

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Sheffield Hallam University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Date of visit</b>	2-4 December 2008

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
<b>Visit details .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
<b>Conditions .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Commendations.....</b>	<b>10</b>

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'radiographer', 'diagnostic radiographer' and 'therapeutic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At the Committee meeting on 11 June 2009, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) 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 HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice, Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer) Jane Day (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	70
Initial approval	18 April 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Clive Woodman (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Eleanor Willcocks (Sheffield Hallam University)
Members of the joint panel	Elaine Gannon (College of Radiographers) Neil Bricklebank (Sheffield Hallam University, Internal Panel Member) Murray Clark (Sheffield Hallam University, Internal Panel Member) Doug Emery (Sheffield Hallam University, Internal Panel Member)

## Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<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"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<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"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. 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 assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

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

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

The visitors have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all the submitted programme documentation and any other documents to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** In the submitted documentation, there are instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to the role of HPC in approving or endorsing specific practice placements. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure there is consistency in the information provided regarding the length of programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation there was conflicting information regarding the length of the programme. In order to prevent confusion amongst applicants and students the visitors require the documentation to be updated.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide information on the current programme staff and associate lecturers accompanied with their CVs.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was difficult to exactly determine the staff and associate lecturers contributing to the programme and their qualifications and experience. At the visit further CVs were provided on request however there wasn't sufficient time for the visitors to thoroughly read through this documentation. In order to ensure that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide information on the current programme staff and associate lecturers accompanied with their CVs.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was difficult to exactly determine the staff and associate lecturers contributing to the

programme and their relevant specialist experience. At the visit further CVs were provided on request however there wasn't sufficient time for the visitors to thoroughly read through this documentation. In order to ensure that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence.

**3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide the protocols used to obtain consent to demonstrate that there is a coherent mechanism appropriate to all situations requiring consent and that there are clearly articulated opt-out pathways.

**Reason:** From the programme documentation the visitors could not determine the full process for obtaining consent and the guidelines for student participation in the programme. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the protocol in place to ensure that all situations requiring consent are stipulated for and that the pathway for opt-out is clear to the students throughout the programme.

**4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide the final validated versions of the new inter-professional education modules and these should not indicate that they are separately approved by HPC.

**Reason:** The revalidation event arose from changes to the common inter-professional education modules that feature in all undergraduate health and social care programmes offered by the Faculty of Health and Wellbeing. The education provider was required to take into account the views of not only the HPC and relevant professional bodies, but also those of the Nursing and Midwifery Council and General Social Care Council. As a result of this, the revalidation is a multi-staged event taking place across two weeks. In order for the visitors to be confident that they have reviewed the programmes in their complete form, the visitors will require oversight of the final version of the module descriptors after all bodies have applied their requirements to them.

Additionally, the modules indicated that HPC would be separately approving the inter-professional education programme. These modules contribute to a portion of the courses being validated and do not in themselves lead to eligibility for applying for registration with HPC. The visitors stated, therefore, that this reference must be removed.

**5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of the policy in place to ensure that information regarding Criminal Records Bureau and health checks is communicated to practice placement providers.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the placement providers there was confusion regarding the policy in place about communicating positive Criminal Records Bureau and health check information to placement providers. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the policy and process for this aspect of information submission between the education provider and placement providers.

**5.12 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of patients or clients and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.**

**Condition:** The education provider must articulate the policy regarding acquiring electronic data for use in the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors require evidence that demonstrates the protocol that is applied to the attainment of electronic data for use in the programme, including the methods of obtaining patient consent, for PACS, VERT and Treatment Planning. The visitors also request clarification in relation to agreements that are in place with teaching hospitals for obtaining this information.

**6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the policy it has in place for external examiner appointments and amend it to reflect that the requirements of the regulator will be followed.

**Reason:** The education provider wide *Nomination for an initial appointment of a subject external examiner for a taught course programme* form indicated that external examiner appointments will be made taking into account the requirements of “professional bodies”. As the HPC is not a professional body, but a statutory regulatory body, the visitors were unable to see how the specific requirements of this standard are articulated in the documentation. Therefore the visitors felt the documentation required updating to reflect the requirements of the regulator as well as those of other professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRBs).



## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors wish to recommend that the programme team considers applying equitable entry criteria with the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation it was apparent that the entry criteria between the programme and the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography programme were different. The visitors felt that, in line with other institutions, the programme team could consider implementing equitable standards.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors wish to recommend that the assessment criteria contained in the programme module descriptors is updated to show consistency in the information they contain.

**Reason:** From a review of the module descriptors the visitors noticed that some contained more detail of the assessment criteria than others. In some cases the learning outcomes for the module were matched against the pass criteria whereas in others they were also matched against mark classifications. The visitors wished to recommend that the latter approach is utilised across all module descriptors for the benefit of the students.

### **3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors wish to recommend that the programme team update the programme documentation to widen the use of current texts.

**Reason:** The visitors felt that the unit descriptors contained texts covering subjects such as anatomy and physiology, communication skills, and reflective practice that were not the most recent editions and recommend that these are updated.

## Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

**Commendation:** The visitors wished to commend the programme team for the extensive use of service users in the programme.

**Reason:** At the visit the programme team demonstrated how they had utilised service users including patients and carers in the design and delivery of the programme. The visitors felt that the level of input of service users to enhance the programme and student learning was of a level not seen by them at other institutions and therefore demonstrated innovation and best practice.

**Commendation:** The visitors wished to commend the programme team for the Clinical Liaison Officer website resource.

**Reason:** At the visit the visitors were shown the Clinical Liaison Officer website. The visitors felt that this was an excellent resource for students and in particular for clinical staff, and the inclusivity and extensive nature of the information on the site demonstrated a level of resource and access that was innovative and best practice for supporting placement staff.

Derek Adrian-Harris  
Jane Day