

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Date of visit</b>	18 – 20 January 2017

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	11

## 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 ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 March 2017. At the Committee meeting on 25 May 2017, 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 HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change 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 the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy. The education provider, the professional bodies 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. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. 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 education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Helen Best (Diagnostic radiographer) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent (Diagnostic radiography panel lead) Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead)
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Josie Fraser for the joint panel meetings (University of Bradford) Chakib Kara-Zairtri (University of Bradford) for the Diagnostic Radiography meetings
Secretary	Kirsten Bell (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Ed Mallen (Internal Panel Member) Farah Shah (Student Panel Member) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational therapists) Jackie Taylor (College of Occupational therapists)

	<p>Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)</p> <p>Jacqueline Mullan (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)</p> <p>Isabella Sarapong (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)</p> <p>Rebecca Sandys (Society of Radiographers)</p> <p>Ruth Strudwick (Society of Radiographers)</p>
--	--

## 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"/>

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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 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 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 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

### **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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how the information made available to potential applicants is clear and consistent that successful completion of the programme will allow eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register as a diagnostic radiographer.

**Reason:** In documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted on page 9 of the programme specification – a document which is available to applicants - that students are eligible to apply for Registration with the HCPC. The visitors were satisfied with this statement as this is correct and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC. However, the visitors also noted the following statement on the education provider's website advertising the programme to applicants: "by the end of your studies you will meet the professional educational standards expected by the HCPC." The visitors noted that this statement could be misleading to applicants as students are only eligible to apply to the HCPC Register and will not automatically fulfil HCPC requirements. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions information available to applicants is clear and consistent in delivering the message that successful completion of the programme will allow eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register as a diagnostic radiographer so that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

### **2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.**

**Condition:** The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate what the health requirements are, how they are appropriate to the content of the programme, and how students are told about these requirements.

**Reason:** From a review of the admissions documentation available to applicants, the visitors noted that the education provider clearly outlines that, as part of fulfilling the entry requirements to be admitted onto the course, applicants must complete "an assessment by an occupational health department" to ensure that "the student can meet the physical and emotional demands of the programme and the requirements of the Faculty's Learning and Development agreement with the Yorkshire and Humber Strategic Health Authority for protection of the public" (page 16 of the Programme specification and the university web page). However, the visitors were unclear from this documentation for applicants as to what the health requirements of the Faculty's Learning and Development agreement are and how this information is made available to applicants. As the visitors did not know what all of the health requirements were they could not determine whether these requirements were appropriate to the content of the programme and could also not determine how applicants would be aware of all of them. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence which clearly outlines the health requirements for the programme, the appropriateness to the content of the programme and how students are told about these health requirements.

**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 to clarify how the 100 per cent attendance requirement is applied appropriately to placements of varying length, as well as how this is monitored and communicated to students.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors learnt that students would be out in placement for 18 weeks a year completing between 24 and 34 hours a week at placement (depending on their rota) with a minimum of 24 hours per week. The visitors also learnt from this documentation that 100 per cent attendance is required at placement, and that the personal attendance requirement is stated in individual placement rotas (RAD10 Clinical Portfolio document, page 17). At the visit, the visitors heard from the students on the current programme that they complete an average of 34.5 hours a week but this depends on their weekly rota which is different across different placements sites. The programme team stated that students would be in placement between 24 and 30 hours a week on the revised programme from September 2017, and confirmed that no student would complete less than 24 hours a week or more than 30 hours a week. The programme team also stated that students are required to make up any missed placement experience according to their individual rota. The visitors were satisfied that, if students completed a minimum of 24 hours a week, the duration of placements would be appropriate to support the delivery of the learning outcomes. However, the visitors were not clear about the total compulsory number of hours of placement experience each individual student is required to attend as it was unclear what 100 per cent attendance at placement equates to due to the differences in individual rotas at placement. The visitors were also unclear about how the education provider has a robust monitoring mechanism for ensuring that students have attended 100 per cent of the required placement experience where students are completing a different number of hours per week, and also how students are clear about these attendance requirements. As such, the visitors require further evidence to clarify the 100 per cent attendance requirement at placement where individual placement rotas are different as well as how this is monitored by the education provider and clearly communicated to students.

**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 to demonstrate how students are fully prepared for placement in relation to the duration of any placement experience.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors learnt that students would be out in placement for 18 weeks a year completing between 24 and 34 hours a week at placement (depending on their individual rota) with a minimum of 24 hours per week (RAD10 Clinical Portfolio document, page 17). At the visit, the programme team stated that students would be in placement between 24 and 30 hours a week on the revised programme from September 2017 and confirmed that no student would complete less than 24 hours a week or more than 30 hours a week. The visitors noted that this was inconsistent with the information provided to students and, as such, they were not satisfied that students would be fully prepared for placement in relation to the duration of any placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that this information will be clearly and consistently communicated to students so that they are fully prepared for placement.

**6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates how the measurement of student performance for the Objective Patient Assessments is objective and consistent.

**Reason:** In documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors learnt that students have to undertake Objective Patient Assessments at placement. These are assessed by one clinical supervisor and have to be passed in order to progress through the programme and achieve an award. The visitors also learnt on page 23 of the clinical portfolio document that if students fail the first attempt, they may be permitted one more attempt by the Board of Examiners. However, in discussions at the visit, the visitors learnt that some clinical supervisors will stop the Objective Patient Assessment and call it a practice if they feel a student is not performing as they know they can, whereas some clinical supervisors would fail the student and count it as their first formal attempt. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that all clinical supervisors are conducting these assessments in a consistent and objective way. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that the measurement of student performance in the Objective Patient Assessment is objective, particularly in relation to how clinical supervisors decide whether it is a formal assessment or whether the assessment can be stopped and considered a practice.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are two exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. However, the visitors were unclear as to how these waivers work in practice in relation to student progression and achievement throughout the programme. For example, one of the waivers specifies credits where these waivers would be applied but, as the visitors did not see a breakdown of credit components of modules, they were unclear about which part of the modules these waivers would apply to. As such, the visitors could not see how students would be clear about how they progress and achieve within the programme, and how staff would be able to make consistent decisions in relation to student progression. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

### **6.11 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 the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** For this standard, the visitors were referred to page 3 of the guide to external examining for taught programmes: chapter 3: criteria for appointment which states that external examiners must meet “applicable criteria set out by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies.” However, the visitors could not be certain from this evidence that this would mean that the HCPC standard would be met as it is not defined in the assessment regulations as to whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations for this programme specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register.

## Recommendations

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider updates the website as soon as possible so that applicants are receiving accurate and consistent information across all platforms where admissions information is provided for applicants, including the UCAS tariff points.

**Reason:** For this standard, the visitors reviewed the information for applicants in the programme specification which is available to applicants through the programme web page, as well as the programme web page. The visitors were satisfied with the information for applicants in the programme specification and the correct tariff points on the university web page. However, the visitors noted that the information in the programme specification was not completely consistent with the information on the web page itself, including the UCAS tariff points required to access the programme. The programme team stated that they would inform applicants at the interview stage of all the required and correct information about the programme in order for applicants to make an informed decision but that the website cannot be updated to reflect changes made to the programme until the changes have been formally approved. The visitors accepted this as a reasonable response but they recommend that the website is updated as soon as possible once the changes have been approved.

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider keeps the information for applicants under review in light of the funding reforms and any future additional costs which may occur for students in the future.

**Reason:** From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that no additional costs for students had been mentioned in the information for applicants such as the cost of DBS checks, despite the funding reforms which come into effect in September 2017. At the visit, the programme team clarified that for the academic year 2017-18, there will be no additional costs for students and that the university would continue to pay for costs related to placement and the DBS checks. However, the programme team acknowledged that there may be additional costs for students in the future, such as uniform costs or DBS check costs. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider keeps information to applicants under review in relation to any future costs which the student may be required to cover on this programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that that the education provider informs the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC once they have gone through the education provider's internal validation process.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are two exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. As the visitors are currently unclear about how these regulations will apply to this programme, the visitors are aware that the wording could change further once the waivers go through the education provider's validation process even after they may have been approved by the HCPC. As such, the visitors recommend that they inform the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC.

Martin Benwell  
Helen Best  
Roseann Connolly