hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	City University
Programme name	MSc Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiograper
Date of visit	8 – 9 March 2016

Contents

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 'radiographer' or 'diagnostic radiographer' 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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 20 May 2016. At the Committee meeting on 25 August 2016, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the conditions outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

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 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, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
HCPC observer	Andy Giles
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Maria Dingle (City University)
Secretary	Katy beavers (City University)
Members of the joint panel	Umar Yunas-Chaudhery (Internal Panel Member) Waheeda Dhansey (Internal Panel Member) Neal Summer (Internal 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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiners' reports 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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the BBs (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging) 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 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six 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 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 of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the programme has, and will continue to have, a secure place in the education provider's business plan following changes in funding. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors were presented with a business plan that was no longer viable as this programme will not be funded by NHS and students will be expected to self-fund their programme. Due to the uncertainty for funding for this programme, the education provider has changed the start date to September 2017. However, the evidence provided did not document how the education provider will ensure that the programme is secure, is not under any threat and has sufficient support following changes in bursary allocation. At the visit, the visitors met with the senior team and learnt that the education provider is unsure of how many students will be recruited onto the programme. From the discussions, the visitors were unable to determine the security of this programme within the education provider's business plan. In addition, the evidence presented prior to the visit did not demonstrate how the programme would have a secure place in the education provider's business plan for a September 2017 start date. As such the visitors could not determine if the programme had a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that the programme will continue to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme will have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the programme has, and will continue to have, a secure place in the education provider's business plan following changes in funding. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors were presented with a business plan that was no longer viable as this programme will not be funded by NHS and students will be expected to self-fund their programme. At the visit, the visitors met with the senior team and learnt that the education provider is unsure of how many students will be recruited onto the programme. From the discussions, the visitors could not determine that there was an appropriate plan in place to ensure any cohort that starts is secure in the situation where the programme does not recruit the target number of students. As such the visitors could not determine that the programme had a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that the programme will continue to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae which outlined the staff in place to deliver the proposed programme. During the visit the programme team stated that the staff would be delivering the proposed programme alongside the current BSc (Hons) Radiography programmes. The programme team also stated that they had not done any workload modelling to anticipate if there would be sufficient staff to deliver the programme when it starts in September 2017 and that they would anticipate recruiting more staff to deliver the programme. In light of this information the visitors could not determine that there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme alongside the current BSc (Hons) programme. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae which outlined the specialist expertise and knowledge of the staff in place to deliver the proposed programme. During the visit the programme team stated that the staff would be delivering the proposed programme alongside the current BSc (Hons) Radiography programmes. The programme team also stated that they had not done any workload modelling to anticipate if there would be sufficient staff with the specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the programme when it starts in September 2017 and that they would anticipate recruiting more staff to deliver the programme. In light of this information the visitors could not determine that the subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge alongside the current BSc (Hons) programme. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that the subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for radiographer.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation submitted by the education provider several instances of inaccurate terminology associated with the HCPC. For example, appendix 1, page 20 and 116 refer to the HPC". The visitors note that this is an incorrect reference to the HCPC and that the HCPC should be correctly

referenced throughout the documentation. It is important students are equipped with accurate information. To ensure students are not unintentionally misinformed about the role of the HCPC, the visitors require the education provider revises the programme documentation to correct all instances of inaccurate terminology to ensure it accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for radiographer.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that the resources to support student learning in all settings are effectively used.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the module guides which included the reading lists for the different modules. The visitors noted that there was no reference made to the HCPC Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) or Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics (SCPEs). During the visit the programme team stated that the SOPs and SECPs are used as essential learning resources throughout the programme. The visitors note that this was not reflected in the resources to support student learning, as such they could not determine that the resources to support student learning in all settings would be effectively used. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that the resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification which stated that the maximum period of registration for the programme was six years. The visitors noted that as a two year programme a student could potentially be on the programme but not study for four years. The visitors further noted that this would potentially impact a student's ability to retain and meet the SOPs during their programme. This concern was raised with the programme team who stated that the six year maximum registration was the normal expectation for a two year MSc programme at the education provider, and they have requested an exception to the policy to reduce the period of maximum registration. In light of this information the visitors could not determine that the assessment regulations clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme and require clarification of the maximum period of registration for the programme. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to clarify the approved programme is the only programme which contains any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification which outlined the possible exit awards and the final award. The evidence stated that the final MSc award was the award that allows the student who completes it to apply for registration with the HCPC. The visitors noted that the exit awards would not allow someone to apply for registration. However the evidence did not state the names of the exit awards, as such the visitors could not determine that the MSc programme was the only award that contained any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award. During the meeting with the programme team this was discussed and it was stated that the exit awards would not contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award. Therefore the visitors require further documentation that clarifies that the MSc is the only programme which contains any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the programme team engage with the monitoring processes accordingly, following any changes made to the programme.

Reason: In meeting this standard the visitors were directed to information about how the programme will be managed effectively. During the visit it was stated that the programme was due to start in September 2017 rather than the original proposed date of September 2016. As such the visitors noted that there could potentially be changes to how the programme is effectively managed in the run up to the September 2017 start date, during the visit the programme team acknowledged this possibility. In light of the potential changes between the approval of the programme and the start date of the programme, it is recommended that the visitors programme team consider how any changes would impact on how the programme meets the SETs and engage with the monitoring processes accordingly.

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that the programme team consider revising the audit form used to approve and monitor all placements.

Reason: In meeting their standard the visitors were directed to the process for approving and monitoring all placements, which included an audit form used for monitoring placement sites. The visitors were satisfied that the current process ensure that there was a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. However the visitors noted that the audit form referred to the HPC rather than the HCPC, the visitors note that this does not impact how the standard is met, however they recommend that the audit form be revised to ensure currency with the language used.

<div style="text-align: right;">

Stephen Boynes
Angela Duxbury
Ian Hughes

</div>