of Occupational Therapists) Sally Feaver (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"/>
Programme evaluation 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 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 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 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 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 ensure that the level of academic and/or professional entry standards is clearly articulated in the admissions documentation to ensure that the applicant can make an informed choice as to whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that appropriate selection and entry criteria, including academic and/or professional entry standards were applied as part of the admissions procedures. However, in the documentation available to potential applicants, the level of degree and what constituted an appropriate professional qualification was not clearly articulated. The visitors would like to receive clearly articulated documentation that explains the level of degree required for entry to the programme and the appropriate “professional” qualification to ensure that the applicant can make an informed choice as to whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must formalise the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms within the admissions procedures.

Reason: From their reading of the documentation before the visit the visitors were unable to determine whether there was a policy or procedure that encompassed accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and other inclusion mechanisms for the programme. However, during discussions with the students the visitors learnt that if a student had graduated over 12 years ago, they were required to undertake a prerequisite research skills module prior to joining the course. The visitors also heard from the programme team that an informal procedure was in place for admission to the programme. The visitors were concerned that the policies or procedures were not articulated within the admissions procedures and as such the visitors were unable to determine whether the policy ensured that applicants eligible for AP(E)L or another inclusion mechanism would be able to meet the standards of proficiency upon successful completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly identifies the AP(E)L and other inclusion mechanisms for admission to the programme.

Recommendations

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing a strategy to enhance the take-up of staff development opportunities.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the education provider had a good programme of staff development in place and that some members of the programme team were participating in this. However, due to practicalities of programme delivery, not all of the programme team were able to take advantage of these opportunities. The visitors felt that the staff development policy could be enhanced by developing a strategy to allow greater take-up of the staff development policy.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider further enhancement of the delivery of inter-professional learning for the programme.

Reason: The visitors were happy that this standard was met. From the tour and senior and programme team meetings the visitors learnt that inter-professional learning was conducted with the Art Therapy programme. However, the visitors learnt that there were other similar programmes at post graduate level within the school and they would like the education provider to consider further opportunities for inter-professional learning with these programmes to enhance the delivery of inter-professional learning.

Bernadette Waters
Susan Lloyd

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	30 – 31 March 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
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 15 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 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 1 June 2010. 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 7 July 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 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 programme - 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. A separate report exists for the other programme. 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 was 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) Susan Lloyd (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
HPC observer	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	30
Initial approval	September 1999
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Alan McDonald (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Lucy Clapson (Internal Panel member) Julia Dixon-Philip (Internal Panel Member) Lindesay Irvine (Internal Panel Member) Jane Hislop (Internal Panel Member)

	Alison Galloway (Internal Panel Member) Helen Kelly (Internal Panel Member) Christine Craik (College of Occupational Therapists) Sally Feaver (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"/>
Programme evaluation 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 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 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 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 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 ensure that the level of academic and/or professional entry standards is clearly articulated in the admissions documentation to ensure that the applicant can make an informed choice as to whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that appropriate selection and entry criteria, including academic and/or professional entry standards were applied as part of the admissions procedures. However, in the documentation available to potential applicants, the level of degree and what constituted an appropriate professional qualification was not clearly articulated. The visitors would like to receive clearly articulated documentation that explains the level of degree required for entry to the programme and the appropriate “professional” qualification to ensure that the applicant can make an informed choice as to whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must formalise the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms within the admissions procedures.

Reason: From their reading of the documentation before the visit the visitors were unable to determine whether there was a policy or procedure that encompassed accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and other inclusion mechanisms for the programme. However, during discussions with the students the visitors learnt that if a student had graduated over 12 years ago, they were required to undertake a prerequisite research skills module prior to joining the course. The visitors also heard from the programme team that an informal procedure was in place for admission to the programme. The visitors were concerned that the policies or procedures were not articulated within the admissions procedures and as such the visitors were unable to determine whether the policy ensured that applicants eligible for AP(E)L or another inclusion mechanism would be able to meet the standards of proficiency upon successful completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly identifies the AP(E)L and other inclusion mechanisms for admission to the programme.

Recommendations

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing a strategy to enhance the take-up of staff development opportunities.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the education provider had a good programme of staff development in place and that some members of the programme team were participating in this. However, due to practicalities of programme delivery, not all of the programme team were able to take advantage of these opportunities. The visitors felt that the staff development policy could be enhanced by developing a strategy to allow greater take-up of the staff development policy.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider further enhancement of the delivery of inter-professional learning for the programme.

Reason: The visitors were happy that this standard was met. From the tour and senior and programme team meetings the visitors learnt that inter-professional learning was conducted with the Art Therapy programme. However, the visitors learnt that there were other similar programmes at post graduate level within the school and they would like the education provider to consider further opportunities for inter-professional learning with these programmes to enhance the delivery of inter-professional learning.

Bernadette Waters
Susan Lloyd

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Dietitian
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Dietitian' or 'Dietician' 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 23 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 20 September 2010. 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 21 October 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 – curriculum and practice placements. 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. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	June Copeman (Dietitian) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	19
Initial approval	01 April 1996
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	20 September 2010
Chair	Robert Hutchinson (University of Ulster)
Secretary	Grainne Dooher (University of Ulster)

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"/>
Professional practice workbooks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University assessment 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 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 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 programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stated on several occasions that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. All students need to apply to register after they have completed the programme and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The education provider needs to make it clear to applicants and students that completion of the programme means they are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. The visitors also noted on a number of occasions the HPC was referred to as accrediting the programme. The HPC approves programmes and does not offer accreditation. Therefore the visitors require further evidence before this standard can be met.

2.2 The admissions procedure must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team it was apparent that the education provider does not clearly state its IELTS entry requirements to applicants. The education provider must make applicants aware of the fact that, at the end of the programme, all students must have the necessary level of English for the standards of proficiency for their profession. The visitors require the education provider to clearly state that students who complete the programme and wish to be eligible to apply to the register must be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 in the IELTS, with no element below 6.5. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Recommendations

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to ensure that where common modules are used across both undergraduate and postgraduate learning there is clarity to indicate which academic level the learning is being assessed at. The education provider should also consider revisiting the programme documentation to ensure that inconsistencies including typographical errors are corrected.

Reason: The visitors noted that where common modules are used for undergraduate and postgraduate learning the education provider needs to be clear that the level of assessment fulfils the appropriate taxonomy of award. The visitors in particular noted that the definitive course document should reflect the revised programme specifications in terms of the way levels of assessment are communicated.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation and specify that step-off or exit awards do not lead to the person receiving them being eligible to apply for registration.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to the titles of step-off or exit awards were being met. The visitors did however feel that students would benefit from a statement that clearly outlines that the alternative award of BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition would not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC register.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat awards not to provide eligibility for admissions to the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register and ensure consistency throughout the documentation.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard are being met. The visitors did however feel that the aegrotat policy could be more clearly communicated and consistently used within the documentation. The visitors felt that the use of the term aegrotat award was inconsistently used within the documentation.

June Copeman
Maureen Henderson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Dietitian
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Dietitian' or 'Dietician' 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 23 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 20 September 2010. 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 21 October 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 – curriculum and practice placements. 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. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	June Copeman (Dietitian) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	2
Initial approval	01 April 1996
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	20 September 2010
Chair	Robert Hutchinson (University of Ulster)
Secretary	Grainne Dooher (University of Ulster)

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"/>
Professional practice workbooks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University assessment 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 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 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 programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stated on several occasions that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. All students need to apply to register after they have completed the programme and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The education provider needs to make it clear to applicants and students that completion of the programme means they are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. The visitors also noted on a number of occasions the HPC was referred to as accrediting the programme. The HPC approves programmes and does not offer accreditation. Therefore the visitors require further evidence before this standard can be met.

2.2 The admissions procedure must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team it was apparent that the education provider does not clearly state its IELTS entry requirements to applicants. The education provider must make applicants aware of the fact that, at the end of the programme, all students must have the necessary level of English for the standards of proficiency for their profession. The visitors require the education provider to clearly state that students who complete the programme and wish to be eligible to apply to the register must be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 in the IELTS, with no element below 6.5. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Recommendations

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to ensure that where common modules are used across both undergraduate and postgraduate learning there is clarity to indicate which academic level the learning is being assessed at. The education provider should also consider revisiting the programme documentation to ensure that inconsistencies including typographical errors are corrected.

Reason: The visitors noted that where common modules are used for undergraduate and postgraduate learning the education provider needs to be clear that the level of assessment fulfils the appropriate taxonomy of award. The visitors in particular noted that the definitive course document should reflect the revised programme specifications in terms of the way levels of assessment are communicated.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation and specify that step-off or exit awards do not lead to the person receiving them being eligible to apply for registration.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to the titles of step-off or exit awards were being met. The visitors did however feel that students would benefit from a statement that clearly outlines that the alternative award of BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition would not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC register.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat awards not to provide eligibility for admissions to the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register and ensure consistency throughout the documentation.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard are being met. The visitors did however feel that the aegrotat policy could be more clearly communicated and consistently used within the documentation. The visitors felt that the use of the term aegrotat award was inconsistently used within the documentation.

June Copeman
Maureen Henderson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Dietitian
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Dietitian' or 'Dietician' 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 23 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 20 September 2010. 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 21 October 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 – curriculum and practice placements. 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. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	June Copeman (Dietitian) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	2
Initial approval	01 April 1996
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	20 September 2010
Chair	Robert Hutchinson (University of Ulster)
Secretary	Grainne Dooher (University of Ulster)

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"/>
Professional practice workbooks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University assessment 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 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 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 programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stated on several occasions that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. All students need to apply to register after they have completed the programme and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The education provider needs to make it clear to applicants and students that completion of the programme means they are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. The visitors also noted on a number of occasions the HPC was referred to as accrediting the programme. The HPC approves programmes and does not offer accreditation. Therefore the visitors require further evidence before this standard can be met.

2.2 The admissions procedure must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team it was apparent that the education provider does not clearly state its IELTS entry requirements to applicants. The education provider must make applicants aware of the fact that, at the end of the programme, all students must have the necessary level of English for the standards of proficiency for their profession. The visitors require the education provider to clearly state that students who complete the programme and wish to be eligible to apply to the register must be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 in the IELTS, with no element below 6.5. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Recommendations

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to ensure that where common modules are used across both undergraduate and postgraduate learning there is clarity to indicate which academic level the learning is being assessed at. The education provider should also consider revisiting the programme documentation to ensure that inconsistencies including typographical errors are corrected.

Reason: The visitors noted that where common modules are used for undergraduate and postgraduate learning the education provider needs to be clear that the level of assessment fulfils the appropriate taxonomy of award. The visitors in particular noted that the definitive course document should reflect the revised programme specifications in terms of the way levels of assessment are communicated.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation and specify that step-off or exit awards do not lead to the person receiving them being eligible to apply for registration.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to the titles of step-off or exit awards were being met. The visitors did however feel that students would benefit from a statement that clearly outlines that the alternative award of BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition would not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC register.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat awards not to provide eligibility for admissions to the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register and ensure consistency throughout the documentation.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard are being met. The visitors did however feel that the aegrotat policy could be more clearly communicated and consistently used within the documentation. The visitors felt that the use of the term aegrotat award was inconsistently used within the documentation.

June Copeman
Maureen Henderson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wales Institute of Cardiff
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Wales
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	13 – 14 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
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 15 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 9 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 August 2010. 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 16 September 2010.

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 programme – BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science Part Time. 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	Christine Murphy (Biomedical Scientist) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer in attendance	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	20 – 25
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Paul Thomas (University of Wales Institute Cardiff)
Secretary	Anne Cox (University of Wales Institute Cardiff)
Members of the joint panel	Peter Redding (Internal Panel Member) Andy Roberts (Internal Panel Member) Sue Easmon (External Panel Member) Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) Patrick Naughton (Institute of Biomedical Science) Nick Kirk (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"/>

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 49 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 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 programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that it addresses the exact nature of the Applied Biomedical Sciences (ABMS) route and the exact nature of the Biomedical Science (BMS) route. During the admission procedures it must be made clear to applicants the differences between the BMS route and the ABMS route. Applicants and students must also be made aware of which programme of learning they are enrolling on to and the mechanisms and selection criteria for the transfer between the two routes.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted showed a lack of clarity around the BMS route and the ABMS route and the transfer mechanisms between the two. From a review of the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine how applicants were told about the two different routes and the transfer between them. From discussions with the senior management team it was clear that the education provider had previously offered several BMS programmes with separate UCAS codes. It was made clear to the visitors that for the next cohort, all students will enrol onto the BMS route and apply for the ABMS route in year two of the programme. The visitors would therefore like this to be made clear within the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure an applicant has the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for checking the quality of placements. The education provider must also produce guidelines on their placement requirements, articulating what they constitute as a safe and supportive placement environment.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to check and monitor the quality of practice placements and therefore demonstrate that the education provider was responsible for managing the placements in the programme. The visitors noted that the education provider used the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) assessment of laboratories as a measure of placement quality. The visitors could not find any evidence that this process has been audited and in turn could not be sure that the education provider has full ownership of the process. The visitors require further evidence of the placement auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether placements are good quality and provide safe and supportive environments.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation and produce clear policies and procedures to support the approval and monitoring of placements.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors did not have enough evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the approval and monitoring of placements and therefore that the education provider was responsible for the placements in the programme. The visitors noted that the education provider used the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) assessment of laboratories as a measure of placement quality. The visitors could not find any evidence that this process has been audited and in turn could not be sure that the education had full ownership of the process. The visitors require the education provider to produce clear policies and procedures around placements in the programme to ensure that this standard is met.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the way in which they monitor the equality and diversity policies of practice placements. The education provider must also clarify the mechanisms that they use to inform students about access to these policies.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to monitor the equality and diversity policies of its practice placements. The visitors also require evidence that demonstrates how students are informed about accessing the equality and diversity policies on placements and what to do if they feel they have been discriminated against whilst on placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the placement audit and document a clear process for monitoring staff numbers and experience within the placements utilised on the programme. The education provider must also document the criteria by which they judge staff to be appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit and speaking to the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to check and monitor the quality of practice placements and therefore demonstrate that the education provider was responsible for managing the placements in the programme. The visitors require further information to clarify the mechanisms that the education provider uses to

monitor the staff numbers and experience of its practice placements and details of the staff numbers and experience requirements that the education provider sets to ensure that placement staff support student learning in a safe environment.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the placement audit and document a clear process for monitoring knowledge, skills and experience of practice placement educators.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no mechanism in place to check and monitor the knowledge, skills and experience of practice placement educators. The visitors require further information to clarify the mechanisms that the education provider uses to monitor the knowledge, skills and experience of its practice placement educators.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. The education provider must also clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure the practice placement educators training is recorded and monitored.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team and placement providers it was not made clear that sufficient arrangements are in place to prepare practice placement educators to supervise students on the programme. The visitors require clarification of how the education provider ensures the suitability of this training in preparing educators to take students from this programme. The visitors were not given any indication of the content of the clinical educator training and the learning outcomes for this training. The visitors seek reassurance that mechanisms are in place to ensure that all new practice placement educators are trained.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for training portfolio verifiers to assess the standards of proficiency. The education provider must also provide details outlining the organisation of the assessment.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was not clear who would be assessing the practice placement elements and the IBMS portfolio. The visitors require further evidence regarding the assessment of the placement module in the programme including details of the methods of assessments, what is required as part of the placement assessments, the timescales involved and clarification

of the actions taken if the timescales or assessment requirements are not met. The visitors noted that if the education provider were to use IBMS verifiers to assess students on placements, as was indicated at the visit, they would not be assessing the specific learning outcomes for the placement programme. The visitors require evidence of the training that will be provided to verifiers for the requirements of the programme.

The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment methods used ensure that the students are meeting the standards of proficiency and are clearly communicated to all parties involved in the programme to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

Recommendations

3.15 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 introducing mandatory attendance across all elements of teaching within the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that mandatory attendance is required on the programme within practical sessions. At the visit the programme team discussed the success of this but mentioned that some students do not attend lectures that support the practical sessions. The visitors felt that introducing the mandatory provision across all elements of teaching would strengthen the delivery of the programme

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to strongly recommend that the education provider checks that all practice placement educators are HPC registered

Reason: The visitors recommend that the education provider checks the registration status of all placement educators to see if they are on the HPC register as an additional level of security for the education providers' placement management.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the clinical laboratory practice (placement) handbook to ensure that it is applicable to both students and practice placement educators.

Reason: The visitors recommend that the education provider considers revisiting the clinical laboratory practice (placement) handbook to put a greater focus on the clinical laboratory learning outcomes. The visitors considered the document to be very broad in its approach and would recommend signposting students and practice placement educators to specific sections relevant to the module being learnt .

Chris Murphy
Pradeep Agrawal

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wales Institute of Cardiff
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Wales
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	13 – 14 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
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 15 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 09 June 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 August 2010. 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 16 September 2010.

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 programme – BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science Full Time. 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	Christine Murphy (Biomedical Scientist) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer in attendance	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	10
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Paul Thomas (University of Wales Institute Cardiff)
Secretary	Anne Cox (University of Wales Institute Cardiff)
Members of the joint panel	Peter Redding (Internal Panel Member) Andy Roberts (Internal Panel Member) Sue Easmon (External Panel Member) Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) Patrick Naughton (Institute of Biomedical Science) Nick Kirk (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"/>

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 48 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 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 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 programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that it addresses the exact nature of the Applied Biomedical Sciences (ABMS) route and the exact nature of the Biomedical Science (BMS) route. During the admission procedures it must be made clear to applicants the differences between the BMS route and the ABMS route. Applicants and students must also be made aware of which programme of learning they are enrolling on to and the mechanisms and selection criteria for the transfer between the two routes.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted showed a lack of clarity around the BMS route and the ABMS route and the transfer mechanisms between the two. From a review of the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine how applicants were told about the two different routes and the transfer between them. From discussions with the senior management team it was clear that the education provider had previously offered several BMS programmes with separate UCAS codes. It was made clear to the visitors that for the next cohort, all students will enrol onto the BMS route and apply for the ABMS route in year two of the programme. The visitors would therefore like this to be made clear within the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure an applicant has the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for checking the quality of placements. The education provider must also produce guidelines on their placement requirements, articulating what they constitute as a safe and supportive placement environment.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to check and monitor the quality of practice placements and therefore demonstrate that the education provider was responsible for managing the placements in the programme. The visitors noted that the education provider used the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) assessment of laboratories as a measure of placement quality. The visitors could not find any evidence that this process has been audited and in turn could not be sure that the education provider has full ownership of the process. The visitors require further evidence of the placement auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether placements are good quality and provide safe and supportive environments.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation and produce clear policies and procedures to support the approval and monitoring of placements.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors did not have enough evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the approval and monitoring of placements, and therefore that the education provider was responsible for the placements in the programme. The visitors noted that the education provider used the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) assessment of laboratories as a measure of placement quality. The visitors could not find any evidence that this process has been audited and in turn could not be sure that the education had full ownership of the process. The visitors require the education provider to produce clear policies and procedures around placements in the programme to ensure that this standard is met.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the way in which they monitor the equality and diversity policies of practice placements. The education provider must also clarify the mechanisms that they use to inform students about access to these policies.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to monitor the equality and diversity policies of its practice placements. The visitors also require evidence that demonstrates how students are informed about accessing the equality and diversity policies on placements and what to do if they feel they have been discriminated against whilst on placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the placement audit and document a clear process for monitoring staff numbers and experience within the placements utilised on the programme. The education provider must also document the criteria by which they judge staff to be appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit and speaking to the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to check and monitor the quality of practice placements and therefore demonstrate that the education provider was responsible for managing the placements in the programme. The visitors require further information to clarify the mechanisms that the education provider uses to

monitor the staff numbers and experience of its practice placements and details of the staff numbers and experience requirements that the education provider sets to ensure that placement staff support student learning in a safe environment.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the placement audit and document a clear process for monitoring knowledge, skills and experience of practice placement educators.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no mechanism in place to check and monitor the knowledge, skills and experience of practice placement educators. The visitors require further information to clarify the mechanisms that the education provider uses to monitor the knowledge, skills and experience of its practice placement educators.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. The education provider must also clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure the practice placement educators training is recorded and monitored.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team and placement providers it was not made clear that sufficient arrangements are in place to prepare practice placement educators to supervise students on the programme. The visitors require clarification of how the education provider ensures the suitability of this training in preparing educators to take students from this programme. The visitors were not given any indication of the content of the clinical educator training and the learning outcomes for this training. The visitors seek reassurance that mechanisms are in place to ensure that all new practice placement educators are trained.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the content and terminology used is appropriate and relevant to students studying this programme on a part time mode of study.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit it was noted that there are a number of references to part time students going on placement. From discussions with the programme team it was clear that part time students use their own work place to evidence the placement hours. The visitors require the documentation to clarify this and amend the documentation so that there is no ambiguity between part time students and practice placement educators.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for training portfolio verifiers to assess the standards of proficiency. The education provider must also provide details outlining the organisation of this assessment.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was not clear who would be assessing the practice placement elements and the IBMS portfolio. The visitors require further evidence regarding the assessment of the placement module in the programme including details of the methods of assessments, what is required as part of the placement assessments, the timescales involved and clarification of the actions taken if the timescales or assessment requirements are not met. The visitors noted that if the education provider were to use IBMS verifiers to assess students on placements, as was indicated at the visit, they would not be assessing the specific learning outcomes for the placement programme. The visitors require evidence of the training that will be provided to verifiers for the requirements of the programme.

The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment methods used ensure that the students are meeting the standards of proficiency and are clearly communicated to all parties involved in the programme to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

Recommendations

3.15 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 introducing mandatory attendance across all elements of teaching within the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that mandatory attendance is required on the programme within practical sessions. At the visit the programme team discussed the success of this but mentioned that some students do not attend lectures that support the practical sessions. The visitors felt that introducing the mandatory provision across all elements of teaching would strengthen the delivery of the programme

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to strongly recommend that the education provider checks that all practice placement educators are HPC registered

Reason: The visitors recommend that the education provider checks the registration status of all placement educators to see if they are on the HPC register as an additional level of security for the education providers' placement management.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the clinical laboratory practice (placement) handbook to ensure that it is applicable to both students and practice placement educators.

Reason: The visitors recommend that the education provider considers revisiting the clinical laboratory practice (placement) handbook to put a greater focus on the clinical laboratory learning outcomes. The visitors considered the document to be very broad in its approach and would recommend signposting students and practice placement educators to specific sections relevant to the module being learnt.

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	18 – 19 May 2010

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 15 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 1 July 2010 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 7 July 2010. 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 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

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 validating body did not validate or 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	Robert Williams (Biomedical scientist) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	10 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Alex Hopkins (University of Wolverhampton)
Secretary	Krystyna Boswell (University of Wolverhampton)

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"/>
School of Applied Science handbooks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University admissions policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC reviewed programme documentation from the existing BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme.

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 existing BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science and BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programmes.

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 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 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 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 programme documentation, including advertising materials for the programme to clearly articulate to applicants the relationship between entry onto the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme and transfer onto the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme. The programme documentation should provide full details of the selection process and key information for prospective students considering applying to the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme.

Reason: In the submitted documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted the competition for transferring to places on the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme at the end of the second year of the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme. Though it was clear to the visitors that students will be informed of the element of competition, the visitors felt the various factors determining the availability of placements and therefore places on the programme (such as Strategic Health Authority funding, competition between other education providers for placement places and the fact that student numbers on the programme were not set and could vary depending on availability of placement places) made it difficult for the programme team to guarantee placements to any student. The visitors felt the documentation must be amended to more clearly reflect a realistic view of a student's chances of progressing to the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme. The visitors also require the education provider to provide details about the funding arrangements available for students undertaking the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme and details on the likelihood of students receiving financial assistance during the placement year for applicants.

Overall, the visitors considered that detailed information regarding student selection to the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme was not provided to prospective students and therefore the visitors were not satisfied that an applicant could make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require all the programme documentation available to prospective students to more clearly articulate the selection procedures for entry onto the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme.

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 programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that clear information is provided regarding the various Biomedical Science programmes delivered by the

education provider and that the associated routes to HPC registration are clearly outlined.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the visitors noted that there were a number of biomedical science programmes delivered by the education provider. Throughout the programme documentation different terminology and references were used in relation to these programmes. The information provided to applicants and students did not always clearly explain the different routes associated with these programmes to apply to the HPC Register. In order to prevent confusion amongst applicants and students the visitors require the programme documentation to be explicit and consistent in reference to the various programmes, terminology and references to each programme and the routes to HPC registration. The documentation also needs to clearly outline the programme (and the mode of study of this programme) that is subject to HPC approval, what this entails for students regarding eligibility to apply to the HPC Register on successful completion of the programme and that HPC approval is not retrospective, clearly stating that only students starting the programme after approval is granted would be on an HPC approved programme.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials for the programme to clearly articulate the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) standard or equivalent required for entry on to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could not determine the IELTS level for entry on to the programme. At the visit the programme team stated that the level was 6.5 and pointed towards the education provider prospectus as the source of this information for applicants. After reviewing the prospectus the visitors discovered that the entry level was set institutionally at 6.0. The visitors require the IELTS entry level to the programme to be clarified and clearly stated in the programme documentation and advertising materials. If students enter the programme with an IELTS score of 6.0 the visitors also require evidence of how the programme team ensures at the point of registration the applicant will attain a score of IELTS 7.0 (Standard of Proficiency 1b.3).

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must submit updated programme documentation if changes are made to the programme curriculum at the programme review event to be held in June 2010.

Reason: At the visit the visitors were informed that the programme was due to be reviewed in conjunction with the practice placement educators at an event in June 2010 in order to update the programme if required. From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that this standard was being met. In order to ensure that this remains the case through the current approval process, if any amendments are

made to the programme as a result of the review day the visitors require evidence of these changes to be submitted.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure practice placement verifiers undertake appropriate programme specific placement training.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors could not determine fully how the practice placement would be assessed. From discussions with the programme team it was clarified that some elements of the placement would be assessed by the programme team, some by the practice placement educators and the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) portfolio verified by IBMS verifiers. The visitors require further evidence of how verifiers assess students from this programme and how the education provider ensures that the verifiers are trained to ensure that they are fully aware of the assessment requirements of the programme, particularly the Biomedical Science Work Based module BM2022 that they contribute towards. The evidence should include information clarifying the links in place between the assessment of the portfolio and the programme team to ensure this information is clear to all parties involved in placements. The revised documentation should demonstrate that the education provider has ownership of the complete assessment process for this module.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how students, practice placement educators and practice placement providers are fully informed of the assessment procedures for the placement elements in the programme.

Reason: From the submitted documentation and discussion with the programme team and placement providers, the visitors noted that more work was required to ensure students and placement educators understood how assessment in the practice environment would work. The visitors require further evidence that clearly articulates the assessment procedures for the Biomedical Science Work Based module BM2022, including the assessment of the portfolio. This evidence should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are clearly communicated to all involved, are clearly linked to the assessment criteria and contain details of which roles are allocated to carrying out each assessment. The evidence should include clarification of the links in place between the assessment of the portfolio and the programme team to ensure this information is clear to all parties involved

in placements. The revised documentation should demonstrate that the education provider has ownership of the assessment process for this module.

The visitors also noted that the documentation provided gave weightings of assessments for this module. Discussions with the programme team indicated that these weightings were indicative of the time allocations to each element of the assessments rather than the weighting of the contributions these assessments made to the module. The visitors require that this information is clarified in the programme documentation in order to prevent confusion.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how the education provider has effective mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment for placement elements in the programme.

Reason: From the submitted documentation and discussion with the programme team and placement providers, the visitors noted that more work was required to ensure the standards of assessments in the practice environment were appropriate. The visitors require further evidence that clearly articulates the assessment procedures for the Biomedical Science Work Based module BM2022, including the assessment of the portfolio. This evidence should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are clearly communicated to all involved, are clearly linked to the assessment criteria and contain details of which roles are allocated to carrying out each assessment. The evidence should include clarification of the links in place between the assessment of the portfolio and the programme team to ensure this information is clear to all parties involved in placements. The revised documentation should demonstrate that the education provider has ownership of the assessment process and state how the assessments would be moderated for this module.

The visitors also noted that the documentation provided gave weightings of assessments for this module. Discussions with the programme team indicated that these weightings were indicative of the time allocations to each element of the assessments rather than the weighting of the contributions these assessments made to the module. The visitors require that this information is clarified in the programme documentation in order to prevent confusion.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how the education provider has effective mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards and measurement of the learning outcomes in the assessment for placement elements in the programme.

Reason: From the submitted documentation and discussion with the programme team and placement providers, the visitors noted that more work was required to ensure the standards of assessments in the practice environment were

appropriate. The visitors require further evidence that clearly articulates the assessment procedures for the Biomedical Science Work Based module BM2022, including the assessment of the portfolio. This evidence should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are clearly communicated to all involved, are clearly linked to the assessment criteria and contain details of which roles are allocated to carrying out each assessment. The evidence should include clarification of the links in place between the assessment of the portfolio and the programme team to ensure this information is clear to all parties involved in placements. The revised documentation should demonstrate that the education provider has ownership of the assessment process and state how the assessments would be moderated for this module.

The visitors also noted that the documentation provided gave weightings of assessments for this module. Discussions with the programme team indicated that these weightings were indicative of the time allocations to each element of the assessments rather than the weighting of the contributions these assessments made to the module. The visitors require that this information is clarified in the programme documentation in order to prevent confusion.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme as a whole and the placement module of the programme in particular.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors could not fully determine the assessment regulations around the placement module in the programme. In particular it was not clear what was expected of the students in respect of the timings required in passing the module, what prevents a student from progressing in the programme and the options available for a student that failed this module, including any referral options available. From the detail provided it also was not clear how this information linked in to the various exit awards (BSc Medical Laboratory Science, DipHE Medical Laboratory Science, CertHE Medical Laboratory Science) available from the programme. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure that this standard is being met.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation to ensure that it is clearly articulated which programme is subject to HPC approval and clearly states the exit awards for the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the visitors noted that there were a number of biomedical science programmes delivered by the education provider and the information contained in the programme documentation did not always clearly outline which programme was subject to

HPC approval and the different routes associated with these programmes to apply to the HPC Register. The visitors noted that as the assessment regulations were not clearly communicated with regard to progression in the programme and the exit awards available that there was confusion whether students could be given an award that refers to a protected title. Programme titles need to be clear and applicants, students, staff and the public need to understand who is eligible to apply for registration. From discussions with the programme team it was stated that students failing the placement module would be transferred to the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme. As this programme is not an HPC approved programme the information needs to be clarified in the programme documentation that this would not be an exit award but a transfer onto a separate programme that did not have HPC approval and as a result individuals would not be eligible to apply to the Register upon completion of the programme.

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 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. The visitors were happy with the planned 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

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that links to information regarding entry requirements for international applicants are strengthened.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors found it difficult to determine the entry requirements for international applicants to the programme. At the visit it became apparent that there was a separate education provider brochure giving further information for international students. The visitors felt that applicants would benefit from having clearer links to this information.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the programme team produces annual course reports which contain increased detail on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the annual course reports provided before the visit it was apparent that there were variations in the level of details contained in the reports over the last number of years. At the visit this variation between reports was explained as being due to changes in education provider requirements for programme monitoring and was likely to be a temporary change. The programme team expressed their intention to produce further details in the annual course report that would be programme specific in the future on top of the education provider requirements. The visitors wished to support the programme team in this action with this recommendation.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the programme team review the reading lists for the programme to ensure that they reference current and up to date material.

Reason: From a review of the module descriptors the visitors noticed a number of resources listed within these that were not the most recent versions of the texts or that appeared dated. At the visit it was explained that the module descriptors received were not up to date versions and that information about recommended and required reading and resources were usually contained in the module handbooks which the visitors had not received. The visitors therefore wished to recommend that the programme team ensures that the reading lists for the programme contain references to current, up to date texts and material.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the programme team review the partnership agreements in use and consider removing the Clinical Pathology Accreditation (CPA) requirement.

Reason: From a review of the placement partnership agreements provided before the visit the visitors noticed that these contained a reference to a Clinical Pathology Accreditation (CPA) requirement. The visitors wished to recommend that the programme team review this requirement as, if this status was lost, the partnership agreements could be void.

Robert Williams
Pradeep Agrawal