

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme name	DipHE Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	1 – 2 December 2016

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 5 January 2017 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 9 February 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 January 2017. 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 9 February 2017.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	John Donaghy (Paramedic) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent
HCPC observers	Stephen Cohen (Council member) Niall Gooch (Education officer)
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	April 2017
Chair	Diane Cox (University of Cumbria)
Secretary	Suzanne Parkes (University of Cumbria)
Members of the joint panel	Iain Stainton (Internal Panel Member) Kirsteen Laidlaw (Internal Panel Member) Claire Malkin (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiner reports prior to the visit for this programme as this programme is new.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the HCPC-approved DipHE Paramedic Practice (HM Armed Forces) programme. The visitors met with these students as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant 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 11 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 two recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally 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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the resources to support student learning in all settings effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors had a tour of the practical teaching resources, library, study spaces, and an introduction to the virtual learning environment. However, the visitors did not see the full range of practical resources, such as additional manikins and ambulance equipment, which would be available for this programme at the visit. The programme team informed the visitors that there were additional resources at other sites where current paramedic programmes are delivered by the University of Cumbria which would be shared with this programme. The visitors were informed that these resources could be transported to the Ambleside campus site where this programme is being delivered when required. However, the visitors did not see evidence of these available resources or evidence as to how the use and transportation of these resources would be managed by the programme team. As such, they were unable to determine how the additional resources would effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the additional resources that will be used for this programme in order to determine whether the resources support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the learning resources are readily available to students and staff.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors had a tour of the practical teaching resources, library, study spaces, and an introduction to the virtual learning environment. For the tour, one of the practical rooms had been set up to deliver practical teaching elements of the programme with a range of practical teaching resources. However, considering the proposed number of students, the visitors could not see how the current resources on site would be adequate for this programme. In addition, the visitors were informed that there would be paramedic textbooks available on site for this programme but they did not see evidence of this on the library tour or evidence that these books would be available by the start date of the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine how the resources, notably practical resources and text books, would be adequate and readily available to students. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that all learning resources for this programme are readily available to students and staff.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the system for approving all practice placements on this programme will ensure that the non-ambulance practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at North West Ambulance Service (NWS) and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. The visitors noted that the education provider carries out a joint audit with NWS to approve and monitor placements. The visitors were satisfied that this is an effective and thorough system for approving and monitoring placements at NWS as a means of ensuring that NWS provide a safe and supportive environment for students on placement. However, in the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors did not see evidence of a system in place for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements. In addition, at the visit, the visitors did not meet with placement staff from alternative placement settings so they were unable to ascertain whether there is a thorough and effective system in place for monitoring non-ambulance placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that the non-ambulance practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment and require further evidence from the education provider in order to establish whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is a thorough and effective system in place for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements.

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at NWS and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. The visitors noted that the education provider carries out a joint audit with NWS to approve and monitor placements. The visitors were satisfied that this is an effective and thorough system for approving and monitoring placements at NWS. However, in the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors did not see evidence of a system in place for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements. In addition, at the visit, the visitors did not meet with placement staff from alternative placement settings so they were unable to ascertain whether there is a thorough and effective system in place for monitoring non-ambulance placements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements which do not take place at NWS.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence as to how the system for approving all non-ambulance practice placements on this programme will ensure

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

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at NWS and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. The visitors noted that the education provider carries out a joint audit with NWS to approve and monitor placements. The visitors were satisfied that this is an effective and thorough system for approving and monitoring placements at NWS as a means of ensuring that NWS have quality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored. However, in the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors did not see evidence of a system in place for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements. In addition, at the visit, the visitors did not meet with placement staff from alternative placement settings so they were unable to ascertain whether there is a thorough and effective system in place for monitoring non-ambulance placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided how the education provider ensures that the non-ambulance practice placement settings have equality and diversity policies in relation to students. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider ensures that the non-ambulance placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the non-ambulance placement settings.

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at NWS and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. The visitors noted that the education provider carries out a joint audit with NWS to approve and monitor placements. The visitors were satisfied that this is an effective and thorough system for approving and monitoring placements at NWS as a means of ensuring that NWS have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting. However, in the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors did not see evidence of a system in place for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements. In addition, at the visit, the visitors did not meet with placement staff from alternative placement settings so they were unable to ascertain whether there is a thorough and effective system in place for monitoring non-ambulance placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided how the education provider ensures that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the non-ambulance practice placement setting. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the non-ambulance practice placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence as to how the system for approving non-ambulance practice placements on this programme will ensure that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at NWAS and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. The visitors noted that the education provider carries out a joint audit with NWAS to approve and monitor placements. The visitors were satisfied that this is an effective and thorough system for approving and monitoring placements at NWAS as a means of ensuring that practice placement educators at NWAS have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. However, in the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors did not see evidence of a system in place for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements. In addition, at the visit, the visitors did not meet with placement staff from alternative placement settings so they were unable to ascertain whether there is a thorough and effective system in place for monitoring non-ambulance placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators at the non-ambulance setting will have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that practice placement educators at non-ambulance practice placement settings will have the required knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that all practice placement educators at non-ambulance placements undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at NWAS and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. From a review of the programme documentation prior to the visit, the visitors noted from the placement handbook that there is practice placement educator training for practice placement educators at North West Ambulance Service (NWAS). In discussions at the visit, the visitors learnt that all practice educators within NWAS undertake the online practice educator training provided by the education provider. However, it was not clear from the documentation whether practice educators at alternative placement settings undertake this training. In addition, at the visit, the visitors did not meet with staff from non-ambulance placement settings in order to determine whether they undertake appropriate practice educator training. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training for non-ambulance placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence as to how the system for approving all non-ambulance practice placements on this programme will ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at NWS and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. The visitors noted that the education provider carries out a joint audit with NWS to approve and monitor placements. The visitors were satisfied that this is an effective and thorough system for approving and monitoring placements at NWS as a means of ensuring that practice placement educators at NWS are appropriately registered. However, in the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors did not see evidence of a system in place for approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements. In addition, at the visit, the visitors did not meet with placement staff from alternative placement settings so they were unable to ascertain whether there is a thorough and effective system in place for monitoring non-ambulance placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators at the non-ambulance settings will be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that non-ambulance practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and all practice placement providers.

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at NWS and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. In documents provided prior to the visit and in discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that there is regular and effective collaboration between NWS and the education provider. However, the visitors did not see evidence of effective and regular collaboration between placement providers of non-ambulance placements and they did not meet with staff from other potential placement providers at the visit. As such, the visitors require further evidence about the collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement providers of non-ambulance settings to determine whether this standard is met.

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 provide further evidence that practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for non-ambulance placements.

Reason: In the programme handbook, the visitors noted that the education provider operates a hub and spoke system for placements whereby 80 per cent of placements are at NWS and 20 per cent are in non-ambulance settings. From a review of the placement documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that NWS and practice placement educators at NWS are fully prepared for placement. However, the visitors did not meet with other placement providers at the visit and they were unclear from the documentation as to how non-ambulance placement providers and educators are fully prepared for placement. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that non-ambulance practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for non-ambulance placements.

Recommendations

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider considers reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that it accurately reflects how any curriculum guidance is used for this programme.

Reason: In the programme documentation, notably on page three of the programme specification, the visitors noted a statement that the programme meets the QAA benchmark statements (2016) for paramedics. However, in discussions at the visit, the programme team stated that they have not mapped against these statements but that they have used them as guidance for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that these benchmark statements had been used as guidance for the programme and, therefore, that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider revisits the programme documentation so that it accurately states how any curriculum guidance used has informed the curriculum to reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base in this programme.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest that the education provider considers revising the programme documentation to reflect the service user and carer involvement in this programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme documentation prior to the visit that the university has an Experts by Experience group at the university which they intend to use in this programme. They also heard at the visit in more detail as to how service users and carers will be involved in this programme and, as such, the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, in the programme documentation, the visitors did not see detailed information about the proposed service user and carer involvement within this specific programme. Furthermore, the visitors noted in the programme handbook prior to the visit that service users and carers have been involved with curriculum development and design but, in discussions at the visit, it was noted that they are not involved in this area. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the programme team revise the documentation regarding how service users and carers will be involved in this programme so that it accurately reflects their level of involvement in this specific programme.

John Donaghy
Manoj Mistry
Mark Woolcock

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part Time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant domain	Health psychologist
Date of visit	14 – 15 December 2017

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Health psychologist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 February 2017 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 9 February 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 February 2017. 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 23 March 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health psychologist) Sandy Wolfson (Sports and exercise psychologist) Dee Keane (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	7 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 April 2017
Chair	Tony Hall
Secretary	Helen Summers
Members of the joint panel	Lynn Dunwoody (The British Psychological Society) Liz Simpson (The British Psychological Society) Vicky Staples (The British Psychological Society) Susan Quinn (The British Psychological Society) Lucy Horder (The British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiner reports as none are available due to the programme not having previously run.

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

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

The HCPC met with a student from the Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology programme and a programme applicant.

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the programme does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant 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 6 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally 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 education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials to clearly articulate to applicants any additional costs that students may be liable to pay when on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could not see how the education provider informs students about the costs that students will have to pay as a result of taking a place on the programme. In the programme team meeting and in discussion with students the visitors heard there are costs which the students pay that are not stated in programme documentation, such as travel costs and professional body membership that must be paid when on the programme. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require about all costs incurred by the student, so they can make an informed choice to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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 education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates where students' attendance on placement is mandatory and how the associated attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that page 13 of the programme guide states that attendance is mandatory across the programme. However, in discussions with the programme team it was stated that should a student's attendance fall below 80 per cent, this would constitute a failure to progress on the programme. Therefore the visitors could not determine the requirement for attendance on the programme. From the discrepancies regarding the expectations of student attendance on the programme, the visitors were unable to determine the mandatory attendance level for students when on placement and how students are informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. As such, the visitors could not determine how the team ensured that students meet the requirement and subsequently meet the learning outcomes provided by the practice placement. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team satisfy themselves, through suitable checks or monitoring mechanisms, that the students meet the attendance requirement of the programme when on practice placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

Reason: From a review of the SETs and SOPs mapping documents the visitors noted references to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics being assessed through learning outcomes one and two. However they were unable to find any evidence within the module guides under learning outcomes 1 and 2 to outline where HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the curriculum. Although the programme team stated that students receive information about appropriate conduct, performance and ethics whilst on the programme the visitors still could not see 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 curriculum ensures that students on the programme understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 demonstrate how students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement, including information about an understanding of the expectations of professional conduct and lines of responsibility.

Reason:

In the programme team meeting the visitors heard that students may have no direct supervision when at their practice placements. The visitors could not see evidence of a process in place whereby the education provider or placement educator can identify issues should they arise on placement and how any issues regarding professional conduct would be identified, reported to the education provider and appropriate action taken. For instance, if a student was on placement in their own practice where they offered a service as a counselling psychotherapist and alternately provided a service as a trainee health psychologist to the same service user, the visitors could not see what the process would be for identify and reporting issues. In instances such as these the visitors were unable to see how the education provider ensures that issues are identified should they arise on placement and how any issues regarding professional conduct would be identified, reported to the education provider and appropriate action taken. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the process by which the education provider ensures that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are prepared for placements and have an understanding of their lines of responsibility and of expectations of professional conduct when on placement.

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.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they ensure that students, while on placement, introduce themselves appropriately and that service users and carers are appropriately informed of any students' role in their care.

Reason: From discussions with the programme leaders the visitors heard that students could use their place of employment or self-employment as their practice placement. In discussion with the programme team the visitors could not see how the education provider ensures that when students change from delivering a service as trained employee to delivering a service as a trainee/student that service users and carers were clearly aware of their change in role. The visitors were also unclear about how the education provider ensures that service users and carers are aware of the capacity in which students on this programme are working with them and how service users can choose not to receive the service delivered by this individual in their capacity as a trainee. In particular, the visitors could not identify how the education provider ensures that students identify themselves as students to service users and carers in all practice placement settings. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to the processes that the education provider has in place to ensure that the rights and needs of service users and carers are respected throughout all practice placements and information about who the education provider is in these situations.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided in module proforma 8001, 8002 and 8003, the visitors saw that students are required to attend 104 hours of lectures, tutorials and workshops over the course of the programme. The visitors also noted that students are required to complete 1500 placement hours over the course of the programme. In review of the programme guide, on page 13 the visitors noted that students are encouraged to attend all of the timetabled activity and that it is the student's responsibility to attend. This document also directs the reader to a web link for the university's attendance policy which applies to levels 3,4,5,6 & 7 but not Level 8 which is the level at which the students will be studying for this Doctoral level programme. Therefore visitors could not see how this policy applied to this programme. In discussion with the programme team the visitors heard that should student attendance fall below 80 per cent across all elements of the programme it would result in a student's failure to progress. However based on the evidence provided the visitors could not identify where this attendance requirement is located in programme documentation. As such the visitors are unclear what the attendance requirement is for this programme and how it is communicated to students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence stipulating the attendance requirements, how attendance is monitored across the programme including placements, the requirement for student progression and achievement and how this information is communicated to the students.

Recommendations

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how they will broaden the membership of the service user group and ensure that service users continue to be involved in the programme.

Reason: Visitors were happy that the programme can meet this standard. However, during their meeting with service user and carers the visitors were made aware that that the person who attended the meeting was also a practice placement educator. It was also clear from discussions that there could potentially be limited opportunity for this person to interact with students on the programme, and that this could be determined by this service user and carer's availability or proximity to a students' practice placement site. Because of this the visitors felt that the range of service users involved in the stakeholder group was limited by the service users and carers' availability and that the programme team could potentially broaden the membership of the group. In doing this the programme team may include a greater variety of service users and carer input into the programme and provide a more flexible resource for the programme.

Dee Keane
Sandy Wolfson
Gareth Roderique-Davies

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part Time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Sport and Exercise Psychologist
Date of visit	14 – 15 December 2017

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Sport and exercise psychologist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 February 2017 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 9 February 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 February 2017. 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 23 March 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health psychologist) Sandy Wolfson (Sport and exercise psychologist) Dee Keane (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	7 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 April 2017
Chair	Tony Hall
Secretary	Helen Summers
Members of the joint panel	Ian Maynard (The British Psychological Society) Lynne Evans (The British Psychological Society) Susan Quinn (The British Psychological Society) Lucy Horder (The British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiner reports as none are available due to the programme not having previously run.

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

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

The HCPC met with a student from the Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology programme and received a written report from a student on the Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology. The HCPC also met with programme applicants.

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the programme does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant 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 6 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally 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 education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials to clearly articulate to applicants any additional costs that students may be liable to pay when on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could not see how the education provider informs students about the costs that students will have to pay as a result of taking a place on the programme. In the programme team meeting and in discussion with students the visitors heard there are costs which the students pay that are not stated in programme documentation, such as travel costs and professional body membership that must be paid when on the programme. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require about all costs incurred by the student, so they can make an informed choice to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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 education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates where students' attendance on placement is mandatory and how the associated attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that page 13 of the programme guide states that attendance is mandatory across the programme. However, in discussions with the programme team it was stated that should a student's attendance fall below 80 per cent, this would constitute a failure to progress on the programme. Therefore the visitors could not determine the requirement for attendance on the programme. From the discrepancies regarding the expectations of student attendance on the programme, the visitors were unable to determine the mandatory attendance level for students when on placement and how students are informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. As such, the visitors could not determine how the team ensured that students meet the requirement and subsequently meet the learning outcomes provided by the practice placement. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team satisfy themselves, through suitable checks or monitoring mechanisms, that the students meet the attendance requirement of the programme when on practice placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

Reason: From a review of the SETs and SOPs mapping documents the visitors noted references to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics being assessed through learning outcomes one and two. However they were unable to find any evidence within the module guides under learning outcomes 1 and 2 to outline where HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the curriculum. Although the programme team stated that students receive information about appropriate conduct, performance and ethics whilst on the programme the visitors still could not see 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 curriculum ensures that students on the programme understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 demonstrate how students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement, including information about an understanding of the expectations of professional conduct and lines of responsibility.

Reason:

In the programme team meeting the visitors heard that students may have no direct supervision when at their practice placements. The visitors could not see evidence of a process in place whereby the education provider or placement educator can identify issues should they arise on placement and how any issues regarding professional conduct would be identified, reported to the education provider and appropriate action taken. For instance, if a student was on placement in their own practice where they offered a service as a counselling psychotherapist and alternately provided a service as a trainee sport and exercise psychologist to the same service user, the visitors could not see what the process would be for identifying and reporting issues. In instances such as these the visitors were unable to see how the education provider ensures that issues are identified should they arise on placement and how any issues regarding professional conduct would be identified, reported to the education provider and appropriate action taken. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the process by which the education provider ensures that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are prepared for placements and have an understanding of their lines of responsibility and of expectations of professional conduct when on placement.

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.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they ensure that students, while on placement, introduce themselves appropriately and that service users are appropriately informed of any students' role in their care.

Reason: From discussions with the programme leaders the visitors heard that students could use their place of employment or self-employment as their practice placement. In discussion with the programme team the visitors could not see how the education provider ensures that when students change from delivering a service as trained employee to delivering a service as a trainee/student that service users were clearly aware of their change in role. The visitors were also unclear about how the education provider ensures that service users are aware of the capacity in which students on this programme are working with them and how service users can choose not to receive the service delivered by this individual in their capacity as a trainee. In particular, the visitors could not identify how the education provider ensures that students identify themselves as students to service users in all practice placement settings. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to the processes that the education provider has in place to ensure that the rights and needs of service users are respected throughout all practice placements and information about who the education provider is in these situations.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided in module proforma 8001, 8002 and 8003, the visitors saw that students are required to attend 104 hours of lectures, tutorials and workshops over the course of the programme. The visitors also noted that students are required to complete 1500 placement hours over the course of the programme. In review of the programme guide, on page 13 the visitors noted that students are encouraged to attend all of the timetabled activity and that it is the student's responsibility to attend. This document also directs the reader to a web link for the university's attendance policy which applies to levels 3,4,5,6 & 7 but not Level 8 which is the level at which the students will be studying for this Doctoral level programme. Therefore visitors could not see how this policy applied to this programme. In discussion with the programme team the visitors heard that should student attendance fall below 80 per cent across all elements of the programme it would result in a student's failure to progress. However based on the evidence provided the visitors could not identify where this attendance requirement is located in programme documentation. As such the visitors are unclear what the attendance requirement is for this programme and how it is communicated to students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence stipulating the attendance requirements, how attendance is monitored across the programme including placements, the requirement for student progression and achievement and how this information is communicated to the students.

Recommendations

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how they will broaden the membership of the service user group and ensure that service users continue to be involved in the programme.

Reason: Visitors were happy that the programme can meet this standard. However, during their meeting with service user and carers the visitors were made aware that that the person who attended the meeting was also a practice placement educator. It was also clear from discussions that there could potentially be limited opportunity for this person to interact with students on the programme, and that this could be determined by this service user and carer's availability or proximity to a students' practice placement site. Because of this the visitors felt that the range of service users involved in the stakeholder group was limited by the service users and carers' availability and that the programme team could potentially broaden the membership of the group. In doing this the programme team may include a greater variety of service users and carer input into the programme and provide a more flexible resource for the programme.

Dee Keane
Sandy Wolfson
Gareth Roderique-Davies

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	Podiatric Surgery Training Programme
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement	Podiatrists practising podiatric surgery
Date of visit	13 – 14 December 2016

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using a protected title must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve include podiatric surgery programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists).

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 2 February 2017 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 23 March 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 March 2017. 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 23 March 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against our standards for podiatric surgery for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery.

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Thomas Galloway (Podiatric surgeon) Stephen Bendall (Orthopaedic surgeon) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Susanne Roff (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed trainee numbers	2 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Ian McMillan (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Day 1 - Fraser Rudge (Queen Margaret University) Day 2 - Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review the external examiners' reports prior to the visit as the programme is new.

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

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

The HCPC met with a trainee from the Podiatric Surgery Training programme not approved by HCPC as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any trainees enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards for education providers and that those who complete the programme meet our standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery.

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 38 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 20 standards.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the admissions information that applicants will receive to demonstrate that they will have all of the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors saw some pre-application admissions information for this programme on pages 3, 10 and 12 of the Programme document. However, the visitors noted that this document will not be available to applicants. At the visit, the programme team informed the visitors that they have put together a draft of advertising information along with other role specific information for potential applicants but this was not available at, or prior to, the visit. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how applicants will be given all of the information they require, such as the entry criteria and information about the qualifications trainees can achieve on this programme including options for further study. In addition, the visitors could not see how applicants will be provided with the requisite information about the professional body's relationship with this programme which would thereby make it clear that the successful completion of this award will not lead to recognition by the Society. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the admissions information which will be available to applicants to demonstrate that applicants will receive all of the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme.

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the criteria used to assess applicants' prior formal learning and how this enables them to identify any gaps in applicants' prior knowledge, skills and ability and judge if they should make offers of places on this programme.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted on pages 10 and 12 of the Programme document that trainees are required to have 180 Masters level credits or equivalent in the Theory of Podiatric Surgery. At the visit, the programme team clarified that they have undertaken a mapping exercise to look at the masters level programmes in the theory of podiatric surgery that are currently offered in the UK. Through this process the programme team have determined what theoretical knowledge each trainee applying to this programme will have. The education provider confirmed that this would be used to assess trainees' prior learning in the selection process and identify additional theoretical learning which needs to be undertaken by the trainee on this programme in order to meet all of the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery. The education provider also confirmed that assessment of theoretical learning from the MSc would be included in the final exit exam. However, from the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to the criteria against which relevant masters programmes were assessed and how the results of this assessment would be applied to trainees to ensure that any learning needs would be addressed and

assessed through this programme. As such the visitors require further evidence to determine how the programme team assesses trainees' prior learning in the selection process, how they identify any gaps in their learning and how this informs decisions about offering places on this programme.

A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the criteria used to assess applicants to ensure that they have the relevant knowledge, skills and ability to be admitted onto the programme.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors saw the professional and academic entry requirements on pages 10 and 12 of the Programme document. However, the visitors did not see the criteria used in the selection process for assessing trainees in terms of their academic knowledge, ability and skills. Furthermore, the visitors did not see the criteria which will be used for assessing trainees in terms of their previous postgraduate work experience and how they will assess whether trainees are "committed". Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided and from discussions at the visit, whether the admissions procedures will be applying appropriate academic and professional entry standards and how this will be communicated to applicants. As such, the visitors require further evidence about the criteria used to assess trainees throughout the selection process to ensure that they have the relevant, knowledge, skills and ability to undertake the programme and how this is communicated to applicants.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the role of Queen Margaret University (QMU) and NHS Scotland (NES) in the admissions process.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. On page 10 and 11 of the Programme document, the visitors noted that all applicants will be interviewed by the programme leader for the surgery programme, programme leader for the Professional Doctorate programme, NES representatives, the Medical Deanery, a proposed Education Supervisor, professional lead from a health board and a lay person. The visitors also noted that, prior to interview, "QMU will liaise with the Deanery and the NHS board to establish if there is sufficient capacity within the orthopaedic department to support this training." However, from discussions at the visit, the visitors were unclear about how a potential applicant will be identified and who identifies this applicant. In addition, the visitors were unclear about the role of QMU and NES in the interview process and how QMU will make the final decision about whether a trainee fulfils the required criteria to access the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the role of QMU and NES in the admissions process and how QMU will make the final decision about a trainee accessing the programme in order to demonstrate that the admissions process is effectively managed.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence for how the management structures in place will ensure that the relevant people obtain the relevant information required to address issues as and when they arise in all settings.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. In documentation provided prior to the visit and at the visit, the visitors also learnt that within this partnership, there are a multitude of partners involved with various different roles and responsibilities, including the health board where the trainee is employed. At the visit, the visitors learnt that the programme leader, NES, QMU representatives, placement providers and supervisors will meet annually to ensure the programme runs as planned. The visitors also learnt at the visit that there will be regular informal contact between the contributors of the programme and the programme leader. However, the visitors were unclear about how all elements of the programme will be formally monitored and reviewed at regular points between all partners and when and how the relevant people will receive the information they require at the right time when issues arise. As such, the visitors were unclear as to how the systems in place will make sure that the programme will be effectively managed and ensure that where issues arise they will be addressed and dealt with in a timely manner. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the management structures in place will ensure that the relevant people obtain the relevant information required to ensure the programme is run as planned and that issues are addressed as and when they arise in all settings.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence in relation to how the management of the programme will ensure there is regular, formal monitoring of trainee progression through the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. The visitors noted on page 24 of the programme approval document that the Scottish Trauma and Orthopaedic Annual Review of Competencies Panel (ARCP) made up of placement and education provider representatives will review the progression of the trainee within the work place training blocks and that this will occur annually throughout the programme. In addition, the visitors noted that there is a Professional Board of Examiners to review the trainee's academic progress. At the visit, the visitors learnt that there will also be a six-month review meeting with the ARCP to discuss the trainees' clinical progress and that there will be regular informal contact between the education, doctorate, clinical supervisors and programme leader to discuss the trainee's progress. However, from the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to where the information from these review panels, formal and informal conversations, would go and if it would be monitored to identify potential issues with trainees' progression. The visitors could also not see in the evidence provided how all of the information related to progression would be shared between the trainee, the placement provider and the education provider. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the management of the programme will ensure that there is regular, formal monitoring of trainee progression through the programme.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how they will communicate the role of the programme leader to trainees and other contributors to ensure that the programme leader has the required information to effectively manage the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. At the visit, the visitors learnt that the programme leader has overall professional responsibility for the programme and that, if there are any issues in the academic setting or placement setting, the programme leader will meet with academic or placement staff setting to discuss these issues. The visitors also learnt that the programme leader would address any issues that may arise with the individuals involved to assure that there would be a resolution where possible. However, the visitors were unclear from the documentation as to how all contributors to the programme, as well as the trainees, would be clear about the role of the programme leader and how this would be communicated to them. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence about how they will communicate the role of the programme leader to trainees and other contributors to the programme.

B.6 Training must be delivered by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider should provide further evidence to demonstrate who is responsible for teaching each element of the programme, including sub-specialities, and how they ensure that that these members of staff have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the curriculum vitae for staff. From this evidence, the visitors were clear that elements of the programme will be delivered by consultant podiatrists and consultant orthopaedic surgeons with relevant specialist expertise. The visitors also noted from page 7 of the Programme document that the clinical training will also be delivered “with input from other medical specialisms” including vascular surgeons, plastic surgeons and anaesthetists. However, from the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to who would be responsible for teaching which aspects of the programme, including who would be responsible for training in sub-specialities. In discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that indicative timetables for the programme would be produced but that these would be produced as and when a student would progress through the programme. As such the visitors were not clear as to how the education provider will ensure that relevant members of the programme team will be available and responsible for delivering appropriate elements of the programme. As a result, from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine whether all training would be delivered by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that all elements of the programme will be delivered by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

B.9 The resources to support trainee learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clarify how the programme documentation will allow trainees to know where they meet the learning outcomes and how they progress and achieve through the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors saw a list of the learning outcomes for the clinical practice element (pages 30-37 of the Programme document) and module descriptors with learning outcomes for the academic modules (pages 44-51 of the Programme document). The visitors also saw a diagram of the academic and clinical modules on page 27 of the Programme document which sets out the structure of the programme. In discussions at the visit the visitors were made aware that the learning outcomes of the programme would be continually assessed throughout the placement experience and would then be assessed again as part of the final clinical examination. They were also informed that indicative timetables for the programme would be produced but that these would be produced as and when a student would progress through the programme. However, the visitors could not see, from the evidence provided, how and when trainees would be informed as to where and how learning outcomes are taught and assessed in the clinical practice modules or when and how a trainee would achieve and progress through the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will use the programme documentation to effectively support trainee's understanding about where they meet the required learning outcomes and how they will be expected to progress and achieve through the programme.

B.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified any mandatory components and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how the monitoring mechanisms in place will ensure that information about trainee's attendance in the placement setting is passed to the relevant person at QMU so that, if issues with attendance arise, they can be addressed and consistently dealt with by the education provider.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. The visitors also noted from the documentation that trainees will be employed by health boards while undertaking their training. In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors learnt that all clinical training which is undertaken at the trainee's place of employment is mandatory and that the employer would report any absence to the programme leader (page 30, Placement handbook). In discussions at the visit, the senior team clarified that the trainee's employer will be monitoring the trainee's attendance at the placement setting and that they would report absence to the education provider if there was significant absence or if the absence was impacting on the trainee's learning or assessment. However, the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how the practice placement provider/employer would judge what a 'significant' absence may be or if any absence could impact on a trainee meeting the academic requirements of the placement. The visitors were also unclear as to the processes in place for the practice placement provider to effectively feed back to QMU about any non-attendance at placement and how this would then be

consistently addressed by the education provider. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the monitoring mechanisms in place ensure that information about trainee's attendance in the placement setting is passed to the relevant person at QMU so that, if issues with attendance arise, they can be addressed and consistently dealt with by the education provider.

B.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified any mandatory components and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how the programme documentation will be used to ensure that trainees are clear about mandatory aspects of the programme and any consequences of non-attendance.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted from the mapping document for this standard that both the academic and clinical components are mandatory. On page 30 of the Programme document it is also confirmed that "study days at QMU are mandatory". However, in discussions at the visit, the visitors learnt that there are mandatory elements of the academic component but that trainees are encouraged to attend more if they are not achieving what they are required to achieve to progress through the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how this is accurately reflected in the documents and communicated to trainees so that they are aware of the mandatory elements of the programme and any consequences of non-attendance.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how trainees' needs will be adequately identified and addressed in the management structure of the programme within the interprofessional learning elements of the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. In the mapping document provided for the visit, the visitors noted from the documentation that interprofessional learning does not take place on this programme. At the visit, it was confirmed that there is interprofessional learning in both the clinical and doctoral components of the programme. However, because of the drafting error in the documentation provided prior to the approval visit, no evidence was provided as to how the profession-specific skills and knowledge of a trainee on this programme would be adequately identified and addressed. In addition, in documentation provided prior to the visit and at the visit, the visitors learnt that within the partnership between QMU and NES, there are a multitude of partners involved with various different roles and responsibilities. The visitors noted from discussions at the visit that there will be an annual evaluation of the programme between the various contributors to the programme and regular informal contact between the programme leader and the other contributors to the programme. However, the visitors were not clear about how information about the programme will be regularly and formally fed back into the management structure of the programme so that the relevant people receive the information they require to address any issues if and when they may arise. As such, the visitors were not clear about how a trainee's profession-specific learning

needs will be communicated and addressed within the programme's management structure, particularly if issues arise due to the interprofessional nature of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how trainees' needs will be adequately identified and addressed in the management structure of the programme.

D.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the agreements in place between QMU and NES to ensure that placements will be integral to the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. In discussions at the visit, the visitors learnt that QMU will ensure adequate provision of placement experience by employers of trainees coming to them with available supervisors and placements for trainees. At the visit, the placement providers and programme team confirmed that there are agreements in place between NES, employers and QMU to ensure that further placements would be found if issues arose on the original placements to which trainees are allocated. However, the visitors did not have sight of the indicative information that would be included in an agreement between NES, employers and QMU and as such were unclear as to how QMU will, through the use of these agreements, ensure that there is a contingency plan if issues arise at a trainee's employer. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the agreements in place between QMU, NES and trainees' employers to ensure that there will be sufficient placement experience for trainees and that placements will remain integral to the programme.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how the placement audit and monitoring mechanisms will give QMU the information they require to address any placement issues.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. On page 53 of the Programme document, the visitors noted that the Scottish Deanery (NES) will support QMU in monitoring the quality of clinical placements. At the visit, the education provider clarified that they will be using the NES audit process for quality assuring practice placements. At the visit, the visitors learnt that the programme leader, NES, QMU representatives, placement providers and supervisors will meet annually to ensure the programme runs as planned. The visitors also learnt at the visit that there will be regular informal contact between the programme leader and the education, doctorate and clinical supervisors. However, the visitors did not see evidence of the documents used for NES's quality assurance process for practice placements or how the information gathered as part of this process will be fed back to QMU in order for them to act on the information provided. The visitors were also unclear, from the evidence provided, when NES's approval process would be undertaken and when regular monitoring would happen to allow contemporary issues to be flagged to QMU. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the processes in place to approve and monitor practice placements and how the placement audit and

monitoring mechanisms will feed up through the management structure of the programme to give QMU the information they require to address any placement issues.

D.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in the practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the agreements in place between QMU and NES to ensure that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place in the practice placements.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. In discussions at the visit, the visitors learnt that QMU ensure adequate provision of placement experience by employers of trainees coming to them with available supervisors and placements for trainees. At the visit, the placement providers and programme team confirmed that there are agreements in place between NES, employers and QMU to ensure that additional staff would be found if issues arose with the number of appropriately qualified, experienced staff at placement. However, the visitors did not have sight of the indicative information that would be included in an agreement between NES, employers and QMU and as such were unclear as to how QMU will, through the use of these agreements ensure that there is a contingency plan if issues arise at a trainee's employer. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the agreements in place between QMU, NES and trainee's employers to ensure that there will be adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place in the practice placements.

D.7 The clinical supervisor must undertake appropriate educator training.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the educator training that clinical supervisors must undertake to be in a position to supervise trainees on this programme and how they ensure that this training has taken place.

Reason: In documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted on page 63 of the Programme document that there are opportunities for academic staff to enrol on the University's PgCert in Professional and Higher Education and that there are other activities for development "such as validation and review and equality and diversity workshops." The visitors also noted on page 64 that there are research supervision workshops delivered at QMU and an annual workshop on professional doctorate trainee supervision. However, the visitors were unclear about the provision of training for practice placement educators who supervise trainees in the clinical element of the programme. At the visit, QMU stated that they have training in place for anyone supervising trainees, including how they are prepared to assess trainees and deliver the programme at doctorate level. In addition, in discussions with the practice placement educators, the educators confirmed that they have undertaken appropriate practice educator training and that the programme leader at QMU holds a clinic once a week for practice educators. However, from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how QMU ensures that educators have undertaken appropriate educator training, what the training offered covers and how it would provide practice placement educators with the skills and knowledge they need to supervise students on this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the training that is offered

to practice placement educators and how QMU ensures that clinical supervisors have undertaken the training required to supervise on this programme to determine how the programme can meet this standard.

D.9 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there will be regular and effective collaboration between QMU and NES and how this will ensure that QMU has the information required to address any issues which may arise on the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. In addition, in documentation provided prior to the visit and at the visit, the visitors learnt that within this partnership, there are a multitude of partners involved in this programme with various different roles and responsibilities. The visitors noted from discussions at the visit that there will be an annual evaluation of the programme between the various contributors to the programme and regular informal contact between the programme leader and the other contributors of the programme. However, the visitors were not clear about how information about the programme and trainees' progression will be regularly and formally fed back into the management structure of the programme so that the relevant people receive the information they require to address any contemporary issues as and when they arise. As such, the visitors require further evidence that there will be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider so that any issues relating to the programme or the trainee can be identified and adequately addressed by the relevant person.

D.10 Trainees and clinical supervisors must be fully prepared for the practice placement environment which will include information about:

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of the experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the professional standards which trainees must meet;
- 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 provide further evidence about how they will prepare clinical supervisors and trainees fully for placement.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the Programme document and placement handbook which is provided to clinical supervisors and trainees. In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors saw a list of the learning outcomes for the clinical practice element (pages 30-37 of the Programme document) and module descriptors with learning outcomes for the academic modules (pages 44-51 of the Programme document). The visitors also saw a diagram of the academic and clinical modules on page 27 of the Programme document which sets out the academic and clinical structure of the programme. However, the visitors could not see from the evidence provided how and when learning outcomes are expected to be addressed in

the clinical practice modules, how trainees or clinical supervisors are clear about associated records to be maintained, how trainees are assessed at placement, how trainees demonstrate progress through the clinical elements of the programme and who is responsible for coordinating the trainee's learning at placement. As such, the visitors require further evidence that clinical supervisors and trainees will be fully prepared for placement including information about the learning outcomes to be achieved, associated records to be maintained, assessment procedures and communication and lines of responsibility.

D.11 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how information will be shared to ensure that any issues about professional conduct are fed up through to the fitness to practise procedures at QMU.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. In addition, in documentation provided prior to the visit and at the visit, the visitors learnt that within this partnership, there are a multitude of partners involved in this programme with various different roles and responsibilities. The visitors noted from discussions at the visit that there will be an annual evaluation of the programme between the various contributors to the programme and regular informal contact between the programme leader and the other contributors of the programme, including the placement provider and educators, to discuss any issues at placement. The visitors also noted from page 14 of the Programme document that there is a fitness to practise policy in place should any issues with professional conduct arise. However, the visitors were not clear about how, if issues relating to trainees' professional conduct arise while they are on placement, they will be appropriately raised with QMU and dealt with through the fitness to practise policy. As such, the visitors require further evidence about how information is shared between the partner organisations to ensure that any issues about professional conduct will be fed up through the programme's management structures to ensure that the education provider's fitness to practise policy is enacted.

D.12 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place in the approved clinical learning environment.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how they will ensure that service users and carers are clear about the capacity in which trainees are acting and how they ensure that trainees obtain appropriate consent.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were supplied with the NHS consent form used for trainees to obtain consent to treat service users. However, the visitors noted that this was a generic consent form which does not clearly articulate that trainees on this programme may be registered professionals but that they are trainee podiatrists practising podiatric surgery. The visitors also heard that trainees may identify themselves as podiatrists when interacting with service users rather than as a trainee podiatrist practising podiatric surgery. As such the visitors were unclear as to how the use of this generic form would ensure that service users and carers would be clear that any podiatric surgery trainee operating on them would be acting as a podiatric surgery trainee despite being a registered professional, and that they could decline to give their

consent to be treated by a trainee. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider will ensure that service users and carers are clear that podiatric surgery trainees are acting as trainees when on practice placements and how they will ensure that service users clearly consent to trainees operating on them.

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how and when different assessment methods will be employed throughout the programme to measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors saw a list of the learning outcomes for the clinical practice element (pages 30-37 of the Programme document) and module descriptors with learning outcomes for the academic modules (pages 44-51 of the Programme document). The visitors also saw a diagram of the academic and clinical modules on page 27 of the Programme document which sets out the academic and clinical structure of the programme. In discussions at the visit the visitors were made aware that the learning outcomes of the programme would be continually assessed throughout the placement experience and would then be assessed again as part of the final clinical examination. They were also informed that indicative timetables for the assessments on the programme would be produced but that these would be produced as and when a student would progress through the programme. However, the visitors could not see, from the evidence provided, how and when individual learning outcomes would be expected to be assessed and they were unclear about which assessment methods would be used and when. The visitors therefore require further evidence about how and when trainees will be assessed, what assessment methods will be used and how this will be recorded to ensure that trainees have met the relevant learning outcomes.

E.5 The measurement of trainee performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective podiatric surgery practice.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how information from the assessment of trainees will feed back into the management structure and fitness to practise procedures at the education provider to ensure consistent decisions are being made in assessment regarding a trainee's ability to practise safely and effectively.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. In documentation provided prior to the visit and at the visit, the visitors also learnt that within this partnership, there are a multitude of partners involved in the programme with various different roles and responsibilities. The visitors noted from discussions at the visit that there will be an annual evaluation of the programme between the various contributors to the programme and regular informal contact between the programme leader and the other contributors of the programme, including the placement provider and educators, to discuss any issues at placement. The visitors also noted from page 14 of the Programme document that there is a fitness to practise policy in place should any issues with professional conduct arise. However, the visitors were not clear about how, if issues relating to trainees' professional conduct arise while they are being assessed, they will be appropriately raised with QMU and dealt with through the fitness to practise policy. As such, the visitors require further

evidence about how information is shared between the partner organisations to ensure that any issues about professional conduct that arise through the assessment of trainees are appropriately referred to the education providers' fitness to practise policy.

E.6 There must be an effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how the monitoring and evaluation systems in place will ensure consistency in the assessment of trainees at the placement setting.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware that QMU has overall responsibility for the programme and that the programme will be delivered in partnership with NES. The visitors noted on page 24 of the Programme approval document that the Scottish Trauma and Orthopaedic Annual Review of Competencies Panel (ARCP) made up of placement and education provider representatives will review the progression of the trainee within the work place training blocks and that this will occur annually throughout the programme. In addition, the visitors noted that there is a Professional Board of Examiners to review the trainee's academic progress. At the visit, the visitors learnt that there will also be regular informal contact between the placement provider and programme leader and between the professional doctorate academic team and the programme leader to discuss trainee progression. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine how the information from these meetings and interactions will enable the education provider to evaluate the assessment of trainees to ensure that appropriate standards will be maintained and judgements consistent. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to how the systems in place will ensure that there appropriate standards will be maintained and that trainees will be marked consistently in all placement settings.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for trainee progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clarify requirements for trainee progression and achievement through the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors saw a list of the learning outcomes for the clinical practice element (pages 30-37 of the Programme document) and module descriptors with learning outcomes for the academic modules (pages 44-51 of the Programme document). The visitors also saw a diagram of the academic and clinical modules on page 27 of the Programme document which sets out the academic and clinical structure of the programme. In discussions at the visit the visitors were made aware that the learning outcomes of the programme would be continually assessed throughout the placement experience and would then be assessed again as part of the final clinical examination. In addition, the education provider confirmed that assessment of theoretical learning from the MSc would be included in the final exit exam. The visitors were also informed that indicative timetables for the programme would be produced but that these would be produced as and when a student would progress through the programme. However, the visitors could not see, from the evidence provided, how and when trainees would be informed as to where and how learning outcomes are taught and assessed in the clinical practice modules and the exit exam or when and how a trainee would achieve and progress through the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team

will clearly specify the requirements for a trainee's expected progression through the programme and where they will be expected to achieve the required learning outcomes.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for trainee progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about trainee progression and achievement in relation to the credits required for the professional doctorate and the certificate in podiatric surgery training.

Reason: The visitors saw a diagram of the academic and clinical modules on page 27 of the Programme document which sets out the academic and clinical structure of the programme. At the visit, the programme team stated that students who wish to progress through this programme would have to pass the final clinical examination which has no academic credit attached to it. The education provider also stated that the 240 credits required to complete the programme are completed prior to this examination taking place once the academic and clinical modules have been completed. At this point trainees could exit this programme and continue to undertake the full professional doctorate but be unable to exit with a certificate in podiatric surgery training. Students may also choose to complete the 240 credits, complete the final clinical examination and be awarded with the certificate in podiatric surgery training then choose not to continue with the professional doctorate. However, from the evidence provided prior to the visit the visitors were unclear as to how a student could progress through this programme and achieve the different qualifications. As such the visitors were unclear as to how trainees on this programme would be informed as to how they could progress and achieve the different qualifications associated with this programme and how applicants would be informed about the different qualifications associated with this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about trainee progression and achievement in relation to the professional doctorate and the certificate in podiatric surgery training, including how this will be clearly communicated to trainees and applicants.

E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from a relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the policy the programme team will use to ensure that external examiners have the appropriate experience and qualifications for this programme.

Reason: In evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted on page 61 of the Programme document that "all academic module assessments are double marked by two internal examiners and then scrutinised by the External Examiner for the professional doctorate programme". They also noted that an external examiner will be appointed to review individual trainee's work on this programme, including the clinical Work Place Based Assessments (WPBAs), final exit exam and academic work. However, the visitors did not see the policy for the recruitment of the external examiner who will review this programme and, as such, they could not determine whether this external examiner will be appropriately experienced and qualified to review this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the policy the

programme team will use to ensure that external examiners have the appropriate experience and qualifications for this programme.

Recommendations

B.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Recommendation: If the education provider decides to increase the number of trainees, they should consider how to best engage with HCPC to identify how this may change how the programme continues to meet the standards.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there is a sufficient number of staff and resources in place for a small cohort of trainees per year and, as such, this standard is met. However, the programme team mentioned that, despite the low predictions currently, if demand for the programme increases then they would increase resources accordingly. The visitors recommend that if the programme does see an increase in recruitment that the education provider considers how this may impact the programme continuing to meet this standard and how best to engage with HCPC about these changes.

B.14 Where trainees participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider keeps the need for consent to be obtained for trainees participating as service users under review and that, if this is utilised on the programme in the future, that the relevant protocols for obtaining consent are implemented.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider indicated in the documentation that this is not applicable for this programme. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that this is not applicable as there would be no more than one or two trainees on the programme per cohort and therefore it is very unlikely that there would be an opportunity for trainees to participate as service users. As such, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider keeps the need for consent to be obtained for trainees participating as service users under review and that, if this is utilised on the programme in the future, that the HCPC is informed and the relevant protocols for obtaining consent are implemented.

Thomas Galloway
Stephen Bendall
Paul Blakeman
Susanne Roff

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	York St John University
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational Therapist
Date of visit	6 – 7 December 2016

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title Occupational therapist must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 February 2017 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 9 February 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 January 2017. 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 9 February.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapy) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapy) Ian Prince (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
HCPC observer	Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	March 2017
Chair	Robert Aitken (York St John University)
Secretary	Carla Wardell (York St John University)
Members of the joint panel	Mandy Asghar (Internal Panel Member) Nikki Swift (Internal Panel Member) Fiona Cole (External Panel Member) Anna Clampin (College of Occupational Therapists) Nick Pollard (External Panel Member) Sally Feaver (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiner reports prior to the visit as external examiners' reports have not yet been produced.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BHS (Hons) Occupational Therapy 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 satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: On page 10 of the programme document, the visitors noted reference to a minimum requirement of 1000 practice hours for eligibility for HCPC registration. However, the HCPC does not stipulate the number of practice hours that students must complete. The visitors also noted that in the programme handbook on page 6 "As a graduate from an accredited degree programme, you may register as an occupational therapist with the Health and care professions council". The visitors also noted that the programme document on page 8 makes reference to the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics however the document then directs readers to the College of Occupational Therapists (COT) code of ethics web link rather than the HCPC web link. Additionally, on page 10 of the programme specification and throughout the documentation there are references made to the 2009 version of the standards of education and training (SETs) however in discussion with the programme team the visitors were informed that the SETs published in 2014 were used and should have been referenced. Lastly, on page 11 of the programme document reference is made to a Health and care professions council for students, however this name is inaccurate. The visitors therefore are unclear as to how students on the programme are provided with correct and up-to date information about the HCPC and are clear that successful completion of this programme will confer eligibility to apply to the Register. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that all programme documentation is up to date to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

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 further evidence to show that resources in place effectively support the required learning and teaching activities for this programme.

Reasons: In their review of the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors noted that on pages three and 18 of the professional practice placement handbook, references are made to level three study, despite there not being a level three on this programme. The document also states that learners will undertake a contemporary placement in a setting where there is not an occupational therapist. However, in conversation with the programme team it was made clear that contemporary placements are not offered as part of this programme. The visitors were also unsure about whether international placements counted as contemporary placements. The visitors also noted that on page 3 reference was made to 'Full-time or In-service' modes of study which, after clarification was provided by the programme team, are not modes of study that students can pursue as part of this programme. As a result of these inconsistencies, the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team were using the programme documentation to ensure that students have accurate and up-to-date information about this programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the

relevant resource that will be provided to students on this programme and that it accurately supports the required learning and teaching activities for this programme.

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 education provider must clarify appropriate mandatory attendance requirements, the consequences for not meeting these and demonstrate how this information is effectively communicated to students

Reason: In their review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to see where programme team have identified where attendance is mandatory and what consequences there would be for a student who failed to meet these requirements. In discussion with the programme team the visitors heard that there is an 80 per cent attendance requirement for the programme. However in the student meeting the visitors heard that students understood the attendance requirement to be 85 per cent. In these discussions the visitors also heard inconsistent answers as to what consequences there may be for students who do not meet the attendance requirements of the programme.. Due to the inconsistency in the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that students are aware of the mandatory attendance requirements throughout the programme and what consequences there would be for any student who failed to meet those requirements. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that clearly stipulates the attendance requirements for the programme, the consequences should attendance fall below the required level, and how this is clearly communicated to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure a safe and supportive environment at alternative (non-NHS) placements settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that placements would take place in NHS settings, non-NHS settings and internationally. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with the placement providers. At the visit the visitors were provided with details of the NHS health care placements website which demonstrated that placements provided by the NHS provide a safe and supportive environment for students. The programme team informed visitors that that there are different processes in place for placements in alternative settings to the ones in place for placements in the NHS, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies and processes in place for NHS and non NHS service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures a safe and supportive environment in alternative (non-NHS and international) settings.

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 to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring placements in alternative (non-NHS and international) settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that placements would take place in NHS settings, non-NHS settings and internationally. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. At the visit the visitors were provided with details of the NHS health care placements website which demonstrated how placements provided by the NHS were approved and monitored together with the monitoring processes carried out by the programme team. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements in alternative (non-NHS and international) settings. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place for placements in alternative (non-NHS and international) settings as the ones in place for placements within the NHS, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for NHS and alternative placements, due to the nature of the placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements in alternative (non-NHS and international) settings.

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 equality and diversity policies are in place at alternative (non-NHS and international) placement settings and how these are implemented and monitored.

Reason: The visitors were provided with evidence regarding the implementation and monitoring of equality and diversity policies for placements associated with placements within the NHS. However the visitors were unable to locate a system for ensuring that placements offered outside of an NHS setting have an equality and diversity policy in relation to students and how this is implemented and monitored. The programme team informed visitors that there are different processes in place for placements in alternative settings to the ones in place for placements in the NHS, but the visitors did not see these processes reflected in the documentation. Therefore the visitors were unable to see how the education provider ensures that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students and how these are implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of the policy and process they have in place to ensure that practice placement educators undertake appropriate initial and refresher training.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team and with the practice placement educators the visitors heard that practice placement educators request refresher training as and when they feel the need to and that the education provider is responsive

to their requests. However the visitors were not clear about how long after initial training that refresher training takes place and how the education provider ensures that education providers attend refresher training. As such the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team determine what training is appropriate for all practice placement educators including practice educators in non-traditional and international settings, and how they ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately trained prior to supervising students from this programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the policy and monitoring systems in place which ensure that practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator refresher training at appropriate time intervals, how this is monitored and the consequences for non-attendance.

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 provide further evidence as to why practice placement providers require students to provide certain personal information prior to offering those students a practice placement.

Reason: In review of the professional placement handbook the visitors noted that students should submit a curriculum vitae containing their date of birth and nationality. This information would then be provided to the practice placement provider prior to students being offered a practice placement. However the visitors were unclear why practice placement providers require students to submit this information prior to taking up a placement which may be allocated to them. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate why practice placement providers need to know students' dates of birth and nationalities to be fully prepared to offer students' a placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence as to how students are informed about what they are expected to achieve to progress through the module MOT003.

Reason: In review of the documentation the visitors noted that the information provided regarding the weighting of assessments for module MOT003 Context of professional practice was inconsistent. In the module documents the OSCE accounted for 60 per cent and the critical reflection accounted for 40 per cent of the assessment of the module. However in the programme specification both the OSCE and the critical reflection account for 50 per cent each of the assessment of the module. As such the visitors could not determine the requirement for student progression and achievement within the module MOT003. Therefore the visitors require further evidence

demonstrating the accurate weighting of the assessments for MOT003 and how this is communicated to students in a consistent way in the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to clearly state if aegrotat awards are offered, and if they are, that they do not confer eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion with the programme leader indicated that an MSc in Health Science (an exit award) would be awarded should a student not complete the programme. The visitors were then provided with a printed statement from the university website regarding aegrotat awards not leading to accredited professional qualification. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that an aegrotat award would not provide them with eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates how the programme team ensure that students are aware that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility to apply to the Register.

Jennifer Caldwell
Joanna Goodwin
Ian Prince