

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	9 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jane Topham (Paramedic) Dugald MacInnes (Lay)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Terry Moran, Associate Dean & Head of School of Social Sciences (Chair) Alison Bohan, Principal Officer, Academic Quality & Research, Faculty of Health (Report writer) Jacqui Parkin, Administrative Officer Faculty of Health (Course administrator) Alison Caswell, Group Head Public and Environmental Health, Faculty of Health (Internal panel member) Julie Rogers, Clinical Services Manager, MSK Services, Leeds Primary Care Trust (External panel member)

Scope of visit (*please tick*)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through annual monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A

Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1 None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	50 (30-40% AHPs)
---	---------------------

PROGRAMME APPROVED: ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.4 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Condition: The programme team should review the admissions criteria to ensure that it accurately reflects and distinguishes between the different requirements for the level three and masters level programmes.

Reason: The entry criteria listed in the programme specification and approval document does not currently detail the different requirements for studying at level three and masters level. The module descriptor for the masters level module includes an additional pre-requisite of 'a related first degree or the proven facility to function at level M' and the Faculty CPD scheme definitive document includes first degree requirements. Through discussions with the programme team, it became clear that a prospective students' potential to study at different levels would be assessed as part of the selection process and they would receive guidance on the most appropriate level. Consequently the visitors felt that the programme admissions criteria should be updated to ensure that applicants were clear of the entry standards for the two different versions of the programme.

2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team should review the ap(e)l procedures to ensure that students who are eligible for ap(e)l, are still able to meet the standard of proficiency for supplementary prescribing*. In particular, the programme team should clarify the attendance and assessment requirements following the application of ap(e)l.

**Registrants must know and be able to apply the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber in order to have their name annotated on the Register.*

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team it was confirmed that students could ap(e)l up to 50% of the programme and that this could include both the taught and clinical parts of the programme. It was explained that if a student received ap(e)l for 50% of the programme, then the 80% attendance requirement would be waived. Whilst the visitors were aware that this would only happen in exceptional circumstances, they felt that there needed to be a safeguard to ensure that students would still attend the clinical component of the programme and complete the assessment. The visitors recognised the value of ap(e)l for parts of the programme, but felt that any reduction in the time spent in clinical practice would not enable students to develop into safe and effective practitioners.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: Friday 8 June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 21 June 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-05-10	a	EDU	APV	LMU - SP - Visitors report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including the course programme delivery team details in the course handbook, so that students are aware of the wider programme team and their relevance to particular parts of the programme.

Reason: The Faculty CPD scheme definitive document included a wide range of CVs which showed the number and expertise of the staff who deliver this programme. In the meeting with the programme team, it was explained how these staff contributed to the programme delivery. The visitors felt that the information in the course handbook, which listed a team of four, could be elaborated on, so that students were clear which staff would be responsible for the delivery of the taught part of the programme.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider expressing the 12 clinical days, as hours, to ensure that all students receive sufficient support, teaching and supervision from their Designated Medical Practitioner (DMP) to allow them to achieve the learning outcomes.

Reason: The programme team do not currently provide any interpretation or guidance on what constitutes a 'working day' in practice. To eliminate variations (e.g. six hour days compared to twelve hour days), the visitors suggest that the programme team consider equating days to hours so that all students clinical experience allows them to meet the learning outcomes.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Recommendation: At the next available opportunity, the Faculty should reconsider the wording used in the 40-49% descriptor in the assessment criteria, to guarantee that they are producing graduates who are safe, effective and competent.

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team, it was explained how the assessment criteria detailed in the documentation was not used to assess clinical competencies. Clinical competencies are assessed on a pass/fail basis, so the visitors were confident that this programme's assessment ensured that students were fit to practise, upon completion. However, as these assessment criteria are used more widely within the Faculty, the visitors suggested that it be reviewed at the next appropriate opportunity to ensure that the references to 'levels of supervision' were amended, removed or edited with a caveat, so that it was explicit that those who received a grade within the 40-49% band were able to practice as safe and effective autonomous practitioners.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The students were positive and complimentary about the programme and staff support**
- **The programme team, senior staff and placement educators contributed to a constructive, open and friendly discussion throughout the visit.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Jane Topham

Dugald MacInnes

Date: 10 May 2007

PROGRAMME APPROVED: ALL CONDITIONS MET