hpc **health professions council**

Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | Aston University |
|---|---|
| Programme name | Aston Certificate in Audiology |
| Mode of delivery | Part time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Hearing aid dispensers |
| Date of visit | 6 – 7 October 2011 |

Contents

## 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 28 November 2011 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 22 February 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 18 November. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 February 2012.

## 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.

The visit also assessed whether a number of standards under SET 5 (Practice placements) were applicable to the programme as a result of entry requirements for prior qualifications and experience as an audiologist working in the NHS.

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 | Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) |
| | Timothy Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| HPC observer | Victoria Adenugba |
| Proposed student numbers | 10 per cohort |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | March 2012 |
| Chair | Trevor Knight  (Aston University) |
| Secretary | Gillian Cook (Aston University) |

## Sources of evidence

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

|  | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| Programme specification | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☐ | ☐ | ⊠ |
| Student handbook | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☐ | ⊠ |
| Approval visit evidence folder | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC did not review a practice placement handbook prior to the visit. This programme does not include any practice placements so there is no practice placement handbook.

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, there have been no past external examiners reports 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 | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☐ | ☐ | ⊠ |
| Students | ☐ | ☐ | ⊠ |
| Learning resources | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ⊠ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC did not meet with any placement providers or educators/mentors. This programme does not include any practice placements so there are no placement providers or educators/mentors to meet with.

The HPC did not meet with any students. The programme was a new programme so there were no current or past students to meet.

## 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 to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of SETs are not applicable to this education programme and they are not required to be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 37 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs. The visitors agreed that the remaining 13 SETs are not applicable to this education programme.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## 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 programme team must submit advertising materials for the programme.

**Reason:** Information provided prior to the visit indicated because this is a new programme the education provider had not produced advertising materials. Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team had not produced advertising materials as they were waiting upon the outcomes of the HPC approval visit before advertising the programme. Through discussion with the programme leader it was clarified programmes could be advertised before obtaining HPC approval as long as the advertising materials complied with the HPC's Regulatory status advertising guidelines for education providers. The programme leader confirmed there were no internal processes preventing them from producing advertising materials until after programme approval had been granted. To assess whether this standard is met the visitors need to see the advertising materials.

The visitors also noted the existing programme documentation did not clearly specify that upon successful completion of this programme students will be eligible to apply for registration as a Hearing aid dispenser, "...audiologists who wish to be eligible for registration with HPC" (Programme specification: Educational Aims). The visitors considered this to be an important clarification for potential applicants and for students on the programme and therefore require this clarification to be included in the advertising materials for the programme. The visitors require the programme team to submit advertising materials (such as prospectus information, website information) for this programme to ensure potential applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the criminal convictions checks applied through the admissions procedures.

**Reason:** Documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated the programme would not undertake criminal conviction checks on the applicants or students of this programme. In discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the education provider policies do not need criminal convictions checks because the programme does not include students undertaking a practice placement experience. The programme team indicated as part of the admissions procedures they would request a signed declaration from the applicants' employer (or future employer) confirming they were satisfied the individual had no undisclosed criminal convictions and were therefore suitable to work for them. The visitors were satisfied with this clarification however require the admissions procedures

to include this declaration process as evidence for this standard. The visitors require the advertising materials to clearly articulate the declaration process as it is important information for potential applicants to the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the admissions procedures, and the advertising materials, to include the requirement of a declaration from an employer, or future employer.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of health requirement checks applied through the admissions procedures.

**Reason:** Documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated the programme would not require applicants or students on this programme to undergo health requirement checks. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated that the education provider policies do not need compliance with any health requirements because the programme does not include students undertaking a practice placement experience. The programme team indicated as part of the admissions procedures they would request a signed declaration from the applicants' employer (or future employer) stating they were satisfied the individual complied with any health requirements and were therefore suitable to work for them. The visitors were satisfied with this clarification however require the admissions procedures to include this declaration process as evidence for this standard. The visitors require the advertising materials to clearly articulate the declaration process as it is important information for potential applicants to the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the admissions procedures, and the advertising materials, to include the requirement of a declaration from an employer, or future employer.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must submit further details of the entry standards for applicants who are returning to practise, or joining the hearing aid dispensing profession, after a career break.

**Reason:** Documentation submitted prior to the visit detailed entry standards for applicants to the programme as being recognised professional qualifications or international qualifications. The programme team indicated they expected the majority of applicants to be those already practising as an audiologist. The visitors were satisfied with the entry criteria for those individuals practising as an audiologist, however had concerns around specific groups of applicants who could apply to the programme, particularly applicants who were returning to practise, or joining the hearing aid dispensing profession, after a career break. Applicants who are not currently in practise would not have the same 'current' experience of the clinical environment. The programme does not include a practice placement experience and the visitors therefore expressed concern that applicants not in practise might not be able to meet all of the clinical competencies of the programme. During discussion the programme team

indicated they had been considering setting a limit on the length of any career breaks for applicants however had not determined what the limit would be. The visitors need further information about any career break limits, to be assured the programme will apply appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards for this programme and will ensure that clinical aspects of the teaching on this programme are not disadvantaged by the applicant not having 'current' experience of a clinical environment.  Therefore, the visitors require details of the entry requirements for applicants who are returning to practise, or joining the hearing aid dispensing profession, after a career break.

**4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how theory and practice are integrated with particular consideration to the following SOPs:

- 1a.6 be able to practise as an autonomous professional, exercising their own professional judgement:
    - be able to assess a situation, determine the nature and severity of the problem and call upon the required knowledge and experience to deal with the problem
- 1b.3 be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information, advice, instruction and professional opinion to colleagues, service users, their relatives and carers:
    - understand the need to provide service users (or people acting on their behalf) with the information necessary to enable them to make informed decisions
    - be able to explain the financial implications of suitable hearing aid systems
- 2b.3 be able to formulate specific and appropriate management plans including the setting of timescales:
    - be able to formulate and provide appropriate advice regarding hearing aids and associated technologies and their use to facilitate informed choices by service users

**Reason:** The visitors noted the documentation provided prior to the visit mapped the standards of proficiency to the programme modules. The mapping document indicated the above SOPs are covered through all modules of the programme. During discussion at the visit the programme team particularly emphasised the clinical skills module as covering the theory and practice aspects for practical competencies of the programme. The programme team indicated role-play exercises and actors would be used in the teaching of the professional competencies and they had available links to private hearing aid dispensers through their existing audiology programmes.  Because the programme does not have students undertaking a practice placement experience, the visitors highlighted the importance of ensuring the integration of theory and practice within the programme. The visitors raised the SOPs above as being the ones where it would be most difficult for the programme to ensure students understand the practical application of professional competencies related to dispensing of hearing aids, in particular the impacts of financial implications and the different hearing aid systems for service users. The visitors require further assurance that

students will be able to manage the differences between the simulation experience and the 'real-life' experience of hearing aid dispensing. If it is decided links from the private hearing aid dispenser setting will be used, details of how hearing aid dispensers will be involved with the delivery of the programme could be included as evidence here. The visitors require the programme team to submit further evidence to demonstrate the integration of theory and practice in relation to the SOPs highlighted above.

### 4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

**Condition:** The programme team must submit further information about the use of hearing aid dispenser practitioners within the teaching of the programme.

**Reason:** Documentation received prior to the visit included information about the modules within the programme and an outline of the members of the programme team who will be delivering the modules. During discussion at the visit the programme team indicated they may use links to hearing aid dispenser practitioners through their other audiology programmes to assist the students learning and understanding of the practical components of the programme. The programme team indicated they had existing materials which would be used by the hearing aid dispensers contributing to the programme. The visitors noted the use of hearing aid dispenser practitioners could be beneficial for the programme and could support the concerns outlined in the condition set under SET 4.3 regarding SOPs 1a.6, 1b.3 and 2b.3.  If the programme does use hearing aid dispenser practitioners within the teaching of the programme, information about how they would be involved, including examples of the teaching materials for the SOPs indicated would need to be reviewed by the visitors to ensure it is appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to submit further information about the use hearing aid dispenser practitioners within the teaching of 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 programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the programme confers no aegrotat awards.

**Reason:** Documentation submitted prior to the visit stated that the programme does not confer aegrotat awards (SETs mapping document SET 6.9). The visitors were satisfied with this however noted this was not clearly articulated anywhere in the programme documentation. This standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states this to avoid any confusion. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation (such as the programme specification document) to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not be conferred by this programme. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

# Standards of education and training not applicable to the programme

**5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme. The visitors therefore recommend this standard is not applicable to the programme.

**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.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.2 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission

procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.3 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.4 is not applicable to the programme.

**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.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.5 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the

programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.6 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.7 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.8 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.9 is not applicable to the programme.

**5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.10 is not applicable to the programme.

**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.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements.

The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.11 is not applicable to the programme.

### 5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.12 is not applicable to the programme.

### 5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.13 is not applicable to the programme.

Hugh Crawford
Tim Pringle

Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | Canterbury Christ Church University |
|---|---|
| Validating body | Canterbury Christ Church University University of Greenwich |
| Programme name | Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Speech and language therapist |
| Date of visit | 29 – 30 September 2011 |

Contents

## 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 'Speech therapist' or 'Speech and language 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 8 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 18 November 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 February 2012.

## 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 validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a different programme – Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy, full time with the award from University of Greenwich. The programme is jointly validated by Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich, with both education providers contributing to the programme through management and resources. The programme is delivered as one cohort; however, half the cohort receives an award from Canterbury Christ Church University and half from University of Greenwich.

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 Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy, full time with the award from University of Greenwich. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) |
| | Martin Duckworth (Speech and language therapist) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Lewis Roberts |
| HPC observer | Victoria Adenungba |
| Proposed student numbers | 25 per cohort (split between Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich) |
| First approved intake | 1 February 2007 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | 1 January 2012 |
| Chair | Christopher Stevens (Canterbury Christ Church University) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Secretary | Samantha Ray (Canterbury Christ Church University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Richard Brown (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Fiona McArthur-Rouse (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Irena Chojnacka (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Stephen Naylor (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Lucy Myers (External Panel Member) |
| | Tracey Marsh (Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists) |

## Sources of evidence

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

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| Programme specification | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

## 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 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 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.

Conditions

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the audit tools and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor placements which ensure that resources in all practice placement settings are effectively used to support student learning.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. The programme team and the practice placement educators also discussed with the visitors the use of independent sector placements and future plans to develop role emerging placements. The programme team stated that there is an audit form which they can use for practice placements that are not within the NHS.

However the visitors did not have access to the audit tools, and as such did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each placement setting effectively uses the resources available to support student learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence, including the audit tools, of how the programme team ensures that placements effectively use the available resources to support student leaning in all settings.

**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 programme team must provide evidence of the audit tools and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor placements which ensure that resources in all practice placement settings effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. The programme team and the practice placement educators also discussed with the visitors the use of independent sector placements and future plans to develop role emerging placements. The programme team stated that there is an audit form which they can use for practice placements that are not within the NHS.

However the visitors did not have access to the audit tools, and as such did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each placement setting effectively uses the resources available to support student learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that placements have sufficient resources in place at all placement settings.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the formal mechanisms in place which ensure that all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that a number of informal mechanisms are used to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during a 'mid-placement visit' and ensuring that all placements are evaluated. This is in addition to the self-assessment audit tools that all placement providers are expected to complete.

However, the visitors did not have access to the audit tools and noted that the informal mechanisms, outlined through discussions at the visit, did not demonstrate a consistent approach to auditing practice placements. As this was the case the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider takes responsibility for ensuring that all practice placement learning is conducted in a safe and supportive environment. The visitors therefore did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that mechanisms are in place to ensure all settings, including NHS, independent sector and role emerging placements are safe and supportive. To be sure that this standard is met the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms, including the audit tools, that the education provider uses to ensure that consistent judgements are made on whether placements 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 programme team must provide evidence of the audit tool and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor all placements.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the programme team ensure that practice placement providers, within the NHS, complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. They also noted that there is an audit tool which the programme team can utilise for practice placements outside of the NHS and that that all independent sector and role emerging placements would be visited by a member of the programme team to ensure suitability. The visitors were also clear that a number of informal mechanisms are used by the programme team to check and monitor the quality of practice placements, including looking at the placement environment during the mid-placement visit and ensuring that all placements are evaluated.

However, the visitors did not have access to the audit tools and as such they did not have enough evidence, from discussions at the visit and from the documentation provided, to demonstrate that a thorough and effective system is in place for the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the auditing process along with any policies and

procedures to support the approval and monitoring placements in all settings, including NHS, independent sector and role emerging placements.

**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 programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, and how these policies are implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors note that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. They also noted that there is an audit tool which the programme team can utilise for practice placements outside of the NHS.

However, the visitors did not have access to these audit tools and as such did not have enough evidence of the systems or processes that the programme team use to ensure that all placements have equality and diversity policies in place and that these policies are implemented and monitored. Therefore the visitors require further evidence, including the audit tools, to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place and how they check that the policies are implemented and monitored.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placements which ensures an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are in place at all practice placement setting.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors note that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. They also noted that there is an audit tool which the programme team can utilise for practice placements outside of the NHS.

However, the visitors did not have access to these audit tools and as such did not have enough evidence of the systems or processes the programme team use to ensure that all placements, including those in NHS, independent sector and role emerging settings, have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The visitors require further evidence, including the auditing tools, to demonstrate how they ensure that placement providers have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to supervise students and ensure they gain the experience they require.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training, including refresher training.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and in discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators the visitors noted the role of the 'Key Placement Educator' and the 'Placement Educator' within the programme. 'Key Placement Educators' are a named member of the placement education team and the contact person for the student and the academic staff. 'Placement Educators' are speech and language therapists registered with the HPC and/or other health professional and/or other relevant worker. Within the 'Final Revalidation Document' on page 48 the visitors noted that the role of the Placement Educators is "…of fundamental importance in enabling students to develop their clinical skills…"

The visitors also noted that the programme team delivers a 'Placement Educator Course' and annual refresher training days for practice placement educators. The visitors are satisfied that the course content is appropriate and allows practice placement educators to develop their skills in student education and become familiar with the expectations of the programme and assessment process. From discussions with the programme team it was stated that only the 'Key Placement Educators' must mandatorily undertake training. However on page 4 of the 'Final Revalidation Document' it states that "…the SLT placement educator is expected to complete a preparation course".

From the documents submitted and from discussions with the programme team the visitors did not have enough evidence to demonstrate that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training, including refresher training. The visitors require clarification of the arrangements in place for practice placement educator training. The visitors require clarification that outlines who is required to undertake mandatory practice placement educator training, whether both 'Key Placement Educators' and 'Placement Educators' must attend this training prior to receiving students on placement or just 'Key Placement Educators'. If only 'Key Placement Educators' are mandatorily required to undertake the training then the visitors require further evidence that highlights the mechanisms in place that ensures that all 'Placement Educators' are informed of the specific requirements of the programme, including the programme learning outcomes, to ensure that they are able to appropriately support student learning.

In addition to the 'Placement Educator Course' the visitors noted that the programme team offer an annual refresher training session to practice placement educators. This session is not mandatory and the programme team have no defined period in which practice placement educators must refresh their knowledge of supervision and the programme. The visitors require evidence to show how they will provide on-going refresher training to all practice placement educators.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors note that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. The visitors also note that the programme team stated that all speech and language therapists working within the NHS must be HPC registered and the expectation would be that service managers would check this. However, the programme team and the practice placement educators also discussed with the visitors the use of independent sector placements and future plans to develop role emerging placements. The programme team stated that there is an audit form which they can use for practice placements that are not within the NHS.

However, the visitors did not have access to these audit tools and did not have enough evidence, from discussions at the visit and from the documentation provided, of the systems or processes in place to ensure that practice placement educators in all settings are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the systems or process to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators at all placements, including NHS, independent sector and role emerging settings are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation**: The programme team should consider constructing and documenting a process that demonstrates how they guarantee and monitor the quality of teaching from specialist visiting lecturers.

**Reason**: From discussions the visitors noted a number of mechanisms utilised by the programme team to quality assure the teaching of specialist visiting lecturers. Examples included organising a pre-meeting with the specialist visiting lecturer, proof reading learning resources and students providing informal feedback after the session. However, the visitors also noted that these mechanisms were often applied informally and inconsistently. The visitors therefore suggest constructing and documenting a process that demonstrates how they guarantee and monitor the quality of teaching from specialist visiting lecturers. The visitors suggest that the programme team may want to formally evaluate sessions delivered by specialist visiting lecturers, and felt that this could be used as a useful continuing professional development tool for specialist visiting lecturers.

**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 programme team should consider setting, and communicating, a defined threshold at which point they will automatically contact a non-attending student on the programme and further emphasise within the programme documentation the consequences of non-attendance.

**Reason**: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors felt that the attendance requirements for the programme were clearly articulated. The visitors also noted that the programme deal with issues of student non-attendance on a case-by-case basis. However, through discussions it was highlighted that the programme team does not have a defined threshold at which point they would automatically contact a non-attending student. The visitors felt that communicating to students a clear, defined, threshold for non-attendance at which point the programme team would automatically contact a student, would enhance consistency and transparency. The visitors also felt that having a clear defined policy for non-attendance would protect the programme team from appeals should they be required to escalate issue of attendance in terms of a student's professional related conduct.

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

**Recommendation**: The programme team should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight where the profession specific aspects of the standards of proficiency relating to knowledge, understanding and skills are covered within the programme.

**Reason**: The visitors are satisfied that this standard is met and that all of the standards of proficiency are covered within the curriculum. However, from reviewing the programme documentation the visitors did note that the indicative module outlines do not clearly highlight where within the programme the profession specific aspects of the standards of proficiency relating to knowledge, understanding and skills are covered. The visitors recommend that the programme team may want to review the programme documentation to further highlight these areas.

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

**Recommendation**: The programme team should consider reviewing the protocols in place for using practice placement educators who are not HPC registered speech and language therapists, to ensure they are appropriately experienced, qualified and have received training relevant to the practice placement.

**Reason**: Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted the future plans to expand the use of independent sector placements and plans to develop role emerging placements. The visitors noted discussions where it was stated that in the future students could be supervised by practice placement educators from outside of the health sector, including teachers. The visitors recommend that the programme team may want to review the protocols in place when using placement educators who are not HPC registered speech and language therapists, to ensure they are appropriately experienced, qualified and have received training relevant to the practice placement. The visitors also note that the programme team may want to investigate other models of supervision, such as arms-length supervision to ensure that students always have profession specific supervisor access.

<div align="right">

Lorna Povey
Martin Duckworth

</div>

Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | Queen Margaret University |
|---|---|
| **Programme name** | MSc Diagnostic Radiography (pre – registration) |
| **Mode of delivery** | Full time |
| **Relevant part of HPC Register** | Radiographer |
| **Relevant modality / domain** | Diagnostic radiography |
| **Date of visit** | 6 – 7 September 2011 |

Contents

## 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 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 October 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 7 November 2011. 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 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. 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, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Benjamin Potter |
| Proposed student numbers | 12 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | January 2012 |
| Chair | Claire Seaman (Queen Margaret University) |
| Secretary | Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Stella Howden (Internal Panel Member) Tom Carline (Internal Panel Member) Caroline Jarvis (Internal Panel Member) Stephen Boynes (Society and College of Radiographers) Marcus Walker (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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

The HPC did not review the 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC met with students from the PgDip Radiotherapy and Oncology programme as well as the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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.

## Conditions

**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 submit any revised programme documentation if changes are made as a result of this internal validation event.

**Reason**: The student handbook and other programme documentation submitted prior to the visit supported the learning and teaching activities of the programme. However, in discussions throughout the visit it was clear amendments may be made to these documents as a result of the internal validation process. Visitors' decisions regarding whether or not the SETs are met must be made with the documentation that will be used in the operation of the programme. The visitors will need to review any changes that are made to the programme documentation in order to determine if the SETs are met. Therefore, the HPC visiting panel will need to see any amended or 'final' versions of the documentation before they can make their final recommendation on the approval of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standard of proficiency (SOP);

**3a.3   understand the need to establish and maintain a safe practice environment**
   o   be able to use basic life support techniques and be able to deal safely with clinical emergencies

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the learning outcomes ensure students are able to meet SOP 3a.3 upon completion of the programme. In particular they were unclear as to where students were taught how to use basic life support techniques and to deal safely with clinical emergencies. Through discussion with the programme team it was clarified that these skills would be covered in a module taught jointly with students from other programmes. However, these elements of learning and teaching were not included in the learning outcomes of this module. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the module learning outcomes, students will be taught to use basic life support techniques and to deal with clinical emergencies safely.  In this way the visitors can be sure that the students who successfully complete the programme can meet SOP 3a.3.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of a formal mechanism in place to demonstrate how the programme team approves practice placements and monitors them regularly.

**Reason:** From the documents submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team ensures the quality of practice placements for students on the programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware of mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of practice placements and of the programme teams visits to practice placements prior to students starting the placement. The visitors noted these approval mechanisms were not thoroughly documented and may rely on informal communication between the programme team and the practice placement providers. Because there was no formal process in place to approve practice placements, the visitors did not have enough evidence to ensure the education provider has thorough and effective systems in place for the initial approval and ongoing monitoring of practice placements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate there are clear and consistent procedures in place around the approval and monitoring of practice placements 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 evidence of how they ensure practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and how they are applied to students.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware of how the programme team monitors the quality of practice placements. The visitors had insufficient evidence to determine how the programme team ensures that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and how the policies are implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place and how these policies are implemented and monitored within practice placement settings.

**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 provide evidence to demonstrate how the assessment strategy of the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the following standard of proficiency;

**3a.3 understand the need to establish and maintain a safe practice environment**
   o **be able to use basic life support techniques and be able to deal safely with clinical emergencies**

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the assessment strategy ensures students are able to meet SOP 3a.3 upon completion of the programme. In particular, they were unclear as to where students were assessed on basic life support techniques and how to safely deal with clinical emergencies. Through discussion with the programme

team, it was clarified that assessment of these skills would be conducted as part of a module taught jointly with students from other programmes. However, as it was unclear in the assessment strategy where these skills would be assessed, the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates where, in the assessment strategy, the students will be assessed on basic life support techniques and how to safely deal with clinical emergencies. In this way the visitors can be sure that the students who successfully complete the programme can meet SOP 3a.3 and that this standard is met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation**: The education provider may wish to consider including the requirement for students to inform the programme team of any changes in their criminal convictions status in the student handbook.

**Reason**: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that the admission procedures for the programme apply criminal convictions checks. They were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors noted students are made aware of the requirement to inform the programme team of any changes in their criminal convictions status only on the 'statement of consent'. The visitors therefore recommend that this requirement is included within the student handbook, in addition to the statement of consent. In this way the programme team may increase awareness of this requirement amongst students and mitigate any problems which may arise as a result of this requirement.

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

**Recommendation**: The education provider may wish to consider monitoring the staffing provision for the programme to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

**Reason**: Through discussions at the visit the visitors noted that the programme team did have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme effectively. Therefore they were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors feel that the education provider should consider keeping the number of staff delivering the contributing to the programme under review. This is to ensure that as the programme grows, in line with the education provider's projections, there continues to be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme. The visitors also stated that the education provider should inform the HPC, through the Major Change process, if there is any reduction in the level of staffing.

**3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.**

**Recommendation**: The education provider may wish to consider including details of the student complaints process in the student handbook.

**Reason**: From documentation provided, the visitors were satisfied there is a student complaints process in place and so the programme meets this standard. In discussion with the students they indicated they were not aware of the complaints process as they, or no-one they knew had had cause to utilise it. The visitors could find no information about the complaints process within the student handbook. The visitors recommend the programme team consider including details of the complaints process, or where to find the complaints process, in the student handbook. In this way the team may enhance students' ability to access the process, should they have cause to use it.

**5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Recommendation**: The education provider may wish to consider resuming the bi-annual Radiography Advisory Committee meetings.

**Reason**: Through scrutiny of the programme documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement providers. Therefore they were satisfied the programme meets this standard. In particular the visitors noted the practice placement providers and programme team were very positive about the Radiography Advisory Committee meetings between the providers and programme team. However, the visitors noted the group had not met since 2010 and the placement providers indicated they would like to resume the twice yearly meetings which had happened prior to 2010. In discussion with the programme team it was highlighted the only reason for the lack of meetings currently was due to participants' availability. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team considers re-convening the Radiography Advisory Committee bi-annually. In this way the programme team will have a formal forum in which to address any issues which may arise and can supplement the current good relationship between the programme team and practice placement providers.

Martin Benwell
Linda Mutema

# Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | Queen Margaret University |
|---|---|
| **Programme name** | PgDip Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration) |
| **Mode of delivery** | Full time |
| **Relevant part of HPC Register** | Radiographer |
| **Relevant modality / domain** | Diagnostic radiography |
| **Date of visit** | 6 – 7 September 2011 |

## Contents

## 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 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 October 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 7 November 2011. 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 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered an MSc Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. 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, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) |
|---|---|
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Benjamin Potter |
| Proposed student numbers | 12 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | January 2012 |
| Chair | Claire Seaman (Queen Margaret University) |
| Secretary | Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Stella Howden (Internal Panel Member) Tom Carline (Internal Panel Member) Caroline Jarvis (Internal Panel Member) Stephen Boynes (Society and College of Radiographers) Marcus Walker (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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

The HPC did not review the 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC met with students from the PgDip Radiotherapy and Oncology programme as well as the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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.

## Conditions

**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 submit any revised programme documentation if changes are made as a result of this internal validation event.

**Reason**: The student handbook and other programme documentation submitted prior to the visit supported the learning and teaching activities of the programme. However, in discussions throughout the visit it was clear amendments may be made to these documents as a result of the internal validation process. Visitors' decisions regarding whether or not the SETs are met must be made with the documentation that will be used in the operation of the programme. The visitors will need to review any changes that are made to the programme documentation in order to determine if the SETs are met. Therefore, the HPC visiting panel will need to see any amended or 'final' versions of the documentation before they can make their final recommendation on the approval of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standard of proficiency (SOP);

**3a.3 understand the need to establish and maintain a safe practice environment**
  o   be able to use basic life support techniques and be able to deal safely with clinical emergencies

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the learning outcomes ensure students are able to meet SOP 3a.3 upon completion of the programme. In particular they were unclear as to where students were taught how to use basic life support techniques and to deal safely with clinical emergencies. Through discussion with the programme team it was clarified that these skills would be covered in a module taught jointly with students from other programmes. However, these elements of learning and teaching were not included in the learning outcomes of this module. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the module learning outcomes, students will be taught to use basic life support techniques and to deal with clinical emergencies safely.  In this way the visitors can be sure that the students who successfully complete the programme can meet SOP 3a.3.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of a formal mechanism in place to demonstrate how the programme team approves practice placements and monitors them regularly.

**Reason:** From the documents submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team ensures the quality of practice placements for students on the programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware of mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of practice placements and of the programme teams visits to practice placements prior to students starting the placement. The visitors noted these approval mechanisms were not thoroughly documented and may rely on informal communication between the programme team and the practice placement providers. Because there was no formal process in place to approve practice placements, the visitors did not have enough evidence to ensure the education provider has thorough and effective systems in place for the initial approval and ongoing monitoring of practice placements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate there are clear and consistent procedures in place around the approval and monitoring of practice placements 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 evidence of how they ensure practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and how they are applied to students.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware of how the programme team monitors the quality of practice placements. The visitors had insufficient evidence to determine how the programme team ensures that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and how the policies are implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place and how these policies are implemented and monitored within practice placement settings.

**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 provide evidence to demonstrate how the assessment strategy of the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the following standard of proficiency;

3a.3   understand the need to establish and maintain a safe practice environment
  o   be able to use basic life support techniques and be able to deal safely with clinical emergencies

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the assessment strategy ensures students are able to meet SOP 3a.3 upon completion of the programme. In particular, they were unclear as to where students were assessed on basic life support techniques and how to safely deal with clinical emergencies. Through discussion with the programme

team, it was clarified that assessment of these skills would be conducted as part of a module taught jointly with students from other programmes. However, as it was unclear in the assessment strategy where these skills would be assessed, the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates where, in the assessment strategy, the students will be assessed on basic life support techniques and how to safely deal with clinical emergencies. In this way the visitors can be sure that the students who successfully complete the programme can meet SOP 3a.3 and that this standard is met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation**: The education provider may wish to consider including the requirement for students to inform the programme team of any changes in their criminal convictions status in the student handbook.

**Reason**: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that the admission procedures for the programme apply criminal convictions checks. They were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors noted students are made aware of the requirement to inform the programme team of any changes in their criminal convictions status only on the 'statement of consent'. The visitors therefore recommend that this requirement is included within the student handbook, in addition to the statement of consent.  In this way the programme team may increase awareness of this requirement amongst students and mitigate any problems which may arise as a result of this requirement.

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

**Recommendation**: The education provider may wish to consider monitoring the staffing provision for the programme to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

**Reason**: Through discussions at the visit the visitors noted that the programme team did have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme effectively. Therefore they were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors feel that the education provider should consider keeping the number of staff delivering the contributing to the programme under review. This is to ensure that as the programme grows, in line with the education provider's projections, there continues to be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme. The visitors also stated that the education provider should inform the HPC, through the Major Change process, if there is any reduction in the level of staffing.

**3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.**

**Recommendation**: The education provider may wish to consider including details of the student complaints process in the student handbook.

**Reason**: From documentation provided, the visitors were satisfied there is a student complaints process in place and so the programme meets this standard. In discussion with the students they indicated they were not aware of the complaints process as they, or no-one they knew had had cause to utilise it. The visitors could find no information about the complaints process within the student handbook. The visitors recommend the programme team consider including details of the complaints process, or where to find the complaints process, in the student handbook. In this way the team may enhance students' ability to access the process, should they have cause to use it.

**5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Recommendation**: The education provider may wish to consider resuming the bi-annual Radiography Advisory Committee meetings.

**Reason**: Through scrutiny of the programme documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement providers. Therefore they were satisfied the programme meets this standard. In particular the visitors noted the practice placement providers and programme team were very positive about the Radiography Advisory Committee meetings between the providers and programme team. However, the visitors noted the group had not met since 2010 and the placement providers indicated they would like to resume the twice yearly meetings which had happened prior to 2010. In discussion with the programme team it was highlighted the only reason for the lack of meetings currently was due to participants' availability. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team considers re-convening the Radiography Advisory Committee bi-annually. In this way the programme team will have a formal forum in which to address any issues which may arise and can supplement the current good relationship between the programme team and practice placement providers.

Martin Benwell
Linda Mutema

# Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | The Robert Gordon University |
|---|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Radiographer |
| Relevant modality / domain | Diagnostic radiography |
| Date of visit | 14 – 15 September 2011 |

# Contents

## 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 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 4 November 2011. 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 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programme, MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. 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, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Helen Best (Diagnostic radiographer) |
| | Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Lewis Roberts |
| HPC observer | Victoria Adenugba |
| Proposed student numbers | 16 per cohort |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | January 2012 |
| Chair | Anne Stevenson (Robert Gordon University) |
| Secretary | Lucy Jack (Robert Gordon University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Roddy Smith (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Jane Williams-Butt (External Panel Member) |
| | Richard Price (Society / College of Radiographers) |

## Sources of evidence

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

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| Programme specification | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

The HPC did not review the external examiners' reports from the 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

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

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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.

## Conditions

**3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition**: The education provider must clarify the management structure in place for the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were presented with documentation that indicated that the Programme Leader is the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, from discussions with the senior management team the visitors note that a new member of staff has been recruited to the programme team and is currently working out their notice period with their current employer. The visitors also note discussions that stated that it is highly likely that this individual will take up the role of Programme Leader when their employment begins.

The visitors finally noted discussions with the senior management team that indicated that the current Programme Leader will take on the role of Radiography Subject Lead. The visitors require evidence and clarification that outlines the education providers' future plans for the role of Programme Leader and the role of Radiography Subject Lead, including their roles and responsibilities.

**3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify who the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is.

**Reason**: From discussions with the senior management team the visitors note that a new member of staff has been recruited to the programme team and is currently working out their notice period with their current employer. The visitors also note discussions that stated that it is highly likely that this individual will take up the role of Programme Leader when their employment begins.   The visitors finally noted discussions with the senior management team that indicated that the current Programme Leader will take on the role of Radiography Subject Lead. The visitors require clarification of who the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the following standards of proficiency:

- **1b.1    be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users, and their relatives and carers**

- o Understand the need to build and sustain professional relationships as both an independent practitioner and collaboratively as a member of a team
- o Be able to interpret and act upon information from other healthcare professionals, in order to maximise health gain whilst minimising radiation dose to the service user
- **2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
  - o Be able to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination, assist with CT examinations of the spine, chest and abdomen in acute trauma and to contribute effectively to other CT studies
- **3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice**
  - o recognise the role of other professions in health and social care

**Reason:** The visitors noted discussions with the programme team which clarified how students on the programme learn about multi-professional collaboration during their practice placement experiences. In reviewing the programme documentation however, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to be sure that the programmes learning outcomes ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet standards of proficiency (SOPs) 1b.1 and 3a.1. In particular they were unsure where and how students learned about multi-professional collaboration.

The visitors also did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate how students who successfully complete the programme meet SOP 2.b4, specifically how to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how multi-professional collaboration is taught within the programme and how students are taught how to perform a standard head (CT) examination. In this way the visitors can be sure that those students who successfully complete the programme meet all of the relevant standards of proficiency including SOPs 1b.1, 2b.4 and 3.1.

**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 demonstrate how students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors note some reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors also note discussions with the programme team where it was stated that the standards are embedded throughout the programme. However, the visitors were unable to find evidence to clearly outline where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are referred to in the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards, including

how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team ensure that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit programme documentation to provide evidence of the mechanism in place to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors did not have sufficient evidence as to how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, or evidence of any other arrangements in place to manage this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that those professionals who supervise students on practice placement are appropriately registered.

**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 following standards of proficiency are assessed:

- **1b.1    be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users, and their relatives and carers**
   - Understand the need to build and sustain professional relationships as both an independent practitioner and collaboratively as a member of a team
   - Be able to interpret and act upon information from other healthcare professionals, in order to maximise health gain whilst minimising radiation dose to the service user
- **2b.4    be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
   - Be able to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination, assist with CT examinations of the spine, chest and abdomen in acute trauma and to contribute effectively to other CT studies
- **3a.1    know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice**
   - recognise the role of other professions in health and social care

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors did not have enough evidence to determine how students are assessed to ensure that they can meet standard of proficiency 1b.1 and 3a.1, associated with multi-professional collaboration. The visitors also found insufficient evidence of an assessment to ensure that students can meet SOP 2b.4 and are able to perform

a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of how students are assessed to ensure that they can meet these and all other relevant, standards of proficiency on successful completion of the programme.

## 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 reviewing the programme documentation to ensure terminology and assessment descriptions are consistent throughout.

**Reason**: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted examples of interchangeable terminology. The visitors noted that that the education provider interchangeably referred to the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules as the 'clinical education modules'. The visitors also noted that within the module descriptor for 'Radiography Professional Practice 3', the assessment outline does not match the assessment description for the module within the programme specification document. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider review the programme documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy.

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

**Recommendation**: The education provider should consider reviewing the indicative bibliography for the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules.

**Reason**: From discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. However, from a review of the module descriptors for the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules the visitors note that the indicative bibliography consists of the same two references for all five modules. The visitors recommend that, to better support the learning and teaching activities of these modules, the education provider may want to review the indicative bibliography for each module and expand the range of resources which students may want to utilise.

**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 revisiting the programme documentation, including module descriptors, to further highlight where interprofessional learning takes place within the curriculum.

**Reason**: In discussions with the programme team the visitors were able to clearly determine which parts of the curriculum were delivered interprofessionally. However, the visitors did not have the same clarity when reviewing the programme documentation. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider may want to consider reviewing the programme documentation, including module descriptors, to clearly highlight where interprofessional learning takes place within the curriculum.

Helen Best
Shaaron Pratt

# hpc health professions council

## Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of education provider** | The Robert Gordon University |
| **Programme name** | MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) |
| **Mode of delivery** | Full time |
| **Relevant part of HPC Register** | Radiographer |
| **Relevant modality / domain** | Diagnostic radiography |
| **Date of visit** | 14 – 15 September 2011 |

## Contents

## 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 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 4 November 2011. 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 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programme, Post Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. 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, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Helen Best (Diagnostic radiographer) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Lewis Roberts |
| HPC observer | Victoria Adenugba |
| Proposed student numbers | 16 per cohort |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | January 2012 |
| Chair | Anne Stevenson (Robert Gordon University) |
| Secretary | Lucy Jack (Robert Gordon University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Roddy Smith (Internal Panel Member) Jane Williams-Butt (External Panel Member) Richard Price (Society / College of Radiographers) |

## Sources of evidence

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

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| Programme specification | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

The HPC did not review the external examiners' reports from the 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

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

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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.

## Conditions

**3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition**: The education provider must clarify the management structure in place for the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were presented with documentation that indicated that the Programme Leader is the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, from discussions with the senior management team the visitors note that a new member of staff has been recruited to the programme team and is currently working out their notice period with their current employer. The visitors also note discussions that stated that it is highly likely that this individual will take up the role of Programme Leader when their employment begins.

The visitors finally noted discussions with the senior management team that indicated that the current Programme Leader will take on the role of Radiography Subject Lead. The visitors require evidence and clarification that outlines the education providers' future plans for the role of Programme Leader and the role of Radiography Subject Lead, including their roles and responsibilities.

**3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify who the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is.

**Reason**: From discussions with the senior management team the visitors note that a new member of staff has been recruited to the programme team and is currently working out their notice period with their current employer. The visitors also note discussions that stated that it is highly likely that this individual will take up the role of Programme Leader when their employment begins. The visitors finally noted discussions with the senior management team that indicated that the current Programme Leader will take on the role of Radiography Subject Lead. The visitors require clarification of who the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the following standards of proficiency:

- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users, and their relatives and carers**

- o Understand the need to build and sustain professional relationships as both an independent practitioner and collaboratively as a member of a team
- o Be able to interpret and act upon information from other healthcare professionals, in order to maximise health gain whilst minimising radiation dose to the service user
- **2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
  - o Be able to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination, assist with CT examinations of the spine, chest and abdomen in acute trauma and to contribute effectively to other CT studies
- **3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice**
  - o recognise the role of other professions in health and social care

**Reason:** The visitors noted discussions with the programme team which clarified how students on the programme learn about multi-professional collaboration during their practice placement experiences. In reviewing the programme documentation however, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to be sure that the programmes learning outcomes ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet standards of proficiency (SOPs) 1b.1 and 3a.1. In particular they were unsure where and how students learned about multi-professional collaboration.

The visitors also did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate how students who successfully complete the programme meet SOP 2.b4, specifically how to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how multi-professional collaboration is taught within the programme and how students are taught how to perform a standard head (CT) examination. In this way the visitors can be sure that those students who successfully complete the programme meet all of the relevant standards of proficiency including SOPs 1b.1, 2b.4 and 3.1.

### 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 demonstrate how students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors note some reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors also note discussions with the programme team where it was stated that the standards are embedded throughout the programme. However, the visitors were unable to find evidence to clearly outline where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are referred to in the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards, including

how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team ensure that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit programme documentation to provide evidence of the mechanism in place to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors did not have sufficient evidence as to how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, or evidence of any other arrangements in place to manage this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that those professionals who supervise students on practice placement are appropriately registered.

**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 following standards of proficiency are assessed:

- **1b.1    be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users, and their relatives and carers**
  - o  Understand the need to build and sustain professional relationships as both an independent practitioner and collaboratively as a member of a team
  - o  Be able to interpret and act upon information from other healthcare professionals, in order to maximise health gain whilst minimising radiation dose to the service user
- **2b.4    be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
  - o  Be able to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination, assist with CT examinations of the spine, chest and abdomen in acute trauma and to contribute effectively to other CT studies
- **3a.1    know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice**
  - o  recognise the role of other professions in health and social care

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors did not have enough evidence to determine how students are assessed to ensure that they can meet standard of proficiency 1b.1 and 3a.1, associated with multi-professional collaboration. The visitors also found insufficient evidence of an assessment to ensure that students can meet SOP 2b.4 and are able to perform

a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of how students are assessed to ensure that they can meet these and all other relevant, standards of proficiency on successful completion of the programme.

## 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 reviewing the programme documentation to ensure terminology and assessment descriptions are consistent throughout.

**Reason**: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted examples of interchangeable terminology. The visitors noted that that the education provider interchangeably referred to the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules as the 'clinical education modules'. The visitors also noted that within the module descriptor for 'Radiography Professional Practice 3', the assessment outline does not match the assessment description for the module within the programme specification document. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider review the programme documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy.

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

**Recommendation**: The education provider should consider reviewing the indicative bibliography for the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules.

**Reason**: From discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. However, from a review of the module descriptors for the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules the visitors note that the indicative bibliography consists of the same two references for all five modules. The visitors recommend that, to better support the learning and teaching activities of these modules, the education provider may want to review the indicative bibliography for each module and expand the range of resources which students may want to utilise.

**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 revisiting the programme documentation, including module descriptors, to further highlight where interprofessional learning takes place within the curriculum.

**Reason**: In discussions with the programme team the visitors were able to clearly determine which parts of the curriculum were delivered interprofessionally. However, the visitors did not have the same clarity when reviewing the programme documentation. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider may want to consider reviewing the programme documentation, including module descriptors, to clearly highlight where interprofessional learning takes place within the curriculum.

Helen Best
Shaaron Pratt

Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | University of Greenwich |
| --- | --- |
| Validating body | Canterbury Christ Church University<br>University of Greenwich |
| Programme name | Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Speech and language therapist |
| Date of visit | 29 – 30 September 2011 |

Contents

## 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 'Speech therapist' or 'Speech and language 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 8 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 18 November 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 February 2012.

## 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 validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a different programme – Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy, full time with the award from Canterbury Christ Church University. The programme is jointly validated by Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich, with both education providers contributing to the programme through management and resources. The programme is delivered as one cohort; however, half the cohort receives an award from Canterbury Christ Church University and half from University of Greenwich.

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 Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy, full time with the award from Canterbury Christ Church University. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) |
| | Martin Duckworth (Speech and language therapist) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Lewis Roberts |
| HPC observer | Victoria Adenungba |
| Proposed student numbers | 25 per cohort (split between Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich) |
| First approved intake | 1 February 2007 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | 1 January 2012 |
| Chair | Christopher Stevens (Canterbury Christ Church University) |

| Secretary | Samantha Ray (Canterbury Christ Church University) |
|---|---|
| Members of the joint panel | Richard Brown (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Fiona McArthur-Rouse (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Irena Chojnacka (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Stephen Naylor (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Lucy Myers (External Panel Member) |
| | Tracey Marsh (Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists) |

## Sources of evidence

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

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| Programme specification | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

## 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 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 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.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the audit tools and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor placements which ensure that resources in all practice placement settings are effectively used to support student learning.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. The programme team and the practice placement educators also discussed with the visitors the use of independent sector placements and future plans to develop role emerging placements. The programme team stated that there is an audit form which they can use for practice placements that are not within the NHS.

However the visitors did not have access to the audit tools, and as such did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each placement setting effectively uses the resources available to support student learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence, including the audit tools, of how the programme team ensures that placements effectively use the available resources to support student leaning in all settings.

**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 programme team must provide evidence of the audit tools and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor placements which ensure that resources in all practice placement settings effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. The programme team and the practice placement educators also discussed with the visitors the use of independent sector placements and future plans to develop role emerging placements. The programme team stated that there is an audit form which they can use for practice placements that are not within the NHS.

However the visitors did not have access to the audit tools, and as such did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each placement setting effectively uses the resources available to support student learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that placements have sufficient resources in place at all placement settings.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the formal mechanisms in place which ensure that all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that a number of informal mechanisms are used to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during a 'mid-placement visit' and ensuring that all placements are evaluated. This is in addition to the self-assessment audit tools that all placement providers are expected to complete.

However, the visitors did not have access to the audit tools and noted that the informal mechanisms, outlined through discussions at the visit, did not demonstrate a consistent approach to auditing practice placements. As this was the case the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider takes responsibility for ensuring that all practice placement learning is conducted in a safe and supportive environment. The visitors therefore did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that mechanisms are in place to ensure all settings, including NHS, independent sector and role emerging placements are safe and supportive. To be sure that this standard is met the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms, including the audit tools, that the education provider uses to ensure that consistent judgements are made on whether placements 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 programme team must provide evidence of the audit tool and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor all placements.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the programme team ensure that practice placement providers, within the NHS, complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. They also noted that there is an audit tool which the programme team can utilise for practice placements outside of the NHS and that that all independent sector and role emerging placements would be visited by a member of the programme team to ensure suitability. The visitors were also clear that a number of informal mechanisms are used by the programme team to check and monitor the quality of practice placements, including looking at the placement environment during the mid-placement visit and ensuring that all placements are evaluated.

However, the visitors did not have access to the audit tools and as such they did not have enough evidence, from discussions at the visit and from the documentation provided, to demonstrate that a thorough and effective system is in place for the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the auditing process along with any policies and

procedures to support the approval and monitoring placements in all settings, including NHS, independent sector and role emerging placements.

**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 programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, and how these policies are implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors note that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. They also noted that there is an audit tool which the programme team can utilise for practice placements outside of the NHS.

However, the visitors did not have access to these audit tools and as such did not have enough evidence of the systems or processes that the programme team use to ensure that all placements have equality and diversity policies in place and that these policies are implemented and monitored. Therefore the visitors require further evidence, including the audit tools, to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place and how they check that the policies are implemented and monitored.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placements which ensures an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are in place at all practice placement setting.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors note that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. They also noted that there is an audit tool which the programme team can utilise for practice placements outside of the NHS.

However, the visitors did not have access to these audit tools and as such did not have enough evidence of the systems or processes the programme team use to ensure that all placements, including those in NHS, independent sector and role emerging settings, have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The visitors require further evidence, including the auditing tools, to demonstrate how they ensure that placement providers have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to supervise students and ensure they gain the experience they require.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training, including refresher training.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and in discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators the visitors noted the role of the 'Key Placement Educator' and the 'Placement Educator' within the programme. 'Key Placement Educators' are a named member of the placement education team and the contact person for the student and the academic staff. 'Placement Educators' are speech and language therapists registered with the HPC and/or other health professional and/or other relevant worker. Within the 'Final Revalidation Document' on page 48 the visitors noted that the role of the Placement Educators is "…of fundamental importance in enabling students to develop their clinical skills…"

The visitors also noted that the programme team delivers a 'Placement Educator Course' and annual refresher training days for practice placement educators. The visitors are satisfied that the course content is appropriate and allows practice placement educators to develop their skills in student education and become familiar with the expectations of the programme and assessment process. From discussions with the programme team it was stated that only the 'Key Placement Educators' must mandatorily undertake training. However on page 4 of the 'Final Revalidation Document' it states that "…the SLT placement educator is expected to complete a preparation course".

From the documents submitted and from discussions with the programme team the visitors did not have enough evidence to demonstrate that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training, including refresher training. The visitors require clarification of the arrangements in place for practice placement educator training. The visitors require clarification that outlines who is required to undertake mandatory practice placement educator training, whether both 'Key Placement Educators' and 'Placement Educators' must attend this training prior to receiving students on placement or just 'Key Placement Educators'. If only 'Key Placement Educators' are mandatorily required to undertake the training then the visitors require further evidence that highlights the mechanisms in place that ensures that all 'Placement Educators' are informed of the specific requirements of the programme, including the programme learning outcomes, to ensure that they are able to appropriately support student learning.

In addition to the 'Placement Educator Course' the visitors noted that the programme team offer an annual refresher training session to practice placement educators. This session is not mandatory and the programme team have no defined period in which practice placement educators must refresh their knowledge of supervision and the programme. The visitors require evidence to show how they will provide on-going refresher training to all practice placement educators.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors note that practice placement providers within the NHS must complete a self-assessment using the 'National Standards for Practice-Based Learning audit' developed by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. The visitors also note that the programme team stated that all speech and language therapists working within the NHS must be HPC registered and the expectation would be that service managers would check this. However, the programme team and the practice placement educators also discussed with the visitors the use of independent sector placements and future plans to develop role emerging placements. The programme team stated that there is an audit form which they can use for practice placements that are not within the NHS.

However, the visitors did not have access to these audit tools and did not have enough evidence, from discussions at the visit and from the documentation provided, of the systems or processes in place to ensure that practice placement educators in all settings are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the systems or process to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators at all placements, including NHS, independent sector and role emerging settings are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation**: The programme team should consider constructing and documenting a process that demonstrates how they guarantee and monitor the quality of teaching from specialist visiting lecturers.

**Reason**: From discussions the visitors noted a number of mechanisms utilised by the programme team to quality assure the teaching of specialist visiting lecturers. Examples included organising a pre-meeting with the specialist visiting lecturer, proof reading learning resources and students providing informal feedback after the session. However, the visitors also noted that these mechanisms were often applied informally and inconsistently. The visitors therefore suggest constructing and documenting a process that demonstrates how they guarantee and monitor the quality of teaching from specialist visiting lecturers. The visitors suggest that the programme team may want to formally evaluate sessions delivered by specialist visiting lecturers, and felt that this could be used as a useful continuing professional development tool for specialist visiting lecturers.

**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 programme team should consider setting, and communicating, a defined threshold at which point they will automatically contact a non-attending student on the programme and further emphasise within the programme documentation the consequences of non-attendance.

**Reason**: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors felt that the attendance requirements for the programme were clearly articulated. The visitors also noted that the programme deal with issues of student non-attendance on a case-by-case basis. However, through discussions it was highlighted that the programme team does not have a defined threshold at which point they would automatically contact a non-attending student. The visitors felt that communicating to students a clear, defined, threshold for non-attendance at which point the programme team would automatically contact a student, would enhance consistency and transparency. The visitors also felt that having a clear defined policy for non-attendance would protect the programme team from appeals should they be required to escalate issue of attendance in terms of a student's professional related conduct.

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

**Recommendation**: The programme team should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight where the profession specific aspects of the standards of proficiency relating to knowledge, understanding and skills are covered within the programme.

**Reason**: The visitors are satisfied that this standard is met and that all of the standards of proficiency are covered within the curriculum. However, from reviewing the programme documentation the visitors did note that the indicative module outlines do not clearly highlight where within the programme the profession specific aspects of the standards of proficiency relating to knowledge, understanding and skills are covered. The visitors recommend that the programme team may want to review the programme documentation to further highlight these areas.

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

**Recommendation**: The programme team should consider reviewing the protocols in place for using practice placement educators who are not HPC registered speech and language therapists, to ensure they are appropriately experienced, qualified and have received training relevant to the practice placement.

**Reason**: Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted the future plans to expand the use of independent sector placements and plans to develop role emerging placements. The visitors noted discussions where it was stated that in the future students could be supervised by practice placement educators from outside of the health sector, including teachers. The visitors recommend that the programme team may want to review the protocols in place when using placement educators who are not HPC registered speech and language therapists, to ensure they are appropriately experienced, qualified and have received training relevant to the practice placement. The visitors also note that the programme team may want to investigate other models of supervision, such as arms-length supervision to ensure that students always have profession specific supervisor access.

<div align="right">

Lorna Povey
Martin Duckworth

</div>

# hpc health professions council

Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | University of Surrey |
|---|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Nutrition/Dietetics |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Dietitian |
| Date of visit | 18 – 19 October 2011 |

## Contents

## 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' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 December 2011 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 6 December 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 February 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 29 March 2012.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider issues raised by the previous year's annual monitoring process. The issues raised by annual monitoring affected the following standards - programme management and resources, curriculum, and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

## Visit details

| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Susan Lennie (Dietitian) |
|---|---|
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Victoria Adenugba |
| HPC observer | Tracey Samuel-Smith |
| Proposed student numbers | 38 |
| First approved intake | 1 September 2002 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | 1 September 2012 |
| Chair | Sue Rye (University of Surrey) |
| Secretary | Janet Challis (University of Surrey) |

## Sources of evidence

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

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| Programme specification | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Fitness to Practise/Placement arrangements | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Nutrition programme review meeting minutes | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Stakeholder meeting minutes | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Nutrition and Dietetics Staff structure | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Approval Process for Dietetic Practice Placements | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Education provider | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

## 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 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 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 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.

## Conditions

**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 provide clarification to applicants about their policy on the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) for the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with the education provider the visitors learnt that current students on the programme were not eligible for APEL. However the education provider also stated that if in the future it arose that a student was eligible for APEL this could be offered and the institution wide APEL policy would be used.

The visitors found the education provider's current policy unclear and could not find evidence within the documentation provided to applicants about the programmes position on APEL. The visitors require that the education provider clearly makes known to applicants their policy for APEL before applicants make an informed choice or the education provider makes an offer on this programme. For this SET to continue to be met the visitors need to receive revised documentation that clearly states the programmes position on APEL to all applicants.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of regular formalised on-going monitoring and evaluation systems in place for all of their practice placement settings.

**Reason:** The visitors received as part of the visit documentation the audit used to initially approve practice placements. However there was no documentary evidence showing how placements were to be monitored once they had been approved. During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that there was no formal on-going monitoring mechanism in place. However informal monitoring of practice placements was carried out by Nutrition and Dietetic programme staff who visited each student whilst they were on placement and feedback was also collated from students and practice placement educators after a student had completed a placement.

The visitors did not receive evidence of what checks the Nutrition and Dietetic programme staff made when they visited a placement and they felt there was insufficient evidence that showed how the current system monitored and evaluated the on-going quality of practice placements as without the formal on-going monitoring the visitors were unsure as to how the education provider continued to evaluate their practice placements. The visitors therefore require documentary evidence of the formalised regular monitoring and evaluation systems that the education provider will use to ensure that all their practice

placements remain appropriate and effective for the programme to ensure this standard is being met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that all placement settings for the programme maintain safe and supportive environments.

**Reason:** The visitors received as part of the visit documentation the audit used to initially approve practice placements to make sure they were safe and supportive environments before they are approved. However there was no indication as to how the education provider monitored placements to make sure safety policies and procedures remained in place. During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that there was no formal on-going monitoring mechanism in place to monitor placements. However Nutrition and Dietetic programme staff visited each student whilst they were on placement to ensure that there were no issues and the placement continued to meet the student's needs. No evidence was presented about what the Nutrition and Dietetic programme staff assessed when they visited a placement or how they ensured that safety policies and procedures remained in place and how this information was documented.

The visitors were concerned that the informal monitoring of placements was not sufficiently checking the on-going quality of practice placements to make sure students remained safe in a rapidly changing health setting. As the education provider has overall responsibility for the quality of all their placement settings the visitors require documentation that demonstrates how the education provider ensures that all practice placements remain safe and supportive environments after they have been initially approved.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that all placements settings for the programme are subject to a formalised on-going monitoring process and that an implementation plan is put into place to facilitate this.

**Reason:** The visitors received as part of the visit documentation the audit used to initially approve practice placements. However there was no indication as to how placements were monitored after they were approved. During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that there was no formal monitoring mechanism in place to monitor placements after initial approval. Informal monitoring of placements was carried out by Nutrition and Dietetic programme staff who visited each student whilst they were on placement to ensure that there were no issues and the placement continued to meet the student's needs. Feedback was also collated from students and practice placement educators after a student had completed a placement. At placements where concerns had been raised by students the education provider arranged a visit and met with the placement educators to explore the concerns.

The visitors are concerned that the informal monitoring of placements was not thoroughly checking the on-going quality of practice placements to make sure students remained safe in a rapidly changing health setting or how they ensured that placements remained appropriate environments for students to learn. As the education provider has overall responsibility for the quality of all their placement settings the visitors require documentation that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that all practice placements settings are subject to a formalised on-going monitoring process and how this monitoring process will be implemented to ensure that the programme has a thorough and effective system in place for monitoring all their placements.

**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 evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that all their placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place and how these policies are implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** The visitors received as part of the visit documentation the audit used to initially approve practice placements which checks the equality and diversity policies of new placements before they are approved. However there was no evidence as to how the programme team monitored placements to ensure that equality and diversity policies continued to be implemented after initial approval. During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that there was no formal on-going monitoring mechanism in place to monitor the equality and diversity policies at placements. Nutrition and Dietetic programme staff visited each student whilst they were on placement to ensure that there were no issues and the placement continued to meet the student's needs however they did not monitor the equality and diversity policies during these visits.

Without the formal on-going monitoring the visitors were unsure as to how the education provider ensured equality and diversity policies remained in place and were being implemented at all their practice placements. As the education provider has overall responsibility for the quality of all their placement settings the visitors require documentation that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that all practice placements are subject to a formalised on-going monitoring process which checks that equality and diversity policies remain relevant and in place.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at practice placement settings after their initial approval.

**Reason:** The visitors received as part of the visit documentation the audit used to initially approve practice placements which checks the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting before they are approved. However there was no indication as to how this was monitored to

ensure that there remained a sufficient amount of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support students in their learning after a placements initial approval. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that Nutrition and Dietetic programme staff visited each student whilst they were on placement to ensure that there were no issues and the placement continued to meet student's needs. No evidence was presented of what the Nutrition and Dietetic programme staff reviewed when they visited a placement setting and how they checked the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at each placement setting they visited.

Without the formal on-going monitoring the visitors were unsure as to how the education provider ensured the level of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at their placement settings remained adequate. As the education provider has overall responsibility for the quality of all their placement settings the visitors require documentation that outlines the on-going monitoring systems the education provider will use to ensure practice placement settings maintain a sufficient amount of appropriately qualified and experienced staff after their initial approval.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they monitor practice placement educators to make sure they remain appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors received as part of the visit documentation the audit used to initially approve practice placements which checks that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed, before a practice placement is approved. However there was no indication as to how the programme team monitored practice placement educators' registration status to ensure they remained on the relevant register. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that the registration status of practice placement educators was checked at the initial approval however no on-going checks were made as they expect the placement settings to make these checks. No evidence was presented at the visit as to how the education provider made sure placement settings checked all placement educators' registration status and notified them of this.

Without the formal on-going monitoring the visitors were unsure as to how the education provider ensured that all practice placement educators remained appropriately registered. As the education provider has overall responsibility for the quality of all their placement settings the visitors require documentation that demonstrates the on-going monitoring procedures which will ensure placement educators remain appropriately registered before they take on students, unless other arrangements have been agreed.

Pauline Douglas
Susan Lennie

## Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of education provider** | University of the West of England, Bristol |
| **Programme name** | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science) |
| **Mode of delivery** | Full time<br>Part time |
| **Relevant part of HPC Register** | Biomedical scientist |
| **Date of visit** | 21 – 22 September 2011 |

## Contents

## 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 7 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 26 October 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 February 2012.

## Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical) programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

The education provider plans to recruit students to a generic programme – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences). During the second year of this programme the students decide which of four pathways they wish to complete. The programme award reflects the pathway title the student has completed. The visitors will recommend approval for this pathway title – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science).

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 visit also considered the following programmes: BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science), and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science).  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. A separate report produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Christine Murphy (Biomedical scientist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) |
|---|---|
| HPC executive officers (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | Maximum of 27 per cohort across all pathways (Genetic Science, Tissue Science, Infection Science and Blood Science) |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2011 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Chair | Roger Conlan (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
| Secretary | Dave Nolan (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
| Members of the joint panel | Neville Hall (Institute of Biomedical Science) |
| | Dan Smith (Institute of Biomedical Science) |
| | Alan Wainright (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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| Supplementary Documentation | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, there have been no past external examiners' reports 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme and the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) programme. The students from the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) programme had not yet decided the Healthcare Science pathway they would be completing; they were part of the first cohort for this programme.

## 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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## 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 programme team must revise all programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure references to the programme award are accurate.

**Reason:** This programme is part of a suite of programmes under the generic title of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences)'. Students enrol on this generic programme and are required to choose a pathway through the programme that leads to the specific programme award of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)'. The HPC holds the title of the pathways as the approved programme, which leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC. The documentation submitted by the programme team prior to the visit used the generic title of the programme throughout, "We look forward to working with you and to helping you achieve your goal of gaining a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) degree. This degree has been approved by both the Institute of Biomedical Science and the Health Professions Council and conferment of this degree makes you eligible to apply for Health Professions Council Registration." (Programme handbook, p1)

The visitors considered this to be confusing for the students and potential applicants for the programme. The visitors considered this implies the approved programme title is 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)' which is not correct. The approved programme award title the students would graduate with is 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)'.

The visitors were satisfied with the generic programme award being used to reference the suite of programmes; however, for accuracy they require the additional pathway titles to be included whenever the title of the programme is referred to. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise all programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure accuracy when referring to the programme title.

**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 programme team must revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the placement structure and the financial support mechanisms for placement activity.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme documentation and advertising materials prior to the visit. The website materials stated this is a programme with placements but gave no further detail about them. The programme is structured so the bulk of the placements take place in the summer at the end of levels one, two and three, this means the programme runs straight through three full years.

The visitors considered students may wish to spend time during the summer months earning money to help fund them through the next academic year. If students are unable to do this it may affect their decision about whether to apply for this programme. The visitors judged the structure of the placements to be important for potential applicants and students to be aware of.

The documents submitted prior to the visit referred to the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) financially supporting students for their clinical placement activity (Contextual documentation for Accreditation/Reaccreditation, p9). At the visit, the programme team and a representative from the SHA confirmed this commitment. The visitors considered the details of this financial support (how it is transferred to the student and the amount) to be important information for potential applicants and students on the programme.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the placement structure and the financial support mechanisms for placement activity.


**3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate they are committed to limiting the risks associated with arranging placements and have a plan in place if a placement becomes unavailable for a student.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit looked at the placement arrangements for the programme. This programme is part of a suite of programmes under the generic title of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences)'. Students enrol on this generic programme and then are required to choose a pathway through the programme that leads to the specific programme award of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)'. At the end of level one, students choose their pathway field preference, competitive interviews are held and as a result students are placed into a particular programme pathway. The pathway they are placed into will determine the field of their placement at the end of levels two and three. Level two is comprised of generic modules and then a pathway specific module. Three of the pathways (Genetic, Blood and Tissue Sciences) will take one module while the other pathway (Infection Science) takes a different module. In level three, all pathways are taught separately. The programme team confirmed that students could transfer between the Genetic, Blood and Tissue Sciences pathways but not from the Infection Sciences pathway. Transfer between pathways can only occur before the second year summer placement.

Discussion with the programme team indicated the placements will agree to hold a certain number of places for students in particular fields for placements in level one, two and three. They have agreed this will be arranged nine months before that cohort starts. This arrangement is made on informal discussions between the programme team and the placement providers. The existing programmes working with these placement providers have built up a strong network between placements and the education provider.

The visitors were satisfied with the strong network of placement providers that work with the programme team, however were unable to determine how the programme could guarantee a placement would be available for a particular student in their particular field. The visitors considered the placement providers may agree to take a student on placement before the cohort commences and then may have to change those arrangements in either level one or level two of the programme. This could therefore result in the student having no placement and alternative arrangements having to be made. Due to the nature of the pathways, if a student was on either the Genetic, Blood or Tissue Sciences they would be able to switch pathways and so increase the chances of finding an alternative placement site. If the student was on the Infection Science pathway they would be unable to switch between pathways and so there could be more problems in seeking an alternative placement.

The programme team discussed the possibility for a student to be able to defer a placement if necessary. This could have an impact on the original number of placement places needed if changes are made in an academic year and more places are required the following year.

The visitors were concerned a situation could arise where a student on a particular pathway might not be able to continue with their practical training in that pathway if their placement place became unavailable. The visitors require reassurance the programme team have made this possibility clear for the students on the programme before they take up an offer of a place. The visitors also require reassurance the programme team are aware of the potential difficulties and have taken steps to limit the occurrence (such as a signed memorandum of understanding with placements) and have a plan in place for finding new placements should this occur.

Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to submit further evidence to demonstrate the programme team are committed to limiting the risks associated with arranging placements and have a plan in place for if a placement becomes unavailable for a student.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the programme documentation is finalised for the programme.

**Reason:** Not all the documentation submitted prior to the visit were finalised versions. Because the programme is running with students, the visitors highlighted the documentation should all be finalised as soon as possible. For example, the module handbook for the Interprofessional Practice module (UZYSFD-20-2) did not have this programme included in the list of programmes that the module will be contributing to, on the front of the document.  The visitors were also aware that as a result of the visit and the conditions detailed in this report, documentation would need to be revised. The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure all documentation is finalised as soon as possible.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for biomedical scientists and contains accurate information about the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted prior to the visit contained occurrences of misleading information. The visitors noted instances where the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioner' is used, "to practice as a Healthcare Science Practitioner" and "…student can undertake the full breadth of practice expected of a newly qualified Healthcare Science Practitioner" (Placement Handbook, p7). The HPC does not regulate 'Healthcare Science Practitioners' and so the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioners' is not a protected title. The HPC regulates 'Biomedical scientists' and the protected title for this profession is 'Biomedical Scientist'.

The visitors considered the documentation to be misleading for potential applicants and students with the implication that upon completion of the programme students will be able to register with the HPC and then be able to use the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioner'. Upon completion of the programme, and with successful application to the HPC Register, the protected title students will be able to use will be 'Biomedical scientist'. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the protected title of 'Biomedical scientist' is clearly articulated throughout and the current landscape of 'healthcare science practitioners' is clearly explained.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the different options available to support students should they fail an aspect of the programme.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit included a diagram of the pattern of programme delivery (Programme handbook, p5). From this diagram the visitors noted the structure of the programme means students' progress straight through academic work and placement work for the three years of the programme with no summer holidays. The visitors had concerns if a student failed an aspect of the programme, there would be significant pressure on that student to manage any exam re-sits or placement retakes whilst they continued through the programme. When this was discussed with the programme team, it was indicated there were informal options available for a student who fails an exam or a placement. The programme team highlighted that communication between the placement supervisor and the personal tutor is crucial for support to the student and that each case is looked at on an individual basis.

The programme team highlighted if an exam was failed before a placement, it was possible for allocated time to be negotiated between the personal tutor and the placement supervisor for the student. This would allow the student to have time to prepare for examination re-sits.  The programme team described the option for students to defer placements if necessary and to halt progression to the following academic year if aspects of the previous year needed to be retaken. There was also the option for the personal tutor and the placement supervisor to review the learning outcomes intended to be assessed at one placement and to defer them to following placements. This would effectively allow the student to 'step back' from the placement and concentrate on examination re-sits with no detrimental effect to either the current placement or progression on from that placement.

The visitors noted the programme handbook had a section about passing academic modules (Student Handbook, p9-10) however did not include information about the options available for students should they fail an aspect of academic work or a placement.  It can be seen that close communication between the placement supervisors and the personal tutors is important when considering the best course of action for a student who has failed an aspect of the programme. It is important that the placement providers are aware of these options when working with students from the programme. It is important for the students to be aware of the support arrangements in place should they need to be used.

Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise programme documentation to include information about the different options available to support students should they fail an aspect of the programme.


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

**Condition:** The programme team must implement written protocols to obtain consent for when students participate as service users, and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical and clinical teaching.

**Reason:** Through the tour of facilities, the visitors noted there would be some aspects of practical or clinical teaching where students would be participating as service users. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted students were notified they could 'opt-out' of participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching through posters informing students of this option. There was no formal information regarding consent protocols in place, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed.  In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from students to participate in the practical and clinical teaching.  A common way to obtain informed consent is via a form to be signed as part of the admission procedures. The form could inform students about the possible scenarios they are expected to undertake and to detail the procedures for 'opting-out' taking account of cultural differences and the students health.

The visitors require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

### 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.

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements for placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements or the associated monitoring mechanisms in place for students at placement. Discussions with the programme team indicated the Placement Learning Unit (PLU) would monitor the attendance at placements and inform the programme leader of absences if necessary. The programme team also indicated the PLU systems were being modified to give the programme team more control. The programme team highlighted attendance records would be taken into account when awarding the student with the final programme award and so could affect that decision.

From the evidence received, the visitors were not satisfied the requirements of attendance at placement were being fully communicated to the students and placement providers or were being monitored in a way that allows the programme team to be aware of absences. The visitors noted if all parties involved with placement were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the programme team to monitor and take action to ensure absence does not affect a trainee's learning and development on placement.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide programme documentation that clearly communicates to students, placement staff and programme staff, the minimum attendance requirements for placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate placements for the programme are subject to formal approval and monitoring processes. This should include documented processes for initial approval and systems in place for the on-going monitoring of placements.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not find enough evidence of documented processes in place for the initial approval and on-going monitoring of placements. There was no information provided regarding the initial approval processes by which the programme team can evaluate and record the suitability of the placements to be used. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme would link to the education providers Placement Learning Unit (PLU). The programme team highlighted they were

undergoing some development with the PLU in order that they could have more responsibility with managing the placements for their programme. The visitors could not review the approval and monitoring systems in place for this programme because these developments were not ready.

At the visit the visitors were provided with the PLU's current placement self-assessment audit form, this was based on the HPC's standards of education and training (SETs), in particular SET 5. The programme team indicated that with the existing programmes the programme team would visit a new placement site as part of the initial placement approval process. After this initial visit, the self-assessment audit form completed annually would be used to monitor the placements.

The visitors were satisfied with the current PLU self-assessment form and the visits to new placement sites. The visitors were however, concerned the programme team did not verify the self-assessment forms and so may not be monitoring placements effectively. The visitors were aware that it would be difficult to audit every placement via a visit annually but noted visits to placements to see students could be used to verify details of the self-assessment form.

In order to ensure the programme team maintains overall responsibility for the placements and the approval and monitoring systems for placements are thorough and effective, the visitors require the programme team to submit information about the approval and monitoring processes that will be in place for this programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the content of the practice placement educator training workshops they plan to deliver for the practice placement educators for this programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team intends to use placement provider workshops delivered by the education provider. These workshops are to inform practice placement educators about the requirements of this programme. The visitors received no information regarding the content of these training workshops. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the programme team would ensure practice placement educators are appropriately oriented to the requirements of this particular programme. The training should include details of the learning outcomes and assessment procedures, the support available for students and practice placement educators, information of the pathway and module structure of the programme and information about the final year research module. The training sessions should ensure practice placement educators are informed when changes are made to the programme.  The visitors therefore require further information regarding the programme specific information delivered to practice placement providers to ensure they are appropriately trained to work with students from this programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the training sessions intended to provide practice placement educators information about assessment of the PTP Training Manual.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) 'Train the trainer' sessions. The 'Train the trainer' sessions are to inform practice placement educators about the MSC Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool. Discussion at the visit indicated the PTP Training Manual was in a draft format and the online assessment tool had not yet been produced. The programme team however, were confident the uncertainty of the assessment of the PTP Training manual would be resolved and if not, alternative assessment arrangements could be made. The visitors received no information regarding the content of the MSC 'Train the trainer' sessions which would inform the placement educators of the particulars of the assessment for the placements. There was no information available regarding dates and scheduled sessions for practice placement educators. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team would ensure the placement providers would be prepared to work with students from this programme in light of the specific PTP Training Manual and the online assessment tool. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the content and scheduling of the MSC 'Train the trainer' sessions (or if any equivalent sessions are arranged) for the assessment of the PTP Training Manual to ensure the practice placement educators are appropriately 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 programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates students and practice placement educators are appropriately informed of the planned assessment procedures for the PTP Training Manual.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted, the visitors were unclear as to how the placement learning outcomes would be assessed. At the visit, it was confirmed the programme intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool for placements.  At the visit, the visitors saw a draft version of the PTP Training Manual and it was noted that the online assessment tool had not yet been developed by MSC. The visitors

were concerned the online assessment tool would not be completed by the time the students go out to their first placement. The programme team stated the PTP Training Manual contained information on the assessment criteria and so could be used to implement an alternative assessment tool to assess students whilst the online assessment tool was being developed. The visitors noted the draft PTP Training Manual contained some information regarding assessment methods (case based discussions (CbDs), directly observed procedures / direct observation of practical skills (DOPs)) however, it indicated the details of the different CbDs and DOPs would be found on the online assessment tool. The programme documentation did not include any information about the procedures for assessment at placement using the PTP Training Manual because procedures have not yet been finalised.

Due to the unconfirmed arrangements for the assessment of the PTP Training Manual, the visitors were unable to determine what information is being given to students and practice placement educators in order to prepare them for the placement. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence that demonstrates students and practice placement educators are appropriately informed of the planned assessment procedures for the PTP Training Manual.

**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 revised placement programme documentation that has had instances of confusing and inconsistent information removed.

**Reason:** The Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement submitted prior to the visit contained information that was inconsistent and confusing. The handbook was confusing in its references to assessment on placement. The programme team confirmed at the visit that students would be undertaking a Training Portfolio (which is based on the institute of Biomedical Science registration training portfolio) and the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual.

The visitors noted the handbook is unclear in places when describing the assessment and often only references the PTP Training manual, for example, "Professional requirements: Successful completion of the Healthcare Science (Life sciences) Training Manual" (Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement, p13). The visitors noted in other places, the handbook only discusses the Registration Training Portfolio, for example, "It must be clearly understood by all

students that the procedure described below is designed to allow them to complete the Registration Training Portfolio" (Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement, p10). There is also a picture on p9 of the online system that students will use and it is of the IBMS Laboratory-based Learning Agreement e-portfolio. This e-portfolio is referenced through the responsibilities of parties to the agreement.

The visitors understood the two assessment methods of the PTP Training Manual and the Training Portfolio is complicated. Because of this, they have stressed the importance of ensuring the programme documentation is as clear as possible for the students. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review and revise the programme placement documentation to ensure students will be clear as to the two assessment methods being used.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates how the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual will be assessed.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the placement learning outcomes would be assessed. At the visit, it was confirmed the programme intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool on placements. At the visit, the visitors saw a draft version of the PTP Training Manual and it was noted that the online assessment tool had not yet been developed by MSC. The programme team stated the PTP Training Manual contained information on the assessment criteria and so could be used to implement an alternative assessment tool to assess students whilst the online assessment tool was being developed. The visitors noted the draft PTP Training Manual contained some information regarding assessment methods (case based discussions (CbDs), directly observed procedures / direct observation of practical skills (DOPs)) however, it indicated the details of the different CbDs and DOPs would be found on the online assessment tool. Due to the unconfirmed arrangements for the assessment of placement, the visitors were unable to determine whether the assessment methods employed at placement would appropriately measure the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence that demonstrates how the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual will be assessed.

<div align="right">
Christine Murphy<br>
Mary Popeck
</div>

## Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of education provider** | University of the West of England, Bristol |
| **Programme name** | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science) |
| **Mode of delivery** | Full time<br>Part time |
| **Relevant part of HPC Register** | Biomedical scientist |
| **Date of visit** | 21 – 22 September 2011 |

## Contents

## 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 7 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 26 October 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 February 2012.

## Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical) programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

The education provider plans to recruit students to a generic programme – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences). During the second year of this programme the students decide which of four pathways they wish to complete. The programme award reflects the pathway title the student has completed. The visitors will recommend approval for this pathway title – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science).

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 visit also considered the following programmes: BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science).  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. A separate report produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Christine Murphy (Biomedical scientist) Mary Pepeck (Biomedical scientist) |
|---|---|
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | Maximum of 27 per cohort across all pathways (Genetic Science, Tissue Science, Infection Science and Blood Science) |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2011 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Chair | Roger Conlan (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
| Secretary | Dave Nolan (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
| Members of the joint panel | Neville Hall (Institute of Biomedical Science) |
| | Dan Smith (Institute of Biomedical Science) |
| | Alan Wainright (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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| Supplementary Documentation | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, there have been no past external examiners' reports 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme and the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) programme. The students from the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) programme had not yet decided the Healthcare Science pathway they would be completing; they were part of the first cohort for this programme.

## 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 42 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## 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 programme team must revise all programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure references to the programme award are accurate.

**Reason:** This programme is part of a suite of programmes under the generic title of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences)'. Students enrol on this generic programme and are required to choose a pathway through the programme that leads to the specific programme award of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)'. The HPC holds the title of the pathways as the approved programme, which leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC. The documentation submitted by the programme team prior to the visit used the generic title of the programme throughout, "We look forward to working with you and to helping you achieve your goal of gaining a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) degree. This degree has been approved by both the Institute of Biomedical Science and the Health Professions Council and conferment of this degree makes you eligible to apply for Health Professions Council Registration." (Programme handbook, p1)

The visitors considered this to be confusing for the students and potential applicants for the programme. The visitors considered this implies the approved programme title is 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)' which is not correct. The approved programme award title the students would graduate with is 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)'.

The visitors were satisfied with the generic programme award being used to reference the suite of programmes; however, for accuracy they require the additional pathway titles to be included whenever the title of the programme is referred to. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise all programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure accuracy when referring to the programme title.

**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 programme team must revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the placement structure and the financial support mechanisms for placement activity.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme documentation and advertising materials prior to the visit. The website materials stated this is a programme with placements but gave no further detail about them. The programme is structured so the bulk of the placements take place in the summer at the end of levels one, two and three, this means the programme runs straight through three full years.

The visitors considered students may wish to spend time during the summer months earning money to help fund them through the next academic year. If students are unable to do this it may affect their decision about whether to apply for this programme. The visitors judged the structure of the placements to be important for potential applicants and students to be aware of.

The documents submitted prior to the visit referred to the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) financially supporting students for their clinical placement activity (Contextual documentation for Accreditation/Reaccreditation, p9). At the visit, the programme team and a representative from the SHA confirmed this commitment. The visitors considered the details of this financial support (how it is transferred to the student and the amount) to be important information for potential applicants and students on the programme.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the placement structure and the financial support mechanisms for placement activity.


**3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate they are committed to limiting the risks associated with arranging placements and have a plan in place if a placement becomes unavailable for a student.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit looked at the placement arrangements for the programme. This programme is part of a suite of programmes under the generic title of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences)'. Students enrol on this generic programme and then are required to choose a pathway through the programme that leads to the specific programme award of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)'. At the end of level one, students choose their pathway field preference, competitive interviews are held and as a result students are placed into a particular programme pathway. The pathway they are placed into will determine the field of their placement at the end of levels two and three. Level two is comprised of generic modules and then a pathway specific module. Three of the pathways (Genetic, Blood and Tissue Sciences) will take one module while the other pathway (Infection Science) takes a different module.  In level three, all pathways are taught separately.  The programme team confirmed that students could transfer between the Genetic, Blood and Tissue Sciences pathways but not from the Infection Sciences pathway. Transfer between pathways can only occur before the second year summer placement.

Discussion with the programme team indicated the placements will agree to hold a certain number of places for students in particular fields for placements in level one, two and three. They have agreed this will be arranged nine months before that cohort starts. This arrangement is made on informal discussions between the programme team and the placement providers. The existing programmes working with these placement providers have built up a strong network between placements and the education provider.

The visitors were satisfied with the strong network of placement providers that work with the programme team, however were unable to determine how the programme could guarantee a placement would be available for a particular student in their particular field. The visitors considered the placement providers may agree to take a student on placement before the cohort commences and then may have to change those arrangements in either level one or level two of the programme. This could therefore result in the student having no placement and alternative arrangements having to be made. Due to the nature of the pathways, if a student was on either the Genetic, Blood or Tissue Sciences they would be able to switch pathways and so increase the chances of finding an alternative placement site. If the student was on the Infection Science pathway they would be unable to switch between pathways and so there could be more problems in seeking an alternative placement.

The programme team discussed the possibility for a student to be able to defer a placement if necessary. This could have an impact on the original number of placement places needed if changes are made in an academic year and more places are required the following year.

The visitors were concerned a situation could arise where a student on a particular pathway might not be able to continue with their practical training in that pathway if their placement place became unavailable. The visitors require reassurance the programme team have made this possibility clear for the students on the programme before they take up an offer of a place. The visitors also require reassurance the programme team are aware of the potential difficulties and have taken steps to limit the occurrence (such as a signed memorandum of understanding with placements) and have a plan in place for finding new placements should this occur.

Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to submit further evidence to demonstrate the programme team are committed to limiting the risks associated with arranging placements and have a plan in place for if a placement becomes unavailable for a student.


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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the programme documentation is finalised for the programme.

**Reason:** Not all the documentation submitted prior to the visit were finalised versions. Because the programme is running with students, the visitors highlighted the documentation should all be finalised as soon as possible. For example, the module handbook for the Interprofessional Practice module (UZYSFD-20-2) did not have this programme included in the list of programmes that the module will be contributing to, on the front of the document. The visitors were also aware that as a result of the visit and the conditions detailed in this report, documentation would need to be revised. The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure all documentation is finalised as soon as possible.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for biomedical scientists and contains accurate information about the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted prior to the visit contained occurrences of misleading information. The visitors noted instances where the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioner' is used, "to practice as a Healthcare Science Practitioner" and "…student can undertake the full breadth of practice expected of a newly qualified Healthcare Science Practitioner" (Placement Handbook, p7).  The HPC does not regulate 'Healthcare Science Practitioners' and so the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioners' is not a protected title. The HPC regulates 'Biomedical scientists' and the protected title for this profession is 'Biomedical Scientist'.

The visitors considered the documentation to be misleading for potential applicants and students with the implication that upon completion of the programme students will be able to register with the HPC and then be able to use the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioner'. Upon completion of the programme, and with successful application to the HPC Register, the protected title students will be able to use will be 'Biomedical scientist'.  The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the protected title of 'Biomedical scientist' is clearly articulated throughout and the current landscape of 'healthcare science practitioners' is clearly explained.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the different options available to support students should they fail an aspect of the programme.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit included a diagram of the pattern of programme delivery (Programme handbook, p5). From this diagram the visitors noted the structure of the programme means students' progress straight through academic work and placement work for the three years of the programme with no summer holidays. The visitors had concerns if a student failed an aspect of the programme, there would be significant pressure on that student to manage any exam re-sits or placement retakes whilst they continued through the programme. When this was discussed with the programme team, it was indicated there were informal options available for a student who fails an exam or a placement. The programme team highlighted that communication between the placement supervisor and the personal tutor is crucial for support to the student and that each case is looked at on an individual basis.

The programme team highlighted if an exam was failed before a placement, it was possible for allocated time to be negotiated between the personal tutor and the placement supervisor for the student. This would allow the student to have time to prepare for examination re-sits. The programme team described the option for students to defer placements if necessary and to halt progression to the following academic year if aspects of the previous year needed to be retaken. There was also the option for the personal tutor and the placement supervisor to review the learning outcomes intended to be assessed at one placement and to defer them to following placements. This would effectively allow the student to 'step back' from the placement and concentrate on examination re-sits with no detrimental effect to either the current placement or progression on from that placement.

The visitors noted the programme handbook had a section about passing academic modules (Student Handbook, p9-10) however did not include information about the options available for students should they fail an aspect of academic work or a placement. It can be seen that close communication between the placement supervisors and the personal tutors is important when considering the best course of action for a student who has failed an aspect of the programme. It is important that the placement providers are aware of these options when working with students from the programme. It is important for the students to be aware of the support arrangements in place should they need to be used.

Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise programme documentation to include information about the different options available to support students should they fail an aspect of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must implement written protocols to obtain consent for when students participate as service users, and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical and clinical teaching.

**Reason:** Through the tour of facilities, the visitors noted there would be some aspects of practical or clinical teaching where students would be participating as service users. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted students were notified they could 'opt-out' of participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching through posters informing students of this option. There was no formal information regarding consent protocols in place, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed. In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from students to participate in the practical and clinical teaching. A common way to obtain informed consent is via a form to be signed as part of the admission procedures. The form could inform students about the possible scenarios they are expected to undertake and to detail the procedures for 'opting-out' taking account of cultural differences and the students health.

The visitors require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.


**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.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements for placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements or the associated monitoring mechanisms in place for students at placement. Discussions with the programme team indicated the Placement Learning Unit (PLU) would monitor the attendance at placements and inform the programme leader of absences if necessary. The programme team also indicated the PLU systems were being modified to give the programme team more control. The programme team highlighted attendance records would be taken into account when awarding the student with the final programme award and so could affect that decision.

From the evidence received, the visitors were not satisfied the requirements of attendance at placement were being fully communicated to the students and placement providers or were being monitored in a way that allows the programme team to be aware of absences. The visitors noted if all parties involved with placement were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the programme team to monitor and take action to ensure absence does not affect a trainee's learning and development on placement.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide programme documentation that clearly communicates to students, placement staff and programme staff, the minimum attendance requirements for placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.


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

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure placement providers carry out regular risk assessments.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated one of the factors the education provider uses when determining if placements can be approved is if the IBMS has approved that site (SETs Mapping Document SET 5.4). The visitors are aware however that the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories as suitable for training purposes. The education provider needs an effective approval and monitoring system that allows the programme team to maintain overall responsibility for the placements and to determine that the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

In light of the fact the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories, the visitors stressed the importance of ensuring genetic laboratory placements for this programme will have completed appropriate risk assessments as part of the initial approval and on-going monitoring processes. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure placement providers carry out regular risk assessments.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate placements for the programme are subject to formal approval and monitoring processes. This should include documented processes for initial approval and systems in place for the on-going monitoring of placements.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not find enough evidence of documented processes in place for the initial approval and on-going monitoring of placements. There was no information provided regarding the initial approval processes by which the programme team can evaluate and record the suitability of the placements to be used. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme would link to the education providers Placement Learning Unit (PLU). The programme team highlighted they were undergoing some development with the PLU in order that they could have more responsibility with managing the placements for their programme. The visitors could not review the approval and monitoring systems in place for this programme because these developments were not ready.

At the visit the visitors were provided with the PLU's current placement self-assessment audit form, this was based on the HPC's standards of education and training (SETs), in particular SET 5. The programme team indicated that with the existing programmes the programme team would visit a new placement site as part of the initial placement approval process. After this initial visit, the self-assessment audit form completed annually would be used to monitor the placements.

The visitors were satisfied with the current PLU self-assessment form and the visits to new placement sites. The visitors were however, concerned the programme team did not verify the self-assessment forms and so may not be monitoring placements effectively. The visitors were aware that it would be difficult to audit every placement via a visit annually but noted visits to placements to see students could be used to verify details of the self-assessment form.

In order to ensure the programme team maintains overall responsibility for the placements and the approval and monitoring systems for placements are thorough and effective, the visitors require the programme team to submit information about the approval and monitoring processes that will be in place for this programme.

**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 programme team must ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated one of the factors the education provider uses when determining if placements can be approved is if the IBMS has approved that site (SETs Mapping Document SET 5.4). The visitors are aware however that the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories as suitable for training purposes. The education provider needs an effective approval and monitoring system that allows the programme team to maintain overall responsibility for the placements and to determine that the practice placement settings have equality and diversity policies in place.
In light of the fact the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories, the visitors stressed the importance of ensuring genetic laboratory placements for this programme will have completed equality and diversity policies as part of the initial approval and on-going monitoring processes. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.


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

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated one of the factors the education provider uses when determining if placements can be approved is if the IBMS has approved that site (SETs Mapping Document SET 5.4). The visitors are aware however that the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories as suitable for training purposes. The education provider needs an effective approval and monitoring system that allows the programme team to maintain overall responsibility for the placements and to determine that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.
In light of the fact the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories, the visitors stressed the importance of ensuring genetic laboratory placements for this programme will have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place as part of the initial approval and on-going monitoring processes . Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated one of the factors the education provider uses when determining if placements can be approved is if the IBMS has approved that site (SETs Mapping Document SET 5.4).. The visitors are aware however that the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories as suitable for training purposes. The education provider needs an effective approval and monitoring system that allows the programme team to maintain overall responsibility for the placements and to ensure practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In light of the fact the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories, the visitors stressed the importance of ensuring genetic laboratory placements for this programme have practice placement educators that have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience as part of the initial approval and on-going monitoring processes . Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the content of the practice placement educator training workshops they plan to deliver for the practice placement educators for this programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team intends to use placement provider workshops delivered by the education provider. These workshops are to inform practice placement educators about the requirements of this programme. The visitors received no information regarding the content of these training workshops. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the programme team would ensure practice placement educators are appropriately oriented to the requirements of this particular programme. The training should include details of the learning outcomes and assessment procedures, the support available for students and practice placement educators, information of the pathway and module structure of the programme and information about the final year research module. The training sessions should ensure practice placement educators are informed when changes are made to the programme.  The visitors therefore require further information regarding the programme specific information delivered to practice placement providers to ensure they are appropriately trained to work with students from this programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the training sessions intended to provide practice placement educators information about assessment of the PTP Training Manual.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) 'Train the trainer' sessions. The 'Train the trainer' sessions are to inform practice placement educators about the MSC Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool. Discussion at the visit indicated the PTP Training Manual was in a draft format and the online assessment tool had not yet been produced. The programme team however, were confident the uncertainty of the assessment of the PTP Training manual would be resolved and if not, alternative assessment arrangements could be made. The visitors received no information regarding the content of the MSC 'Train the trainer' sessions which would inform the placement educators of the particulars of the assessment for the placements. There was no information available regarding dates and scheduled sessions for practice placement educators. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team would ensure the placement providers would be prepared to work with students from this programme in light of the specific PTP Training Manual and the online assessment tool. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the content and scheduling of the MSC 'Train the trainer' sessions (or if any equivalent sessions are arranged) for the assessment of the PTP Training Manual to ensure the practice placement educators are appropriately trained.

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

**Condition:** the programme team must ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure practice placement educators are appropriately registered or have other arrangements agreed.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated one of the factors the education provider uses when determining if placements can be approved is if the IBMS has approved that site (SETs Mapping Document SET 5.4).. The visitors are aware however that the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories as suitable for training purposes. The education provider needs an effective approval and monitoring system that allows the programme team to maintain overall responsibility for the placements and to ensure practice placement educators are appropriately registered or have agreed other arrangements. In light of the fact the IBMS do not approve genetic laboratories, the visitors stressed the importance of ensuring genetic laboratory placements for this programme have practice placement educators who are appropriately registered or have agreed other arrangements, as part of the initial approval and on-going monitoring processes . Therefore, the visitors require the programme

team to ensure the placement approval and monitoring processes for genetic laboratory placements ensure practice placement educators are appropriately registered or have other arrangements agreed.

**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 programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates students and practice placement educators are appropriately informed of the planned assessment procedures for the PTP Training Manual.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted, the visitors were unclear as to how the placement learning outcomes would be assessed. At the visit, it was confirmed the programme intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool for placements. At the visit, the visitors saw a draft version of the PTP Training Manual and it was noted that the online assessment tool had not yet been developed by MSC. The visitors were concerned the online assessment tool would not be completed by the time the students go out to their first placement. The programme team stated the PTP Training Manual contained information on the assessment criteria and so could be used to implement an alternative assessment tool to assess students whilst the online assessment tool was being developed. The visitors noted the draft PTP Training Manual contained some information regarding assessment methods (case based discussions (CbDs), directly observed procedures / direct observation of practical skills (DOPs)) however, it indicated the details of the different CbDs and DOPs would be found on the online assessment tool. The programme documentation did not include any information about the procedures for assessment at placement using the PTP Training Manual because procedures have not yet been finalised.

Due to the unconfirmed arrangements for the assessment of the PTP Training Manual, the visitors were unable to determine what information is being given to students and practice placement educators in order to prepare them for the placement. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence that demonstrates students and practice placement educators are appropriately informed of the planned assessment procedures for the PTP Training Manual.

**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 revised placement programme documentation that has had instances of confusing and inconsistent information removed.

**Reason:** The Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement submitted prior to the visit contained information that was inconsistent and confusing. The handbook was confusing in its references to assessment on placement. The programme team confirmed at the visit that students would be undertaking a Training Portfolio (which is based on the institute of Biomedical Science registration training portfolio) and the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual.

The visitors noted the handbook is unclear in places when describing the assessment and often only references the PTP Training manual, for example, "Professional requirements: Successful completion of the Healthcare Science (Life sciences) Training Manual" (Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement, p13).  The visitors noted in other places, the handbook only discusses the Registration Training Portfolio, for example, "It must be clearly understood by all students that the procedure described below is designed to allow them to complete the Registration Training Portfolio" (Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement, p10). There is also a picture on p9 of the online system that students will use and it is of the IBMS Laboratory-based Learning Agreement e-portfolio. This e-portfolio is referenced through the responsibilities of parties to the agreement.

The visitors understood the two assessment methods of the PTP Training Manual and the Training Portfolio is complicated. Because of this, they have stressed the importance of ensuring the programme documentation is as clear as possible for the students.  The visitors therefore require the programme team to review and revise the programme placement documentation to ensure students will be clear as to the two assessment methods being used.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates how the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual will be assessed.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the placement learning outcomes would be assessed. At the visit, it was confirmed the programme intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool on placements. At the visit, the visitors saw a draft version of the PTP Training Manual and it was noted that the online assessment tool had not yet been developed by MSC. The programme team stated the PTP Training Manual contained information on the assessment criteria and so could be used to implement an alternative assessment tool to assess students whilst the online assessment tool was being developed. The visitors noted the draft PTP Training Manual contained some information regarding assessment methods (case based discussions (CbDs), directly observed procedures / direct observation of practical skills (DOPs)) however, it indicated the details of the different CbDs and DOPs would be found on the online assessment tool. Due to the unconfirmed arrangements for the assessment of placement, the visitors were unable to determine whether the assessment methods employed at placement would appropriately measure the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence that demonstrates how the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual will be assessed.

Christine Murphy
Mary Popeck

# Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | University of the West of England, Bristol |
|---|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time<br>Part time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Biomedical scientist |
| Date of visit | 21 – 22 September 2011 |

## Contents

## 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 7 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 26 October 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 February 2012.

## Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical) programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

The education provider plans to recruit students to a generic programme – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences). During the second year of this programme the students decide which of four pathways they wish to complete. The programme award reflects the pathway title the student has completed. The visitors will recommend approval for this pathway title – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science).

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 visit also considered the following programmes: BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science).  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. A separate report produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Christine Murphy (Biomedical scientist) |
| | Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | Maximum of 27 per cohort across all pathways (Genetic Science, Tissue Science, Infection Science and Blood Science) |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2011 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Chair | Roger Conlan (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
| Secretary | Dave Nolan (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
| Members of the joint panel | Neville Hall (Institute of Biomedical Science) |
| | Dan Smith (Institute of Biomedical Science) |
| | Alan Wainright (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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| Supplementary Documentation | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, there have been no past external examiners' reports 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme and the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) programme. The students from the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) programme had not yet decided the Healthcare Science pathway they would be completing; they were part of the first cohort for this programme.

## 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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## 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 programme team must revise all programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure references to the programme award are accurate.

**Reason:** This programme is part of a suite of programmes under the generic title of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences)'. Students enrol on this generic programme and are required to choose a pathway through the programme that leads to the specific programme award of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)'. The HPC holds the title of the pathways as the approved programme, which leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC. The documentation submitted by the programme team prior to the visit used the generic title of the programme throughout, "We look forward to working with you and to helping you achieve your goal of gaining a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) degree. This degree has been approved by both the Institute of Biomedical Science and the Health Professions Council and conferment of this degree makes you eligible to apply for Health Professions Council Registration." (Programme handbook, p1)

The visitors considered this to be confusing for the students and potential applicants for the programme. The visitors considered this implies the approved programme title is 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)' which is not correct. The approved programme award title the students would graduate with is 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)'.

The visitors were satisfied with the generic programme award being used to reference the suite of programmes; however, for accuracy they require the additional pathway titles to be included whenever the title of the programme is referred to. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise all programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure accuracy when referring to the programme title.

**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 programme team must revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the placement structure and the financial support mechanisms for placement activity.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme documentation and advertising materials prior to the visit. The website materials stated this is a programme with placements but gave no further detail about them. The programme is structured so the bulk of the placements take place in the summer at the end of levels one, two and three, this means the programme runs straight through three full years.

7

The visitors considered students may wish to spend time during the summer months earning money to help fund them through the next academic year. If students are unable to do this it may affect their decision about whether to apply for this programme. The visitors judged the structure of the placements to be important for potential applicants and students to be aware of.

The documents submitted prior to the visit referred to the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) financially supporting students for their clinical placement activity (Contextual documentation for Accreditation/Reaccreditation, p9). At the visit, the programme team and a representative from the SHA confirmed this commitment. The visitors considered the details of this financial support (how it is transferred to the student and the amount) to be important information for potential applicants and students on the programme.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the placement structure and the financial support mechanisms for placement activity.


**3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate they are committed to limiting the risks associated with arranging placements and have a plan in place if a placement becomes unavailable for a student.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit looked at the placement arrangements for the programme. This programme is part of a suite of programmes under the generic title of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences)'. Students enrol on this generic programme and then are required to choose a pathway through the programme that leads to the specific programme award of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)'. At the end of level one, students choose their pathway field preference, competitive interviews are held and as a result students are placed into a particular programme pathway. The pathway they are placed into will determine the field of their placement at the end of levels two and three. Level two is comprised of generic modules and then a pathway specific module. Three of the pathways (Genetic, Blood and Tissue Sciences) will take one module while the other pathway (Infection Science) takes a different module.  In level three, all pathways are taught separately.  The programme team confirmed that students could transfer between the Genetic, Blood and Tissue Sciences pathways but not from the Infection Sciences pathway. Transfer between pathways can only occur before the second year summer placement.

Discussion with the programme team indicated the placements will agree to hold a certain number of places for students in particular fields for placements in level one, two and three. They have agreed this will be arranged nine months before that cohort starts. This arrangement is made on informal discussions between the programme team and the placement providers. The existing programmes working with these placement providers have built up a strong network between placements and the education provider.

The visitors were satisfied with the strong network of placement providers that work with the programme team, however were unable to determine how the programme could guarantee a placement would be available for a particular student in their particular field. The visitors considered the placement providers may agree to take a student on placement before the cohort commences and then may have to change those arrangements in either level one or level two of the programme. This could therefore result in the student having no placement and alternative arrangements having to be made. Due to the nature of the pathways, if a student was on either the Genetic, Blood or Tissue Sciences they would be able to switch pathways and so increase the chances of finding an alternative placement site. If the student was on the Infection Science pathway they would be unable to switch between pathways and so there could be more problems in seeking an alternative placement.

The programme team discussed the possibility for a student to be able to defer a placement if necessary. This could have an impact on the original number of placement places needed if changes are made in an academic year and more places are required the following year.

The visitors were concerned a situation could arise where a student on a particular pathway might not be able to continue with their practical training in that pathway if their placement place became unavailable. The visitors require reassurance the programme team have made this possibility clear for the students on the programme before they take up an offer of a place. The visitors also require reassurance the programme team are aware of the potential difficulties and have taken steps to limit the occurrence (such as a signed memorandum of understanding with placements) and have a plan in place for finding new placements should this occur.

Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to submit further evidence to demonstrate the programme team are committed to limiting the risks associated with arranging placements and have a plan in place for if a placement becomes unavailable for a student.


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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the programme documentation is finalised for the programme.

**Reason:** Not all the documentation submitted prior to the visit were finalised versions. Because the programme is running with students, the visitors highlighted the documentation should all be finalised as soon as possible. For example, the module handbook for the Interprofessional Practice module (UZYSFD-20-2) did not have this programme included in the list of programmes that the module will be contributing to, on the front of the document.  The visitors were also aware that as a result of the visit and the conditions detailed in this report, documentation would need to be revised. The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure all documentation is finalised as soon as possible.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for biomedical scientists and contains accurate information about the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted prior to the visit contained occurrences of misleading information. The visitors noted instances where the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioner' is used, "to practice as a Healthcare Science Practitioner" and "…student can undertake the full breadth of practice expected of a newly qualified Healthcare Science Practitioner" (Placement Handbook, p7).  The HPC does not regulate 'Healthcare Science Practitioners' and so the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioners' is not a protected title. The HPC regulates 'Biomedical scientists' and the protected title for this profession is 'Biomedical Scientist'.

The visitors considered the documentation to be misleading for potential applicants and students with the implication that upon completion of the programme students will be able to register with the HPC and then be able to use the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioner'. Upon completion of the programme, and with successful application to the HPC Register, the protected title students will be able to use will be 'Biomedical scientist'.  The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the protected title of 'Biomedical scientist' is clearly articulated throughout and the current landscape of 'healthcare science practitioners' is clearly explained.


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

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the different options available to support students should they fail an aspect of the programme.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit included a diagram of the pattern of programme delivery (Programme handbook, p5). From this diagram the visitors noted the structure of the programme means students' progress straight through academic work and placement work for the three years of the programme with no summer holidays. The visitors had concerns if a student failed an aspect of the programme, there would be significant pressure on that student to manage any exam re-sits or placement retakes whilst they continued through the programme. When this was discussed with the programme team, it was indicated there were informal options available for a student who fails an exam or a placement. The programme team highlighted that communication between the placement supervisor and the personal tutor is crucial for support to the student and that each case is looked at on an individual basis.

The programme team highlighted if an exam was failed before a placement, it was possible for allocated time to be negotiated between the personal tutor and the placement supervisor for the student. This would allow the student to have time to prepare for examination re-sits. The programme team described the option for students to defer placements if necessary and to halt progression to the following academic year if aspects of the previous year needed to be retaken. There was also the option for the personal tutor and the placement supervisor to review the learning outcomes intended to be assessed at one placement and to defer them to following placements. This would effectively allow the student to 'step back' from the placement and concentrate on examination re-sits with no detrimental effect to either the current placement or progression on from that placement.

The visitors noted the programme handbook had a section about passing academic modules (Student Handbook, p9-10) however did not include information about the options available for students should they fail an aspect of academic work or a placement. It can be seen that close communication between the placement supervisors and the personal tutors is important when considering the best course of action for a student who has failed an aspect of the programme. It is important that the placement providers are aware of these options when working with students from the programme. It is important for the students to be aware of the support arrangements in place should they need to be used.

Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise programme documentation to include information about the different options available to support students should they fail an aspect of the programme.


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

**Condition:** The programme team must implement written protocols to obtain consent for when students participate as service users, and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical and clinical teaching.

**Reason:** Through the tour of facilities, the visitors noted there would be some aspects of practical or clinical teaching where students would be participating as service users. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted students were notified they could 'opt-out' of participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching through posters informing students of this option. There was no formal information regarding consent protocols in place, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed. In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from students to participate in the practical and clinical teaching. A common way to obtain informed consent is via a form to be signed as part of the admission procedures. The form could inform students about the possible scenarios they are expected to undertake and to detail the procedures for 'opting-out' taking account of cultural differences and the students health.

The visitors require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

### 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.

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements for placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements or the associated monitoring mechanisms in place for students at placement. Discussions with the programme team indicated the Placement Learning Unit (PLU) would monitor the attendance at placements and inform the programme leader of absences if necessary. The programme team also indicated the PLU systems were being modified to give the programme team more control. The programme team highlighted attendance records would be taken into account when awarding the student with the final programme award and so could affect that decision.

From the evidence received, the visitors were not satisfied the requirements of attendance at placement were being fully communicated to the students and placement providers or were being monitored in a way that allows the programme team to be aware of absences. The visitors noted if all parties involved with placement were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the programme team to monitor and take action to ensure absence does not affect a trainee's learning and development on placement.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide programme documentation that clearly communicates to students, placement staff and programme staff, the minimum attendance requirements for placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate placements for the programme are subject to formal approval and monitoring processes. This should include documented processes for initial approval and systems in place for the on-going monitoring of placements.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not find enough evidence of documented processes in place for the initial approval and on-going monitoring of placements. There was no information provided regarding the initial approval processes by which the programme team can evaluate and record the suitability of the placements to be used. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme would link to the education providers Placement Learning Unit (PLU). The programme team highlighted they were

undergoing some development with the PLU in order that they could have more responsibility with managing the placements for their programme. The visitors could not review the approval and monitoring systems in place for this programme because these developments were not ready.

At the visit the visitors were provided with the PLU's current placement self-assessment audit form, this was based on the HPC's standards of education and training (SETs), in particular SET 5. The programme team indicated that with the existing programmes the programme team would visit a new placement site as part of the initial placement approval process. After this initial visit, the self-assessment audit form completed annually would be used to monitor the placements.

The visitors were satisfied with the current PLU self-assessment form and the visits to new placement sites. The visitors were however, concerned the programme team did not verify the self-assessment forms and so may not be monitoring placements effectively. The visitors were aware that it would be difficult to audit every placement via a visit annually but noted visits to placements to see students could be used to verify details of the self-assessment form.

In order to ensure the programme team maintains overall responsibility for the placements and the approval and monitoring systems for placements are thorough and effective, the visitors require the programme team to submit information about the approval and monitoring processes that will be in place for this programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the content of the practice placement educator training workshops they plan to deliver for the practice placement educators for this programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team intends to use placement provider workshops delivered by the education provider. These workshops are to inform practice placement educators about the requirements of this programme. The visitors received no information regarding the content of these training workshops. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the programme team would ensure practice placement educators are appropriately oriented to the requirements of this particular programme. The training should include details of the learning outcomes and assessment procedures, the support available for students and practice placement educators, information of the pathway and module structure of the programme and information about the final year research module. The training sessions should ensure practice placement educators are informed when changes are made to the programme.  The visitors therefore require further information regarding the programme specific information delivered to practice placement providers to ensure they are appropriately trained to work with students from this programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the training sessions intended to provide practice placement educators information about assessment of the PTP Training Manual.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) 'Train the trainer' sessions. The 'Train the trainer' sessions are to inform practice placement educators about the MSC Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool. Discussion at the visit indicated the PTP Training Manual was in a draft format and the online assessment tool had not yet been produced. The programme team however, were confident the uncertainty of the assessment of the PTP Training manual would be resolved and if not, alternative assessment arrangements could be made. The visitors received no information regarding the content of the MSC 'Train the trainer' sessions which would inform the placement educators of the particulars of the assessment for the placements. There was no information available regarding dates and scheduled sessions for practice placement educators. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team would ensure the placement providers would be prepared to work with students from this programme in light of the specific PTP Training Manual and the online assessment tool. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the content and scheduling of the MSC 'Train the trainer' sessions (or if any equivalent sessions are arranged) for the assessment of the PTP Training Manual to ensure the practice placement educators are appropriately 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 programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates students and practice placement educators are appropriately informed of the planned assessment procedures for the PTP Training Manual.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted, the visitors were unclear as to how the placement learning outcomes would be assessed. At the visit, it was confirmed the programme intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool for placements. At the visit, the visitors saw a draft version of the PTP Training Manual and it was noted that the online assessment tool had not yet been developed by MSC. The visitors

were concerned the online assessment tool would not be completed by the time the students go out to their first placement. The programme team stated the PTP Training Manual contained information on the assessment criteria and so could be used to implement an alternative assessment tool to assess students whilst the online assessment tool was being developed. The visitors noted the draft PTP Training Manual contained some information regarding assessment methods (case based discussions (CbDs), directly observed procedures / direct observation of practical skills (DOPs)) however, it indicated the details of the different CbDs and DOPs would be found on the online assessment tool. The programme documentation did not include any information about the procedures for assessment at placement using the PTP Training Manual because procedures have not yet been finalised.

Due to the unconfirmed arrangements for the assessment of the PTP Training Manual, the visitors were unable to determine what information is being given to students and practice placement educators in order to prepare them for the placement. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence that demonstrates students and practice placement educators are appropriately informed of the planned assessment procedures for the PTP Training Manual.

**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 revised placement programme documentation that has had instances of confusing and inconsistent information removed.

**Reason:** The Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement submitted prior to the visit contained information that was inconsistent and confusing. The handbook was confusing in its references to assessment on placement. The programme team confirmed at the visit that students would be undertaking a Training Portfolio (which is based on the institute of Biomedical Science registration training portfolio) and the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual.

The visitors noted the handbook is unclear in places when describing the assessment and often only references the PTP Training manual, for example, "Professional requirements: Successful completion of the Healthcare Science (Life sciences) Training Manual" (Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement, p13). The visitors noted in other places, the handbook only discusses the Registration Training Portfolio, for example, "It must be clearly understood by all

students that the procedure described below is designed to allow them to complete the Registration Training Portfolio" (Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement, p10). There is also a picture on p9 of the online system that students will use and it is of the IBMS Laboratory-based Learning Agreement e-portfolio. This e-portfolio is referenced through the responsibilities of parties to the agreement.

The visitors understood the two assessment methods of the PTP Training Manual and the Training Portfolio is complicated. Because of this, they have stressed the importance of ensuring the programme documentation is as clear as possible for the students. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review and revise the programme placement documentation to ensure students will be clear as to the two assessment methods being used.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates how the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual will be assessed.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the placement learning outcomes would be assessed. At the visit, it was confirmed the programme intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool on placements. At the visit, the visitors saw a draft version of the PTP Training Manual and it was noted that the online assessment tool had not yet been developed by MSC. The programme team stated the PTP Training Manual contained information on the assessment criteria and so could be used to implement an alternative assessment tool to assess students whilst the online assessment tool was being developed. The visitors noted the draft PTP Training Manual contained some information regarding assessment methods (case based discussions (CbDs), directly observed procedures / direct observation of practical skills (DOPs)) however, it indicated the details of the different CbDs and DOPs would be found on the online assessment tool. Due to the unconfirmed arrangements for the assessment of placement, the visitors were unable to determine whether the assessment methods employed at placement would appropriately measure the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence that demonstrates how the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual will be assessed.

Christine Murphy
Mary Popeck

# Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of education provider** | University of the West of England, Bristol |
| **Programme name** | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science) |
| **Mode of delivery** | Full time<br>Part time |
| **Relevant part of HPC Register** | Biomedical scientist |
| **Date of visit** | 21 – 22 September 2011 |

## Contents

## 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 7 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 26 October 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 February 2012.

## Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical) programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

The education provider plans to recruit students to a generic programme – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences). During the second year of this programme the students decide which of four pathways they wish to complete. The programme award reflects the pathway title the student has completed. The visitors will recommend approval for this pathway title – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science).

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 visit also considered the following programmes: BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science). 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. A separate report produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Christine Murphy (Biomedical scientist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) |
|---|---|
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | Maximum of 27 per cohort across all pathways (Genetic Science, Tissue Science, Infection Science and Blood Science) |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2011 |

| Chair | Roger Conlan (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
|---|---|
| Secretary | Dave Nolan (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
| Members of the joint panel | Neville Hall (Institute of Biomedical Science) |
| | Dan Smith (Institute of Biomedical Science) |
| | Alan Wainright (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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| Supplementary Documentation | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, there have been no past external examiners' reports 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme and the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) programme. The students from the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) programme had not yet decided the Healthcare Science pathway they would be completing; they were part of the first cohort for this programme.

## 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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## 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 programme team must revise all programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure references to the programme award are accurate.

**Reason:** This programme is part of a suite of programmes under the generic title of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences)'. Students enrol on this generic programme and are required to choose a pathway through the programme that leads to the specific programme award of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science)'. The HPC holds the title of the pathways as the approved programme, which leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC. The documentation submitted by the programme team prior to the visit used the generic title of the programme throughout, "We look forward to working with you and to helping you achieve your goal of gaining a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) degree. This degree has been approved by both the Institute of Biomedical Science and the Health Professions Council and conferment of this degree makes you eligible to apply for Health Professions Council Registration." (Programme handbook, p1)

The visitors considered this to be confusing for the students and potential applicants for the programme. The visitors considered this implies the approved programme title is 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)' which is not correct. The approved programme award title the students would graduate with is 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science)'.

The visitors were satisfied with the generic programme award being used to reference the suite of programmes; however, for accuracy they require the additional pathway titles to be included whenever the title of the programme is referred to. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise all programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure accuracy when referring to the programme title.

**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 programme team must revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the placement structure and the financial support mechanisms for placement activity.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme documentation and advertising materials prior to the visit. The website materials stated this is a programme with placements but gave no further detail about them. The programme is structured so the bulk of the placements take place in the summer at the end of levels one, two and three, this means the programme runs straight through three full years.

The visitors considered students may wish to spend time during the summer months earning money to help fund them through the next academic year. If students are unable to do this it may affect their decision about whether to apply for this programme. The visitors judged the structure of the placements to be important for potential applicants and students to be aware of.

The documents submitted prior to the visit referred to the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) financially supporting students for their clinical placement activity (Contextual documentation for Accreditation/Reaccreditation, p9). At the visit, the programme team and a representative from the SHA confirmed this commitment. The visitors considered the details of this financial support (how it is transferred to the student and the amount) to be important information for potential applicants and students on the programme.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the placement structure and the financial support mechanisms for placement activity.

### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate they are committed to limiting the risks associated with arranging placements and have a plan in place if a placement becomes unavailable for a student.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit looked at the placement arrangements for the programme. This programme is part of a suite of programmes under the generic title of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare (Life Sciences)'. Students enrol on this generic programme and then are required to choose a pathway through the programme that leads to the specific programme award of 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science)'. At the end of level one, students choose their pathway field preference, competitive interviews are held and as a result students are placed into a particular programme pathway. The pathway they are placed into will determine the field of their placement at the end of levels two and three. Level two is comprised of generic modules and then a pathway specific module. Three of the pathways (Genetic, Blood and Tissue Sciences) will take one module while the other pathway (Infection Science) takes a different module. In level three, all pathways are taught separately. The programme team confirmed that students could transfer between the Genetic, Blood and Tissue Sciences pathways but not from the Infection Sciences pathway. Transfer between pathways can only occur before the second year summer placement.

Discussion with the programme team indicated the placements will agree to hold a certain number of places for students in particular fields for placements in level one, two and three. They have agreed this will be arranged nine months before that cohort starts. This arrangement is made on informal discussions between the programme team and the placement providers. The existing programmes working with these placement providers have built up a strong network between placements and the education provider.

The visitors were satisfied with the strong network of placement providers that work with the programme team, however were unable to determine how the programme could guarantee a placement would be available for a particular student in their particular field. The visitors considered the placement providers may agree to take a student on placement before the cohort commences and then may have to change those arrangements in either level one or level two of the programme. This could therefore result in the student having no placement and alternative arrangements having to be made. Due to the nature of the pathways, if a student was on either the Genetic, Blood or Tissue Sciences they would be able to switch pathways and so increase the chances of finding an alternative placement site. If the student was on the Infection Science pathway they would be unable to switch between pathways and so there could be more problems in seeking an alternative placement.

The programme team discussed the possibility for a student to be able to defer a placement if necessary. This could have an impact on the original number of placement places needed if changes are made in an academic year and more places are required the following year.

The visitors were concerned a situation could arise where a student on a particular pathway might not be able to continue with their practical training in that pathway if their placement place became unavailable. The visitors require reassurance the programme team have made this possibility clear for the students on the programme before they take up an offer of a place. The visitors also require reassurance the programme team are aware of the potential difficulties and have taken steps to limit the occurrence (such as a signed memorandum of understanding with placements) and have a plan in place for finding new placements should this occur.

Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to submit further evidence to demonstrate the programme team are committed to limiting the risks associated with arranging placements and have a plan in place for if a placement becomes unavailable for a student.


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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the programme documentation is finalised for the programme.

**Reason:** Not all the documentation submitted prior to the visit were finalised versions. Because the programme is running with students, the visitors highlighted the documentation should all be finalised as soon as possible. For example, the module handbook for the Interprofessional Practice module (UZYSFD-20-2) did not have this programme included in the list of programmes that the module will be contributing to, on the front of the document. The visitors were also aware that as a result of the visit and the conditions detailed in this report, documentation would need to be revised. The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure all documentation is finalised as soon as possible.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for biomedical scientists and contains accurate information about the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted prior to the visit contained occurrences of misleading information. The visitors noted instances where the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioner' is used, "to practice as a Healthcare Science Practitioner" and "…student can undertake the full breadth of practice expected of a newly qualified Healthcare Science Practitioner" (Placement Handbook, p7). The HPC does not regulate 'Healthcare Science Practitioners' and so the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioners' is not a protected title. The HPC regulates 'Biomedical scientists' and the protected title for this profession is 'Biomedical Scientist'.

The visitors considered the documentation to be misleading for potential applicants and students with the implication that upon completion of the programme students will be able to register with the HPC and then be able to use the title of 'Healthcare Science Practitioner'. Upon completion of the programme, and with successful application to the HPC Register, the protected title students will be able to use will be 'Biomedical scientist'. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the protected title of 'Biomedical scientist' is clearly articulated throughout and the current landscape of 'healthcare science practitioners' is clearly explained.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the different options available to support students should they fail an aspect of the programme.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit included a diagram of the pattern of programme delivery (Programme handbook, p5). From this diagram the visitors noted the structure of the programme means students' progress straight through academic work and placement work for the three years of the programme with no summer holidays. The visitors had concerns if a student failed an aspect of the programme, there would be significant pressure on that student to manage any exam re-sits or placement retakes whilst they continued through the programme. When this was discussed with the programme team, it was indicated there were informal options available for a student who fails an exam or a placement. The programme team highlighted that communication between the placement supervisor and the personal tutor is crucial for support to the student and that each case is looked at on an individual basis.

The programme team highlighted if an exam was failed before a placement, it was possible for allocated time to be negotiated between the personal tutor and the placement supervisor for the student. This would allow the student to have time to prepare for examination re-sits.  The programme team described the option for students to defer placements if necessary and to halt progression to the following academic year if aspects of the previous year needed to be retaken. There was also the option for the personal tutor and the placement supervisor to review the learning outcomes intended to be assessed at one placement and to defer them to following placements. This would effectively allow the student to 'step back' from the placement and concentrate on examination re-sits with no detrimental effect to either the current placement or progression on from that placement.

The visitors noted the programme handbook had a section about passing academic modules (Student Handbook, p9-10) however did not include information about the options available for students should they fail an aspect of academic work or a placement.  It can be seen that close communication between the placement supervisors and the personal tutors is important when considering the best course of action for a student who has failed an aspect of the programme. It is important that the placement providers are aware of these options when working with students from the programme. It is important for the students to be aware of the support arrangements in place should they need to be used.

Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise programme documentation to include information about the different options available to support students should they fail an aspect of the programme.


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

**Condition:** The programme team must implement written protocols to obtain consent for when students participate as service users, and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical and clinical teaching.

**Reason:** Through the tour of facilities, the visitors noted there would be some aspects of practical or clinical teaching where students would be participating as service users. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted students were notified they could 'opt-out' of participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching through posters informing students of this option. There was no formal information regarding consent protocols in place, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed.  In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from students to participate in the practical and clinical teaching.  A common way to obtain informed consent is via a form to be signed as part of the admission procedures. The form could inform students about the possible scenarios they are expected to undertake and to detail the procedures for 'opting-out' taking account of cultural differences and the students health.

The visitors require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

### 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.

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements for placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements or the associated monitoring mechanisms in place for students at placement. Discussions with the programme team indicated the Placement Learning Unit (PLU) would monitor the attendance at placements and inform the programme leader of absences if necessary. The programme team also indicated the PLU systems were being modified to give the programme team more control. The programme team highlighted attendance records would be taken into account when awarding the student with the final programme award and so could affect that decision.

From the evidence received, the visitors were not satisfied the requirements of attendance at placement were being fully communicated to the students and placement providers or were being monitored in a way that allows the programme team to be aware of absences. The visitors noted if all parties involved with placement were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the programme team to monitor and take action to ensure absence does not affect a trainee's learning and development on placement.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide programme documentation that clearly communicates to students, placement staff and programme staff, the minimum attendance requirements for placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate placements for the programme are subject to formal approval and monitoring processes. This should include documented processes for initial approval and systems in place for the on-going monitoring of placements.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not find enough evidence of documented processes in place for the initial approval and on-going monitoring of placements. There was no information provided regarding the initial approval processes by which the programme team can evaluate and record the suitability of the placements to be used. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme would link to the education providers Placement Learning Unit (PLU). The programme team highlighted they were

undergoing some development with the PLU in order that they could have more responsibility with managing the placements for their programme. The visitors could not review the approval and monitoring systems in place for this programme because these developments were not ready.

At the visit the visitors were provided with the PLU's current placement self-assessment audit form, this was based on the HPC's standards of education and training (SETs), in particular SET 5. The programme team indicated that with the existing programmes the programme team would visit a new placement site as part of the initial placement approval process. After this initial visit, the self-assessment audit form completed annually would be used to monitor the placements.

The visitors were satisfied with the current PLU self-assessment form and the visits to new placement sites. The visitors were however, concerned the programme team did not verify the self-assessment forms and so may not be monitoring placements effectively. The visitors were aware that it would be difficult to audit every placement via a visit annually but noted visits to placements to see students could be used to verify details of the self-assessment form.

In order to ensure the programme team maintains overall responsibility for the placements and the approval and monitoring systems for placements are thorough and effective, the visitors require the programme team to submit information about the approval and monitoring processes that will be in place for this programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the content of the practice placement educator training workshops they plan to deliver for the practice placement educators for this programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team intends to use placement provider workshops delivered by the education provider. These workshops are to inform practice placement educators about the requirements of this programme. The visitors received no information regarding the content of these training workshops. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the programme team would ensure practice placement educators are appropriately oriented to the requirements of this particular programme. The training should include details of the learning outcomes and assessment procedures, the support available for students and practice placement educators, information of the pathway and module structure of the programme and information about the final year research module. The training sessions should ensure practice placement educators are informed when changes are made to the programme.  The visitors therefore require further information regarding the programme specific information delivered to practice placement providers to ensure they are appropriately trained to work with students from this programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the training sessions intended to provide practice placement educators information about assessment of the PTP Training Manual.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) 'Train the trainer' sessions. The 'Train the trainer' sessions are to inform practice placement educators about the MSC Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool. Discussion at the visit indicated the PTP Training Manual was in a draft format and the online assessment tool had not yet been produced. The programme team however, were confident the uncertainty of the assessment of the PTP Training manual would be resolved and if not, alternative assessment arrangements could be made. The visitors received no information regarding the content of the MSC 'Train the trainer' sessions which would inform the placement educators of the particulars of the assessment for the placements. There was no information available regarding dates and scheduled sessions for practice placement educators. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team would ensure the placement providers would be prepared to work with students from this programme in light of the specific PTP Training Manual and the online assessment tool. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the content and scheduling of the MSC 'Train the trainer' sessions (or if any equivalent sessions are arranged) for the assessment of the PTP Training Manual to ensure the practice placement educators are appropriately 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 programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates students and practice placement educators are appropriately informed of the planned assessment procedures for the PTP Training Manual.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted, the visitors were unclear as to how the placement learning outcomes would be assessed. At the visit, it was confirmed the programme intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool for placements.  At the visit, the visitors saw a draft version of the PTP Training Manual and it was noted that the online assessment tool had not yet been developed by MSC. The visitors

were concerned the online assessment tool would not be completed by the time the students go out to their first placement. The programme team stated the PTP Training Manual contained information on the assessment criteria and so could be used to implement an alternative assessment tool to assess students whilst the online assessment tool was being developed. The visitors noted the draft PTP Training Manual contained some information regarding assessment methods (case based discussions (CbDs), directly observed procedures / direct observation of practical skills (DOPs)) however, it indicated the details of the different CbDs and DOPs would be found on the online assessment tool. The programme documentation did not include any information about the procedures for assessment at placement using the PTP Training Manual because procedures have not yet been finalised.

Due to the unconfirmed arrangements for the assessment of the PTP Training Manual, the visitors were unable to determine what information is being given to students and practice placement educators in order to prepare them for the placement. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence that demonstrates students and practice placement educators are appropriately informed of the planned assessment procedures for the PTP Training Manual.


**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 revised placement programme documentation that has had instances of confusing and inconsistent information removed.

**Reason:** The Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement submitted prior to the visit contained information that was inconsistent and confusing. The handbook was confusing in its references to assessment on placement. The programme team confirmed at the visit that students would be undertaking a Training Portfolio (which is based on the institute of Biomedical Science registration training portfolio) and the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual.

The visitors noted the handbook is unclear in places when describing the assessment and often only references the PTP Training manual, for example, "Professional requirements: Successful completion of the Healthcare Science (Life sciences) Training Manual" (Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement, p13). The visitors noted in other places, the handbook only discusses the Registration Training Portfolio, for example, "It must be clearly understood by all

students that the procedure described below is designed to allow them to complete the Registration Training Portfolio" (Placement Handbook / Learning Agreement, p10). There is also a picture on p9 of the online system that students will use and it is of the IBMS Laboratory-based Learning Agreement e-portfolio. This e-portfolio is referenced through the responsibilities of parties to the agreement.

The visitors understood the two assessment methods of the PTP Training Manual and the Training Portfolio is complicated. Because of this, they have stressed the importance of ensuring the programme documentation is as clear as possible for the students.  The visitors therefore require the programme team to review and revise the programme placement documentation to ensure students will be clear as to the two assessment methods being used.


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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates how the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual will be assessed.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the placement learning outcomes would be assessed. At the visit, it was confirmed the programme intends to use the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) curriculum, the PTP Training Manual and the associated online assessment tool on placements. At the visit, the visitors saw a draft version of the PTP Training Manual and it was noted that the online assessment tool had not yet been developed by MSC. The programme team stated the PTP Training Manual contained information on the assessment criteria and so could be used to implement an alternative assessment tool to assess students whilst the online assessment tool was being developed. The visitors noted the draft PTP Training Manual contained some information regarding assessment methods (case based discussions (CbDs), directly observed procedures / direct observation of practical skills (DOPs)) however, it indicated the details of the different CbDs and DOPs would be found on the online assessment tool. Due to the unconfirmed arrangements for the assessment of placement, the visitors were unable to determine whether the assessment methods employed at placement would appropriately measure the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence that demonstrates how the Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC) Practitioner Training Programme (PTP) Training Manual will be assessed.


Christine Murphy
Mary Popeck