

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme name	MSc in Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of visit	8 – 9 December 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

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' 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 23 March 2016. At the Committee meeting on 23 March 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 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	Helen Best (Diagnostic radiographer) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer) Susanne Roff (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2016
Chair	Ann Minton (University of Derby)
Secretary	Zoe Pritchett (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Doug Carr (Internal Panel Member) Karen Cooper (Internal Panel Member) Karen Eckloff (External Panel Member) Louise Golding (Internal Observer) Beverley Snaith (College of Radiographers)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new and currently there is no external examiner.

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"/>

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, 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 recommendation 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

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 demonstrate how the admissions procedures give all the necessary information to potential applicants to make an informed choice to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that information about the programme including admissions procedures will be available online at the end of November 2015. The visitors were also directed to page 14 of the programme specification for information about admission procedures, but this contained a link to the university wide admissions procedures. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt a number of features and requirements specific to the programme, including:

- the programme is an accelerated programme, delivered over two full calendar years from September to September;
- the programme has no summer break, as students will be on practice placements during summer; and
- there is an expectation that potential applicants will have prior work experience in care setting(s).

The visitors could not find evidence of how the programme team will give potential applicants the information mentioned above, and other information that they will require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures give all the necessary information to potential applicants to make an informed choice to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must clarify whether this programme allows accreditation of prior (experiential) learning.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to the education provider's academic regulations section C. The visitors noted that students can accredit a maximum of 60 credits on any master's programme. However, the programme team highlighted that due to the nature of this programme, students will not be allowed to accredit any prior learning on this programme. The visitors highlighted to the programme team that potential students will need to be informed explicitly about the entry criteria for this programme. The programme team said they will update all the necessary documentation including entry criteria to ensure potential students know in advance this programme does not allow accreditation of prior learnings. Therefore, the visitors will need to see evidence that shows that accreditation of prior (experiential) learning is not allowed on this programme.

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 must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that delivery of this programme will require additional staff (1 full time equivalent) based on the anticipated student numbers across the new programme and the existing undergraduate programme. During the meeting with the senior management team, the visitors learnt that recruitment of an additional staff member has been agreed and finalised in departmental business plan. The visitors also learnt that the programme team will include a master's degree in radiography as a criterion for appointment for this post. However, from discussions at the visit, it was not clear what the full appointment criteria is or when this recruitment would take place. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users in practical sessions, and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted that when required, students would be verbally asked to confirm their consent and their right to confidentiality in the classroom and group work settings. However, in discussions with the programme team and students the visitors noted that there were no formal processes by which students would be able to give their consent when acting as service users in role plays, and that it will be documented and recorded. Also, the visitors could not see how students understood the risk of participating in role plays, and the impact on their academic progression if they chose to opt out of participating. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that shows the link between curriculum content and the standard of proficiency (SOPs) for radiographers.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to modules of the programme to show how SOPs are delivered in the programme. However, the visitors noted that modules have very few numbers of learning outcomes. For example, module Imaging Physics Principles and Applications has only two learning outcomes. Similarly, module Soft Tissue Imaging & Practice 2 has only one learning outcome. From the review of the modules specifications, the visitors were unable to determine where each module specification made reference to, and consequently linked to the SOPs. During the meeting with programme team, the visitors learnt that the curriculum content is designed to deliver the SOPs for radiographers. The visitors also noted that the programme team uses the education provider's template for modules

which has a limit of three learning outcomes for each module. In order for this standard to be met, the visitors considered that the curriculum content and / or learning outcomes must ensure those who successfully complete the programme understand the importance of SOPs. Because the visitors could not see reference or link to the SOPs in the content of modules' specifications, they need further evidence that shows the link between curriculum content and the SOPs to ensure those who successfully complete the programme understand the importance of the SOPs for radiographers.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, or agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC. The visitors were given link to the recruitment process of external examiners however, there was insufficient evidence. Therefore, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Recommendations

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider clarification between an aegrotat award and interim awards.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior the visit, the visitors noted in the programme handbook on page 6 “Please note that none of the following aegrotat awards will confer eligibility to register with the HCPC as a Diagnostic Radiographer, therefore none of these awards allows you to practice as a Diagnostic Radiographer
Interim awards: Post Graduate Certificate in Allied Health Studies, Post Graduate Diploma in Allied Health Studies and MSc in Allied Health Studies”. Although the visitors were content this standard is met, the visitors suggest the programme team to consider clarification between aegrotat award and interim awards as this could be misleading to potential students.

Helen Best
Shaaron Pratt
Susanne Roff