

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiography
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	4 - 5 March 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	7
Commendations	8

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' 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 & Training Committee on 29 May 2008. At the Education and Training Committee's meeting on 29 May, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. 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 HPC visited the programme at the University of Leeds to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards, practice placements 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body 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 the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC'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 of HPC visitors and profession	Madge Heath (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	55
Initial approval	May 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Dr Joan Maclean (University of Leeds)
Secretary	Deborah Schofield (University of Leeds)
Members of the joint panel	Lesley Daniels (University of Leeds, Internal Panel Member) Margaret Lascelles (University of Leeds, Internal Panel Member) John Newton (College of Radiographers) Dr Nick Thyer (University of Leeds, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
Proposal document for programme changes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supplementary evidence document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the student handbook prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, they did table it at the visit itself.

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

The HPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the major change did not affect specialist teaching accommodation, so there was no requirement to visit them.

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 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 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 commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both applicant and the education provider the information they require to make, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials to remove the references to “licence to practice” and “leading to registration”.

Reason: The visitors felt that the submitted documentation contained references which must be corrected to prevent applicants or students misunderstanding their route to registration. In particular, the documentation implies HPC issues a licence to practice rather than protects professional titles and that completion of the programme leads directly to registration.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both applicant and the education provider the information they require to make, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials to clearly articulate the role of the regulator in approving the programme of study.

Reason: In the advertising materials for the programme there was apparent confusion in the terminology of HPC approval of courses. The references to HPC validating rather than approving the award must be corrected to prevent applicants or students misunderstanding the role of the HPC.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the references to HPC approving placements.

Reason: In the documentation for the programme there was apparent confusion of the role of the HPC in relation to placements. The references to HPC approving placements for the programme must be corrected to clearly reflect the roles of the regulator and education provider in approving the programme of study in order to prevent students from misunderstanding the role of the HPC.

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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners must be registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: The submitted documentation did not contain the policy regarding external examiner recruitment. The visitors felt that this needs to be included within the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to pursue staff development in the area of research within the radiography department.

Reason: In discussion, the programme team indicated that a number of staff members were involved in active research but that this currently may not be developing in radiography specific areas. The visitors recognised the programme teams' efforts in extending staff expertise to further enhance the professional development of the department. The visitors wanted to support this continued development with this recommendation.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team update the reading lists for all modules across the programme to widen the use of current texts.

Reason: The visitors commented that the reading lists contained in some of the current module descriptors contained texts that were not the most recent editions and that these should be updated to reflect the range of texts used on the programme.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to develop IPL opportunities throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors recognised the efforts of the programme team in working towards the development of IPL. The visitors wanted to encourage the continued development of this area, particularly in the development of more awareness for all participants of the role of radiography in the overall management of patients/clients experiences.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors wish to commend the programme team for their student mentoring scheme and the strong support mechanisms in place for the students.

Reason: The visitors felt that the pastoral, clinical and academic support that is available to the students on the programme demonstrated best practice. In particular they noted that the benefits that the mentoring scheme offered to the students, both in receiving help and developing the ability to act as mentors, made a significant and innovative contribution to the students' experience.

Madge Heath
Linda Mutema