

---

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Cardiff Metropolitan University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	11 – 12 July 2017

## 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 'speech and language therapist' or 'speech 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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 6 September 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 21 September 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 29 September 2017. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 23 November 2017.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major changes affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The 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	Jenny Ford (Speech and language therapist) Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Sophie Gamwell (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	35 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	01 September 2011
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2018
Chair	Greg Dainty (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Anne Cox (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Alison Clarke (External Panel Member) Cheryl Anthony (Internal Panel Member) Kate Shobbrook (Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists) Neil Lucas (Internal Panel Member) Sarah James (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping of clinical placements during transition year	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategic plan 2017-2018	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategic plan 2012-2017	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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"/>

## **Recommended outcome**

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that there is a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme, and demonstrate that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, from the relevant part of the Register.

**Reason:** At the visit, the visitors noted that Calum Delaney is the programme director for this programme. However, in discussions with the HCPC education executive after the visit, the education provider noted that Calum Delaney will no longer be the programme director and Hannah Plumpton will take his place. The visitors did not review the new programme director's curriculum vitae because she was not yet in post. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the programme leader, Hannah Plumpton, is appropriately qualified and experienced and is on the relevant part of the register. The visitors also could not see evidence of the strategy for supporting the new programme leader in their role. As such, the visitors could not see evidence to demonstrate that there is an appropriate staffing structure in place for this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence demonstrating that the new programme leader is appropriately qualified, experienced, registered and supported at the start of the programme. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

### **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:** In the programme documentation, the visitors noted references to HCPC "accreditation" of the programme. However the HCPC does not accredit but approves programmes. The visitors also noted, in the programme specification, that the programme "confers eligibility for registration" with the HCPC. However, students who successfully complete the programme are only eligible to apply to register with the HCPC – registration is not guaranteed on completion of the programme. In a review of the documentation, the visitors also noted that in the programme specification the credit values for some modules were omitted. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that the programme documentation has been updated to ensure the information provided and terminology used, is accurate consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that service users and carers will continue to be involved in this programme.

**Reason:** The visitors met service users and carers and noted that they were currently involved in the programme in a number of ways, but were unclear if or how their

involvement was formal and / or permanent. Currently, service users and carers are recruited from the group of patients at the education provider's in house clinic, or through personal contact with the programme team. The visitors noted that the education provider does not have a formal system for recruiting service users and carers, or supporting them to undertake role(s) within the programme. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how the education provider would ensure continuing and appropriate service user and carer involvement in the programme, and so were unable to determine if this standard is met. The visitors therefore require further information which details how the education provider ensures that they are able to recruit and adequately support service users and carers. In this way, the visitors can be assured that that service users will continue to be involved in the programme in future.

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

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

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team and the placement educators, the visitors understood that students conduct a risk assessment when on placement. They also noted that NHS Wales practice providers conduct a risk assessment of NHS Wales placements. However the visitors could not see, from the information provided, how the education provider consistently applies a placement approval process which includes a risk assessment of all practice placement, prior to students undertaking placements. As such, the visitors could not see how the education provider ensures that each placement will be a safe environment for all students on the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the system for approving practice placements will ensure all placements provide a safe and supportive environment.

### **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 how they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** From discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that there were overarching service level agreements in place with certain placement providers (for example the Abertawe Bro Morgannwg University Health Board). Although the visitors did not see the detail of this agreement, they understood that it covered the relationship in relation to students on placement. They also noted that NHS Wales conduct risk assessments of the placement settings. However, from the information provided, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider obtains and utilises information to approve and monitor all placements (in the NHS or otherwise), and therefore how the education provider determines that placements are appropriate for this programme. The visitors were also unclear about the education provider's criteria for approving placements or their system for approving and monitoring all practice placements on this programme. In order to determine if this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements in all settings, to ensure all practice placements are appropriate for this programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they 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:** From discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that there were overarching service level agreements in place with certain placement providers (for example the Abertawe Bro Morgannwg University Health Board). Although the visitors did not see the detail of this agreement, they understood that it covered the relationship in relation to students on placement. However, from this information, they could not determine how the education provider ensures that NHS Wales and other placement providers for this programme have equality and diversity policies in relation to students and how they will be implemented and monitored. In order to determine if this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

**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 evidence to demonstrate that students, staff and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement in relation to the assessment procedures should a student fail a clinical placement.

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that students who fail a clinical placement may re-sit the placement once. However, in discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students who fail a clinical placement and wish to re-sit may be required to take a year out and re-sit their clinical placement the following academic year. From the information provided, the visitors could not see how students, staff and practice educators are made aware that in some cases, students who fail a clinical placements may be required to take a year out and re-sit the placement the following academic year. As such, the visitor require further evidence which demonstrates how this information is communicated to students, staff and practice educators so that they are fully prepared for placement.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure that all students are assessed fairly and to the same standard at placement.

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation and in discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that all practice educators receive training about how to apply the assessment criteria when assessing students on placement. The visitors were satisfied that this is an effective way to ensure that all practice educators are aware of how to apply the assessment criteria when assessing students on this programme. However, the visitors could not determine the process by which the education provider checks and reviews the marks awarded on placement to ensure that the marking criteria is applied in a consistent way across all placements. As such, the visitors require further information demonstrating the effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure students are assessed fairly and consistently across all placements.

#### **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 and pass awards are offered, and if they are, that they do not confer eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

**Reason:** In a review of the assessment regulations the visitors were unable to locate where it is stated that an aegrotat award may be awarded on this programme, and that if it is, it will not confer eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. The visitors were also unable to see, from the information provided, where in the documentation it is stated that a pass award may be awarded on this programme. In discussion, with the programme team the visitors noted that both aegrotat and pass awards may be awarded on this programme. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors require further information which clearly states, in the assessment regulations, whether aegrotat or pass awards are offered on this programme and if they are, that they do not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Jenny Ford  
Lorna Povey  
Sophie Gamwell