Health Professions Council
Education & Training Panel – 2 August 2007

VISITORS' REPORTS

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction
The attached visitors' reports for the following programmes have been sent to the education providers and following a 28 day period no representations have been received. The education providers are in the process of meeting the conditions recommended by the HPC visitors.

Education provider	Programme name	Delivery mode
Anglia Ruskin University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	Full-time
Anglia Ruskin University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	Part-time
Brunel University	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)	Full-time
Glasgow Caledonian University	DipHE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Part Time (In Service)
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography	Full-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	Full-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	Part-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Psychology & Speech Pathology	Full-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Psychology & Speech Pathology	Part-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology & Therapy	Full-time
Manchester Metropolitan University	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology & Therapy	Part-time
Napier University, Edinburgh	Non-Medical Prescribing	Part-time
Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre	MA in Music Therapy (Community Music Therapy / Nordoff-Robbins)	Part-time
University of Plymouth	BSc (Hons) Dietetics	Full-time
University of Salford	Post Graduate Certificate Non Medical Prescribing (Level M)	Flexible
University of Salford	Graduate Certificate Non Medical Prescribing (Level 3)	Flexible
Sheffield Hallam University	Dip Higher Education Paramedic Practice	Full-time
Suffolk College	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time

University of Surrey	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of Teesside	University Certificate in Professional Development (UCPD)	Part-time
University of Teesside	University Certificate in Postgraduate Professional Development (UCPPD)	Part-time
University of Teesside	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science	Full-time
Thames Valley University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of Westminster	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences	Part-time
University of Worcester	Non-Medical Independent & Supplementary Prescribing	Part-time

Decision
The Panel is asked to –

accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, including the conditions recommended by the visitors
or
accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, and vary the conditions recommended by the visitors

Background information
None

Resource implications
None

Financial implications
None

Appendices
Visitors' reports (20)

Date of paper
23 July 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full and part time
Date of Visit	8 & 9 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	William Gilmore, Biomedical Science David Houliston, Biomedical Science
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins Andrea Kanaris (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Lesley Dobree, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Chair) Maureen Parsons, Internal Panel Member Chris Menzies, Internal Panel Member Ellen Langford, Quality Assurance Nikki Dibb, Quality Assurance

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	20

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

CONDITIONS

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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.

Condition: The University must provide evidence that the additional 1.5 FTE staff that have been indicated are employed before the programme commences.

Reason: The University have indicated that 1.5 additional FTE staff will be employed only if the programme is approved. Without these additional staff it is the view of the HPC Visitors that the programme does not have sufficient staff and sufficient expertise across the range of subjects to be covered.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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 University must revise and resubmit the module descriptors for all of the Level 3 modules in the programme to better reflect the level of learning outcomes appropriate for an honours programme.

Reason: The learning outcomes currently specified in the module descriptors will not ensure that a student will meet the Standards of Proficiency for Biomedical Scientists upon completion of the programme.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.
4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

Condition: The University must revise and resubmit modules where appropriate to reflect the inclusion of biomedical science specialisms earlier in the programme.

Reason: The current documentation provides little evidence of where the specialisms are covered and there is concern that some are not covered in sufficient detail to adequately prepare students for placement.

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

Condition: The University must engage with the Employers Liaison Group to ensure a consistent approach to inter-professional learning.

Reason: The Programme Team indicated they did not think that inter-professional learning was appropriate for this programme, however the employers indicated that it was appropriate and that it was taking place. Employers believed that it is important for BMS students to engage with other professional groups.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.
5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The University must put in place a comprehensive and formally documented system for approving and monitoring practice placements. This system should include a detailed criteria for placement approval, with particular reference to the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, and the monitoring of the laboratory's CPA accreditation (Clinical Pathology Accreditation).

Reason: The University indicated that practice placements would be visited however there is no formal system in place and no clearly defined criteria for placement approvals.

5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must have relevant qualification and experience
5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must be appropriately registered

Condition: The University must agree a standard job description with the practice placement providers for the practice placement Training Officers.

Reason: A formally documented job description needs to be agreed to ensure that expectations are clearly defined and understood between the employers and the University.

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The University must put in place a formal process for providing appropriate training to practice placement educators.

Reason: The University does not currently have a system in place to ensure that practice placement educators receive appropriate training.

Deadline for conditions to be met: **9 July 2007**

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: **5 July 2007**

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: **2 August 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.

Recommendation: The professional roles, responsibilities and requirements of the HPC, IBMS and other bodies could be more clearly explained to students at the beginning and reflected throughout the course.

Reason: Students indicated they didn't understand or were confused about the various roles of the HPC and the IBMS.

COMMENDATIONS

• **Employers were enthusiastic and positive in their support for the course, providing a strong basis upon which the University can work to address the issues identified around practice placements.**

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:

Bill Gilmore
David Houliston

Date: 20 May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Name and titles of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full-time
Date of visit	30/31 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	17th September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Sue Rugg, University of Plymouth, Occupational Therapist Sarah Johnson, University of Plymouth, Occupational Therapist
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins, Education Officer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Derek Milligan, Director of Academic Development, Brunel University (Chair) Karen Holmes, Education Officer, College of Occuatopnal Therapists Ruth Heames, Coventry University, College of Occupational Therapists Helen Stoneley, University of Derby, College of Occupational Therapists Taeko Wydell, Social Sciences, Brunel University Anthony Blazevich, Sport and Education, Brunel University Ruth Simpson, Brunel Business School

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	30

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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 University must put in place an interview procedure as part of its admission process to ensure that students meet all of the entry criteria, are clear about expectations, and are fully prepared for the programme.

Reason: Currently interviews are only held with prospective students in exceptional circumstances. The HPC Visitors do not believe that this process is sufficiently robust.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.7.2 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title.

Condition: The documentation must be amended to make it clear that any student completing the programme without passing the practice placement element will not receive an award with an HPC protected title.

Reason: The University currently offers intermediate awards in Therapeutic Studies, however it is not clear in the documentation that these awards also apply to those students who complete sufficient credits for the award of a Masters qualification but do not complete the practice placement element.

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

Condition: The documentation must be amended to make it clear that any student receiving an aegrotat award will not receive an award with an HPC protected title and will not be eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The programme team made it clear during discussions that a student would not be given the MSc in Occupational Therapy through an aegrotat award, however this was not clear in the documentation.

Deadline for conditions to be met:	**6 July 2007**
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:	**5 July 2007**
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:	**1 August 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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.

Recommendation: The wording of Module HH5538 should be amended to ensure that it is clear that the module is not intended to 'prepare' students for Masters level study but is designed to further develop their skills.

Reason: The HH5538 Module is currently delivered in the second year of the programme. The programme team explained that the module is not intended as a preparatory module however this was not clear in the module description.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation: Ensure the wording in the practice placement handbook makes it clear how re-assessment of practice placements will occur.

Reason: The procedures outlined in the documentation do not align with current practices, as discussed with the programme team

COMMENDATIONS

- ***The programme team produced a clear and concise set of documentation that made the approval process very straight forward.***

- ***Students spoke very highly of the existing programmes and the support that they have received from the programme team.***

- ***The new facilities are excellent and provide an ideal learning environment for Occupational Therapy.***

- ***The team's innovative and efficient approach to curriculum design and delivery is highly commendable.***

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:

> **Sue Rugg**
> **Sarah Johnson**

Date: 1 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education in Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	17 and 18 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Maria Boutabba (ODP) Penny Joyce (ODP)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mrs Irene Bonnar (Chair) Associate Dean Quality Built Environment Miss Cheryl Cooper (External) Edge Hill University Ms Karen Thomson (Internal) Associate Dean Quality School of Life Sciences Gill Paterson (Secretary) Quality Office

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	X
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	X	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐

IT facilities	**X**	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	**X**	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**15**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must provide a copy of the new CRB criteria that indicates self declaration at level 2.

Reason: At the meeting with the programme team the panel discussed with the team the issue around the continuing currency of the CRB procedure. The team have developed a new form for the students to complete at level 2 as self declaration and the visitors have asked to see a copy of this new form to satisfy the requirement of SET 2.2.2.

2.3 ensure that the education provider has an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must remove all references to "mature" entry in all documentation.

Reason: All documentation needs to be revised to remove the reference to "mature" entry to ensure the documentation reflects the current equal opportunities legislation.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements:
6.7.2 for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title;

Condition: The programme team must ensure that the exit award (Certificate of Higher Education) does <u>not</u> include the protected title of "Operating Department Practice"

Reason: Currently the documentation has the protected title listed against the exit award.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 30 June 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2 August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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 programme team should reflect more contemporary literature on the indicative reading in all modules.

Reason: The indicative reading in modules is limited and does not reflect current Literature available for Operating Department Practice and Perioperative Care.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation: The University should explore opportunities for wider inter-professional learning for ODPs.

Reason: At the meetings with the Senior Management, Students and the programme team it became apparent that although the mapping documents had indicated that there was no inter-professional learning happening, there was evidence that inter-professional learning was occurring in practice. The visitors felt that the University did have an opportunity for the ODP students to share learning with other relevant professions within the student community at Glasgow Caledonian University.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Recommendation: The programme team should formalise the audit process as part of the quality review cycle.

Reason: This part of the audit process was happening, but was not documented.

COMMENDATIONS

The visitors commend the team on the formative tripartite assessment procedure.

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:

  Maria Boutabba

  Penny Joyce

Date: 21 May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	BSc (Hons) Part-time – In service
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	BSc (Hons) Part time In Service September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Carol Lloyd, Occupational Therapist Claire Brewis, Occupational Therapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair), London South Bank University Catherine Moss (Secretary), London South Bank University Jan Jenson, College of Occupational Therapists Ms Mary Gottwald College of Occupational Therapists Professor Mike Molan, London South Bank University Professor Geoffrey Elliott, London South Bank University Lisa Greatrex, London South Bank University

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme BSc (Hons) Full time	☒
Major change to existing programme BSc (Hons) Part time	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc (Hons) to include Part time in service = 48

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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 documentation for the BSc (Hons) programme needs to be revised to make it clear that completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC, it does not automatically confer or entitle the student to HPC registration.

Reason: Currently the documentation could leave students with the impression that HPC registration is an automatic entitlement at the end of the programme.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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 HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics must be formally incorporated into the teaching content of the pre-placement modules of the BSc (Hons) programmes.

Reason: The HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics are as relevant to students as to practitioners, and this is not clearly stated in the document.

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

Condition: The documentation for the BSc (Hons) must be revised to make explicit how learning disabilities are integrated into the programme.

Reason: It is currently unclear how this content is incorporated into the modules.

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Condition: The module content for OTP-M-1-02 must be revised to include an indicative content as well as learning outcomes.

Reason: The current indicative content is identical to the learning outcomes.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The BSc (Hons) documentation should be revised to make explicit where the re-takes of practice placements occur.

Reason: This information is not clear in the documentation.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title;

Condition: The programme documentation should be revised to make it clear which programmes provide eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: The current documentation is not clear.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **29 June 2007**
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **2 August 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.
2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Recommendation: Criminal conviction and health checks could be updated on an annual basis, or students could be asked to complete an annual self declaration.

Reason: Currently CRB checks and health checks are required before the programme commences, however there does not appear to be any mechanism to ensure these are kept up to date.

COMMENDATIONS

1. **The one day conference including students and practice placement providers was excellent practice.**
2. **The tripartite agreement between students, placement providers and the university was very clear and an excellent example of good practice.**

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:

Carol Lloyd
Claire Brewis

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full Time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2008
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Angela Duxbury
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair) Catherine Moss (Secretary) Gaile Biggart Society and College of Radiographers Professor Mike Molan LSBU Professor Geoffrey Elliott LSBU Lisa Greatrex LSBU

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	
Major change to existing programme	X
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	X	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐
IT facilities	X	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc = 10 to be confirmed by SHA/University

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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 admissions procedures must clearly articulate the fact that students on successful graduation must apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Currently the documentation does not explain this and therefore the students are not aware that this process is <u>not</u> automatic.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must provider confirmation and review of the resources for the new programmes.

Reason: Before the new programmes commence there must be evidence produced that will show that the commissioned numbers have been given support by NHS London and that the numbers and resources have not been moved to the detriment of the other established programmes.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:
   5.3.1 a safe environment; and for
   5.3.2 safe and effective practice.

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

Condition: The documentation must include clinical placement resources for 2 of the cancer centres involved in student placements.

Reason: In the current documentation the practice placement educator information for the 2 cancer placements is missing. There is no named placement educator or mentor listed.

Recommendation

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including student self declaration on an annual basis.

Reason: Currently there is no formal policy to monitor criminal conviction checks and health requirements after entry to the programmes.

Commendations

The partnership with the Trusts is excellent.

The quality of the subject specific documentation was excellent.

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:

        Angela Duxbury

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time and Part time
Date of visit	27 and 28 June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mrs Mary Macdonald (Biomedical Scientist) Mr Tommy Cavanagh (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr P Roberts (Chair) Mrs B Furnival (Secretary) Mrs A Geddis External Advisor Professor P Whiting External Assessor Mrs M Kelly Academic Standards Unit Dr E A Price Faculty Academic Development Representative Mr A Wainwright IBMS Dr M Bowen IBMS Dr N Hall IBMS

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	**X**
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	X	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐

IT facilities	X	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	10 F/T 15P/T

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

CONDITIONS

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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.

Condition: The Programme Team must provide a list of the names of associate lecturers who teach into the programme including specialism and HPC registration details and also copies of curriculum vitae.

Reason: In discussions with the Senior Team and the Programme Team it became apparent that there were a number of associate lecturers (visiting lecturers) teaching into the programme. However supporting documentation did not include details of associate lecturers and the visitors wanted to ensure that subject areas were taught by appropriately selected staff to ensure the students received the required teaching.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 16 July 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2 August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Recommendation: The Visitors suggest that the Programme Team review the process of assessment by examination in order that students do not feel disadvantaged by going for long periods without formal written examinations.

Reason: It was noted during the meeting with the current cohort of students that not having many "essay type" examinations until the final year of the programme made them feel unprepared for this type of examination. Although the Programme Team have addressed this by putting more support in place to aid the students with examinations, the Visitors felt that the Programme Team should keep this area of assessment under review to ensure equity of student experience.

COMMENDATIONS

- ▪ *The quality of the documentation*
- ▪ *The high quality and professionalism of the Programme Team and in particular the input made by the placement co-ordinator.*

- ▪ *The Student Support information provided by the University was exemplary.*

- ▪ *The library, IT, research and laboratories were state of the art.*

- ▪ *The range of research being carried out within the School was most impressive together with its other research partners.*

- ▪ *The students seen were a credit to the programme and were highly supportive of the Universities and the Placement Providers.*

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:

Mary Macdonald

Tommy Cavanagh

Date: 29 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	FT / PT
Date of visit	12 – 13 June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Martin Duckworth (Educationalist, Speech and Language Therapist) Lesley Culling (Clinician, Speech and Language Therapist
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Dr Ken Hume** (Chair), Head of Division of Health Science, School of Chemistry, Biological and Health Science, Faculty of Science and Engineering **Mr Stuart Ramsden** (Secretary), Programme Development Officer Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education **Mr Ian Barron** (Internal Panel Member), Academic Division Leader: Early Years & Childhood Studies, Institute of Education **Miss Peggy Cooke** (Internal Panel Member), Principal Lecturer for Quality School of Health, Psychology and Social Care **Mr Robert Baker** (Internal Panel Member), Principal Administrative Assistant **Miss Sandra Sharpe** (Internal Panel Member), Principal Faculty Administrator Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education **Dr Gaye Powell** (External Panel Member), Head of Speech & Language Services (Adults & Children) Plymouth Teaching Primary Care Trust **Ms Claire Johnson** (RCSLT), Head of Division Speech and Language Therapy and RNIB Rehabilitation Faculty of Health, UCE Birmingham **Ms Rubana Hussein** (RCSLT), Professional Development Standards Manager

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy – 50 BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology - 20

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

CONDITIONS

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The Programme Team, in collaboration with the University of Manchester and Clinical Educators, are to review and resubmit the clinical placement marking criteria at pass level (40% - 49% band) to ensure that the graduates from the programme are able to practise safely and effectively.

Reason: In the submitted documentation the wording of the clinical placement marking criteria at pass level was suggestive of deficiencies of knowledge and skills required to practise safely. The Visitors felt that, in order to ensure clinical placement staff are able to effectively grade a students' performance, the clinical placement marking criteria required review and redrafting.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 16th July 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider making explicit to students the process for obtaining consent from all client groups for treatment by students.

Reason: The Visitors recognised relevant protocols were in place to ensure patients and clients gave consent for student involvement in their treatment. The Visitors considered it would be beneficial to students to be made aware of this process to assist their understanding of the rights of patient and clients.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider continuing the development of objective assessment criteria across all units in the programmes.

Reason: The Visitors felt the programme assessment processes effectively met this standard, but felt students would benefit from published assessment criteria for all assessments to assist them in their preparation of assessed work.

COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- The admission handbook, which provides significant and useful detail for staff on the admission process and criteria for assessment of admission requirements.

- The innovative role of Clinical Education Support Centres in providing profession specific facilitation in all areas of the collaboration between the Universities and the placement environments.

- The clinical resources provided by the ICON Centre which is a wide-ranging and well funded resource which enhances the learning and teaching facilities for students.

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:

Martin Duckworth

Lesley Culling

Date: 14th June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	**Napier University**
Name and titles of programme(s)	**Non Medical Prescribing**
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	**PT**
Date of visit	**19th June 2007**
Proposed date of approval to commence	**September 2007**
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Mr David Halliwell –** South Western Ambulance NHS Trust **Mrs Penelope Renwick –**Director of School of Psychology and Social Care, Manchester Metropolitan University.
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Miss Daljit Mahoon**
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Mr Sam Allwinkle (Chair) –** Director of life long learning services Napier University **Mrs Gill Perry –** Faculty assistant manager, Quality **Mr David Reid –** Senior lecturer faculty of engineering, computing and creative industries, Napier University. **Mr Kevin McClure –** Lecturer school of health and social sciences, Napier University **Ms Mandy Edwards –** Health and Life Sciences Partnership **Mrs Gillian Davies –** Quality Enhancement Services, Napier University

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐

IT facilities	⊠	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☐	⊠	☐

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	☐	☐	⊠
2	☐	☐	⊠
3	☐	☐	⊠

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**Min 15** **Max 25**

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

> **SET 2 Programme admissions**
> **2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.**
>
> **Condition:**
> The programme team must revise and resubmit documentation that outlines the process for ensuring health checks are in place for independent practitioners.
>
> **Reason:**
> Currently there is no health check system in place, in admission, for independent practitioners who may access this course. A process needs to be implemented and outlined within the documentation of how this is carried out, for e.g., self declaration.

Condition 2

> **SET 3. Programme management and resource standards**
> **3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**
>
> **Condition:**
> The programme team must submit evidence which outlines and ensures that the requisite specialist expertise for Allied Health Professionals attending the course is in place.
>
> **Reason:**
> It was not clearly articulated within the documentation how the needs for Allied Health Professionals are specifically met on the course. The visitors

felt that through submitting documentation that clearly outlines the specific provisions that are in place for Allied Health professionals, it would assure them that their specific needs are also being met. For e.g.; listing the different AHP focused clinicians who may contribute to the course, or evidence of the on-line learning resources available for AHP students.

Condition 3

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 programme team need to develop and submit a specific consent form for use when students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason:
Currently there is no system in place to obtain consent from students prior to any activity which may involve them in acting as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching. This needs to be put in place.

Condition 4:

3.11 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 programme team need to make it more explicit within the documentation, what aspects of the programme require mandatory attendance and what procedures are in place to manage non-attendance.

Reason:
It was not clearly articulated within the documentation where attendance is mandatory and the implications of non-attendance. This needs to be made much more explicit to students so that they are fully informed.

Condition 5

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.3.2 The practice placement settings must provide for safe and effective practice.
5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment
5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.
5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators have relevant qualification and experience;
5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.
Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

Condition:
The programme team must develop and submit an audit mechanism to ensure the quality of the practice learning environments. They should also submit a clear list of all Designated Medical Practitioner's (DMP), which should include their relevant qualifications, area, and when it was last updated.

Reason:
Currently there is no audit mechanism in place to assess the quality of the practice learning environments. The visitors also found it difficult to assess whether the DMP's are appropriately qualified, for there was no information submitted which outlined the relevant qualifications the DMP's possess.

Condition 6

SET 5. Practice placements standards
Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:
5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;
5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

Condition:
The programme team need to make it more explicit within the documentation the expectations of professional conduct and the actions that are taken in the case of failure.

Reason:
It was not clearly articulated within the documentation the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics and the actions that are taken in the case of a failing student. These need to be made more explicit within the documentation so that students are fully informed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 2 Programme admissions
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

Recommendation 1:
The visitors encourage the programme team to consider the development of a brochure that clearly sets out information that enables applicants to make an informed choice about the course.

Reason:
The visitors felt that a brochure about the course would be very useful for prospective students, for they did not see any evidence of this within the submitted documentation.

COMMENDATIONS

1) **The commitment and professionalism of the programme team and the leadership shown by the programme leader.**
2) **The high quality of the on-line learning resources.**

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:

Mr David Halliwell

Mrs Penelope Renwick

Date: 26/6/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre (North West) (programme delivered at Royal Northern College of Music and validated by City University
Name and titles of programme(s)	MA in Music Therapy (Community Music Therapy / Nordoff-Robbins)
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of visit	5th – 6th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	February 2008
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	John Strange (Clinician, Music Therapist) Teresa Boronska (Educationalist, Art Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Helen Patey (Chair), Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre, London Simon Procter (Secretary), Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre, London

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☐	☐	☒

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	15

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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 programme team must draft and submit advertising material to clearly articulate the distinction between the MA in Music Therapy (Community Music Therapy / Nordoff-Robbins) and other music therapy programmes available in the UK.

Reason: The Visitors felt the programme title accurately reflects the music therapy content of the programme, but considered the innovative nature of the programme was not clear. In order to allow applicants to determine whether the programme's approach to music therapy was the most appropriate for them, the Visitors felt the advertising material should contextualise the programme within the existing music therapy provision in the UK.

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for determining an applicant's English language skills.

Reason: The programme documentation and the subsequent validation report indicated a discrepancy in the method of assessment of an applicant's English language skills. In discussion, the Visitors felt the use of an entry requirement of 6.5-7.0 IELTS and an assessment of a short unprepared written assignment was an appropriate method of determining an applicant's ability. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to include this information.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre North West and the Royal Northern College of Music must submit the final draft of the memorandum of agreement between institutions.

Reason: In the submitted documentation a draft copy of the memorandum of agreement was provided, however, in discussion it was apparent there were some areas subject to negotiation. In order to effectively determine the appropriateness of the memorandum of agreement and accordingly the security of the programme in both institutions' business plans, the Visitors require the final version of the agreement.

3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well-being of students must be both adequate and accessible.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the types of support available to students from all three institutions.

Reason: The submitted documentation provided much information about available support, but in discussion it was apparent that there would be available some additional resources such as: the Nordoff-Robbins student support budget; a limited period of Nordoff-Robbins funded psychological support; and dyslexia support offered through the CityScape virtual learning environment.

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.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly identify texts in the recommended reading lists to address standards of proficiency "3a.1 – know theories of group work and the management of group process"; and "3a.1 – understand the psychological and cultural background to health and be aware of influences on the client-therapist relationship".

Reason: The Visitors felt that, in order to ensure the above standards of proficiency are sufficiently embedded in the programme, the programme team must revisit the recommended reading list to ensure there is adequate coverage of these areas.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate where standard of proficiency "1b.1 – know the professional and personal scope of their practice and be able to make referrals" is delivered in the learning outcomes and subsequently assessed.

Reason: In discussion, the programme team conceded the above standard of proficiency was not a clear learning outcome. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the programme team must revisit the learning outcomes to embed it into the curriculum.

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.

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

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Condition: The programme team must submit outlines and indicative content of the "professional knowledge domain" documents.

Reason: In order to effectively determine how the "professional knowledge domain" documents will incorporate standard of proficiency 3a.1, reflect the curriculum guidance and

operate as a teaching and learning approach, the Visitors require an indication of the content and an outline of how the document will be structured.

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Condition: The programme team must submit the two draft practice guides that have already been produced.

Reason: In order to effectively determine how the practice guides will operate as a teaching and learning approach or impact on teaching and learning in placement, the Visitors require the opportunity to assess the appropriateness of the documents.

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that individual module assessments may be taken forward to contribute to the portfolio word count for each year.

Reason: In discussion, it was indicated that, after the initial formative assessment of each module assessment, the submission may be redrafted and submitted to contribute to the portfolio at the end of each year. The submitted documentation did not reflect this option and in order to make it clear to students, the Visitors felt the documentation must be revised.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:
> 5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate to students and practice educators the professional aspects of practice that may lead to failure.

Reason: The submitted documentation, though making clear failure could be as a consequence of unprofessional behaviour, did not make reference to the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics. Accordingly, the Visitors felt practice educators and students required greater clarification of the risk of failure as a result of failing to meet professional standards.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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 the rationale for maintaining assessment standards through the appointment of an external examiner through City University's process and a Music Therapist advisor using Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre's process.

Reason: The programme documentation did not indicate that the City University appointed external examiner would necessarily be a Music Therapist. Accordingly, the Visitors require confirmation that the arrangements for appointing an external examiner and a Music Therapist advisor will ensure assessment standards are being maintained.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 23rd November 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 4th December 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Recommendation: Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre North West and the Royal Northern College of Music should consider extending the minimum tenancy period stated in the memorandum of agreement to ensure at least one cohort will be able to progress and complete the programme at the same venue.

Reason: In the discussion with senior management, it was clear City University would take responsibility for locating alternate premises for delivery of the programme in the unlikely event the tenancy agreement between institutions was terminated. However, the Visitors considered it would be desirable to ensure that at least one cohort would be able to complete the programme at the same venue to reduce disruption to students.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should include greater emphasis on clinical improvisation in the programme.

Reason: The Visitors recognise graduates will have the skills and knowledge to be able to improvise in the clinical environment. However, through increased emphasis in the programme, the Visitors feel graduates will be better developed and prepared for clinical improvisation.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider separating the practice educator and student practice handbooks.

Reason: The Visitors recognise the practice educator and student practice handbook as a single document is appropriate to its purpose. However, in order to assist students and practice educators, the Visitors feel the document may be clearer if separated into two separate handbooks.

COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- The work already invested by Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre North West into the region and how the new programme fits into already established client settings and further develops Music Therapy in the region.

- The venue at the Royal Northern College of Music. The Visitors recognised the potential for innovative collaboration and future development between the Royal Northern College of Music and Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre North West

- The implementation of the CityScape virtual learning environment in the delivery of the new distance learning model of music therapy pre-registration education.

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:

      John Strange

      Teresa Boronska

Date: 8th June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	1st June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Alexa Scott** - (Clinician, Dietician) **Jennifer Caldwell** - (Educationalist, Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Dr David Harwood** - (Chair), Director of the Institute of Science Education, Faculty of Science **Lisa Lamb** - (Secretary), Senior Administration Officer Quality **Claire McMann** - (Secretary: shadowing), Administration Officer Quality **Bernard Haas** - Deputy Head of School, Health Professions

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☒
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☐	☐	☒
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐

Specialist teaching accommodation	⊠	☐	☐

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 New premises which have not been visited	⊠	☐	☐
2 Staffing compliment and relevant qualifications	⊠	☐	☐
3 Appropriately registered External Examiner	⊠	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	45

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and entry to the HPC register.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation states that students are eligible to register with the HPC upon graduation. To provide full and clear information about the programme, the Visitors felt the programme documentation must be amended to state that upon graduation, students are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to clarify the statement under section 3.6 e) – Assessment of practice education.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook states 'Students are aware of the assessment criteria for practice education, which are (defined by the Health Professions Council)'. The Visitors appreciate this is an attempt to refer students to HPC's standards of proficiency but feel the statement must be clarified to remove any misunderstanding.

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must submit an update, including action plans, which addresses student concerns about the inter-site transport.

Reason: From discussions with students and the programme team, the Visitors noted that negotiations had commenced in an attempt to solve the perceived problems with the free, inter-site transport. To determine the ongoing commitment of the programme team to resolving these issues, the Visitors must be provided with an update on progress.

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must submit the IT strategy for the 2007/2008 intake, taking into account the planned library refurbishment and growth of student numbers within the Peninsula Allied Health Collaboration.

Reason: From discussions with the library staff and programme team, the Visitors learnt of plans to introduce additional University of Plymouth networked computers in the library and that Occupational Therapy and Midwifery programmes will be moving to PAHC in September 2007. While the Visitors felt the IT facilities at PAHC adequately support the current set up, they must be assured this will continue in the refurbished library and with increased numbers of students within the Faculty.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 13th July 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider redrafting the programme handbook to clarify the statement under section 3.7.1 – attendance at interactive sessions.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook could be mis-interpreted. To avoid ambiguity, the visitors felt the handbook should be updated to clarify that HPC's standards of proficiency do not stipulate attendance policies which the university must implement.

COMMENDATIONS

▪ The Visitors would like to commend the programme team on their innovative approach to the interdisciplinary use of the facilities, such as the treadmill and kitchen; their strategy to address the lack of placements; and the multi-disciplinary approach to ensuring parity across all placements within the Faculty.

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:

Jennifer Caldwell

Alexa Scott

Date: 15th June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Name and titles of programme(s)	Post Graduate Certificate Non Medical Prescribing (Level M)
	Graduate Certificate Non Medical Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Flexible
Date of visit	15 June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic Radiographer)
	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ruth Chadwick (Dean)
	Emma Williams (Secretary)
	Joy Duxbury (NMC)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	X
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	X	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐
IT facilities	X	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**Level 3 40 Students** **Level M 20 students** **Both levels have 2 cohorts per year**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements;

Condition: The University must ensure that all documentation relating to admissions to the programmes should include a procedure for the criminal convictions check and the health check to make certain that students can make a fully informed decision for admission to the programme.

Reason: Although the application form for admission to the programmes indicates that both the criminal conviction check and the health check are required it is not included in the Programme Specifications or the website where students access information that lead to an informed decision on whether they take up a place on the programmes.

2.2.4 apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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 programme team must have a protocol and the appropriate form for gaining student consent in such areas as role play.

Reason: It emerged that role play would be involved for the OSCE and although there is a protocol and form already in existence for other programmes within the faculty, this form was not available to visitors during the visit.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must formalise the process of ensuring that Designated Medical Practitioners (DMPs) are visited in practice regularly to discuss progress of students on the programme.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team it was indicated that DMPs would be visited as part of the collaborative process for the new programmes to ensure that students and DMPs are supported by the programme team throughout the duration of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must ensure that all placement providers are communicated with and are included in all feedback mechanisms and involvement in future curriculum developments.

Reason: At the meeting with the placement providers there was discussion around feedback mechanisms and what could be fed back to them under the Data Protection Act and how much input they had had to the design and development of the new programmes. The visitors were concerned that the lack of communication detracted from what is a good programme.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 16 July 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider having annual study days for DMPs and to publise the local network of DMPs to allow a support network to be built.

Reason: Feedback from the DMP's indicated that it would be beneficial to meet with other DMP's on an annual basis in order to be a support for each other and to have this network available for students so they could be used as an additional resource if required.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should provide programme information to all placement providers so that they are fully informed of all aspects of programme delivery and assessment and their role within it. This would ensure that students are fully supported across all placements.

Reason: The placement providers need to have details in advance of receiving a student for placement so that delivery patterns and assessment issues are resolved and allow the student to be treated equitably.

 COMMENDATIONS

- *Complement the team on the documentation provided.*

- *Complement the University of the range of resources available to students on the programmes.*

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:

Patricia Fillis

Gordon Pollard

Date: 18 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	**Sheffield Hallam University**
Name and titles of programme(s)	**Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice**
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	**FT**
Date of visit	**28th – 29th June 2007**
Proposed date of approval to commence	**September 2007**
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Bob Fellows** - Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service NHS Trust. **Vince Clarke –** Training Officer, London Ambulance Service
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Daljit Mahoon**
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Roger New** (Chair) – Faculty of Arts, Computing, Engineering and Sciences. **Eleanor Willcocks** (Secretary) – Student and Academic Services **Monica Dawson** – Internal Panel Member, Faculty of Development and Society **Jenny Shelton** – Head of Quality and Enhancement, Faculty of Health and Wellbeing **Andy Freeman May** – External panel member, Programme lead Paramedic Emergency Care, Oxford Brooks University **John Martin** – British Paramedic Association

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	18

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

Condition:
The programme team must submit evidence in the form of a list of mentors with their current qualifications and an action plan on how they will address any shortfalls.

Reason:
It was difficult to see within the documentation, clear up to date information regarding placement mentor staff, such as who they are and what qualifications they hold. Through the use of a clear mentor list it would enable the visitors to determine whether this SET has been met. It will also help assure the visitors that the education provider has an action plan in place in case there are any shortfalls, such as if placement mentors are lacking in relevant qualifications to act as mentors or even if there ever is a shortage of mentors. The team stated that there would be 3-4 mentors per student on the proposed clinical placement pattern

Condition 2

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition:
The programme team must submit a signed copy of a memorandum of co-operation between the education provider and the practice placement providers.

Reason:
Currently there is no formal signed memorandum of co-operation between the education provider and the practice placement providers (East Midlands and Yorkshire Ambulance Services). A signed memorandum would ensure a more formalised agreement is in place and that there is consistency between both parties.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 2 Programme admissions

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 apply, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Recommendation:
To reproduce the brochure provided for prospective students in relation to the driving entry standards

Reason:
The information presented within the programme brochure in relation to the documentation regarding driving entry standards was inconsistent. To avoid misleading prospective students, this information should be clear and consistent throughout ensuring students are able to make an informed decisions at all stage of the entry pathway.

Recommendation 2

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:
To explore the possibilities for the range of placements to be broadened to other areas of health care, such as maternity.

Reason:
Through broadening the range of possible placements to include other areas of health care, it would help to enhance the student experience.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The use of I.T., such as the use of blackboard, incorporating placement audits and mentor preparation.

2. The way in which all the Allied Health Professions are facilitated in one area within the university and the associated clinical practice areas/facilities that are available.

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:

Mr Bob Fellows

Mr Vince Clarke

Date: 4/07/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Suffolk College
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	13th and 14th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount (Educationalist) Julie Weir (Clinician)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Joanna Jackson** - Chair **Alison McQuin** - Secretary **Shaune Richardson** - UEA validation **Anne Jonston** - Internal **Alex Seabrook** - University of Essex validation (13th June only) **Kay Thompson** - University of Essex validation (14th June only) **Penny Joyce** - CODP **Karen Latcham** - External **Ron Impey** - Internal quality assurance (13th June only)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**12**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials and programme specification to ensure consistency between the documents and to provide information about the new programme, which includes the entry criteria for English language, enhanced criminal conviction checks and health requirements.

Reason: Currently the advertising materials and programme specification do not provide full and consistent information about the new Dip HE Operating Department Practice programme. The Visitors felt applicants and students must be made aware of the entry criteria for English language, enhanced criminal conviction checks and health requirements and that they will be applied. To allow students to make an informed choice, these documents must be updated.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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.

Condition: The programme team must forward the CV's for all lecturers on the programme, including those who participate from practice.

Reason: From discussions with the placement providers it became apparent that not all the CV's for the lecturers from practice had been provided. As such, the Visitors were unable to determine whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme or whether the staff identified on the module specifications as teaching, have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

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

Condition: The programme team must review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and entry to the HPC register.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation, which is a resource, states that students are eligible to register with the HPC upon graduation. To provide full and clear information about the programme, the Visitors felt the programme documentation must be amended to state that upon graduation, students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.

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 programme team must implement and submit procedures for gaining informed consent from students prior to the commencement of simulated clinical activities where students act as patients or clients.

Reason: The Visitors felt the current, faculty wide, consent form was too generic and did not address all the activities which a student may be asked to undertake as part of the programme. As such, the Visitors felt procedures must be implemented which are specific to ODP students.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the HPC standards of proficiency mapping document to clearly identify each standard of proficiency against each module in which it is taught and assessed.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team, the Visitors identified omissions from the standards of proficiency mapping document and to provide a complete overview of the programme, this document must be updated.

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 programme team must review, and were necessary, redraft and resubmit the module specifications to clearly identify which standards of proficiency are taught and assessed in each module.

Reason: Currently the module specifications do not provide full information about which standards of proficiency will be met in each module. Examples of this can be found in Professional Practice 1, Anaesthetic Practice and Surgical Practice. The Visitors felt that these must be updated to provide students with full information.

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.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the inter-professional learning module specification, Communications and Interpersonal Skills, to include reference to HPC's standards of proficiency.

Reason: Currently the module specification directs students to the NMC and QAA standards but not HPC's. To provide ODP students with profession specific knowledge, the Visitors felt this must be updated.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

5.4 Learning, teaching and supervision must be designed to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the practice portfolio to clearly identify at which stage of the programme students are expected to complete each competence.

Reason: Feedback from current students and placement providers about the existing portfolio, indicated confusion surrounding at what stage of their training a student would be expected to prove competence, such as checking an anaesthetic machine. Placement providers confirmed they would realistically expect that at the end of their first year, a student should be able to set up for a 'basic' operating list and perform standard equipment safety checks in accordance with the A.A.G.B.I's checklist for Anaesthetic Equipment (2004), but this area of competence is not assessed within the proposed practice portfolio until the second year. Nor was it apparent from discussions with the programme team, that underpinning theory associated with some of these fundamental anaesthetic and surgical skills was delivered at an appropriate stage to enable safe and effective practice. To provide clear information to students and placement providers, the Visitors believe that the proposed practice portfolio must be updated to harmonise theory and practice and reflect appropriate and realistic stages of skill acquisition throughout the first and second year.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must submit an updated mentor list, which includes the qualifications, speciality training and when the mentor last received practice placement educator training.

Reason: The information received at the visit did not allow the Visitors to undertake a full assessment of the above standards of education and training and as such, an updated list must be forwarded.

5.4 Learning, teaching and supervision must be designed to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook and, where necessary, the module specifications to include reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation does not mention HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The Visitors felt that more direction to the HPC standards is required to ensure students are aware of the thresholds they are expected to meet whilst in education and when registered.

SET 6: *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the practice portfolio and, where necessary, the module specifications to clarify which competences can be appropriately assessed within the practice or academic environment.

Reason: From the review of documentation and discussions with the programme team, the Visitors felt the proposed practice portfolio contained competences which would be more easily assessed by academic methods e.g. competences 3.1 and 17.9.4. Placement providers confirmed this view by commenting that competences, such as 3.1 (Shows evidence of research awareness; can perform a literature search using Athens), would be difficult to assess within the practice environment. As such, the practice portfolio and module specifications must be updated to clarify the distinction between practice and academic competences.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 26th July 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 27th September 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 27th September 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider recruiting another permanent member of staff with relevant theatre experience.

Reason: To further support the Programme Leader, the Visitors felt that a further relevantly qualified individual should be employed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider prioritising bids for clinical skills resources, specifically theatre specific equipment.

Reason: While the Visitors believe the current resources are used effectively, by admission the programme is in the process of building up the stock of instruments. The Visitors felt that to allow students to further practice in a safe and controlled environment before placement, this resource should be prioritised.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that all staff involved in the delivery of the inter-professional learning modules, are made fully conversant with the profession specific issues of the students they are teaching.

Reason: From discussions with students and the programme team, it was noted that inconsistencies between tutors have been identified and a staff update is in development. The Visitors feel this training should be undertaken before the new programme commences.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider standardising the allocation of mentors across the practice placement sites.

Reason: Discussions with the programme team and students identified different approaches to the allocation of mentors between placement sites. The Visitors felt that to dispel student perception of 'being able to choose your mentor' at Bury, this process should be standardised.

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:

Julie Weir

Alan Mount

Date: 27/06/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	24th and 25th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Penny Joyce (Educationalist) Tony Scripps (Clinician)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Corrine de Vries – Chair Simon Appleton – Secretary (Senior Team meeting only) Tony Watson – Secretary Nigel Conway – CODP Dr Emanuela Todeva – University Dr Ian Hammerton – University

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	35

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2. *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials to include information on the relationship between holding the qualification, access to the HPC Register and the use of the protected title 'Operating Department Practitioner'.

Reason: Currently the advertising materials do not make reference to the HPC. To provide full and clear information about the programme, the Visitors felt the advertising materials must be amended to state that upon graduation, students are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. In addition, the Visitors felt students must be informed that should they wish to use the protected title of Operating Department Practitioner, they must be registered with the HPC.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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 handbook to include reference to the library facilities for ODP students.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook refers to the library facilities for nurses. To ensure students are directed to the ODP facilities within the University Library, the Visitors felt the programme handbook must be updated.

and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to include reference to HPC's standards of proficiency for Operating Department Practitioners.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook refers to the Proficiencies of Professional Practice. To ensure students are able to locate the correct information on HPC's website, the Visitors felt the programme handbook must be updated.

3.11 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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to remove the references to 3,000 theory/practise hours and compulsory attendance 'in order to comply with the HPC requirements'.

Reason: The HPC does not stipulate a minimum number of hours or an attendance policy for registration and as such, these references must be removed.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

6.3 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the module outlines and programme handbook to show that where standards of proficiency are incorporated in the learning outcomes, they are part of the formal credit bearing and assessment procedures.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the Visitors noted the introduction of a portfolio in the Supervised Practice module, which is assessed against the standards of proficiency but does not contribute to the final award of the Dip HE. The Visitors believe students will have met the standards of proficiency prior to this final module, but feel the incorporation of the standards in the learning outcomes suggests it is an additional requirement and not a transition from the qualification to the work place. In addition, the Visitors believe this carries an element of risk as a student could argue they have already achieved the required number of credits for the award of the Dip HE. The Visitors felt that to fully acknowledge the value of this module, the learning outcomes and assessment procedures for the Supervised Practice module must be reviewed and redrafted.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:
5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme handbook to include reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: Currently the programme handbook refers students to the university academic codes and professional body Code of Behavioural Conduct. The Visitors felt that more direction to the HPC standards is required to ensure students are aware of the thresholds they are expected to meet whilst in education and when registered.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 9th July 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation: The programme team should consider expanding the entry criteria within the advertising materials to take account of international students, including English language requirements.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team it was evident there is a desire to widen participation and attract international students to the programme. To do this, the Visitors felt the advertising materials should be amended to provide international students with the information they need to make an informed choice about the programme.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider developing the clinical teaching facilities within the European Institute of Health & Medical Sciences to further support ODP students.

Reason: From the visit, the Visitors are confident the facilities on campus and those used at the Chelsea and Westminster NHS Trust enable students to meet the standards of proficiency. However, there was no evidence on campus of subject specific equipment, such as an operating table and scrub up facility and the Visitors believe the provision of these resources would better support the students.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

Recommendation: Where ODP students engage in inter-professional learning, the programme team should further develop their role in contextualising the importance and relevance of this learning style.

Reason: From discussions with students and the programme team, the Visitors noted that some students did not recognise the importance and relevance of inter-professional learning, particularly in the area of nutrition.

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:

Penny Joyce

Tony Scripps

Date: 11 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Teesside
Name and titles of programme(s)	University Certificate in Professional Development (UCPD)
	University Certificate in Postgraduate Professional Development (UCPPD)
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	21st June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Kathy Burgess – Radiographer
	Jane Topham - Paramedic
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Angela Morgan – Assistant Dean, Learning and Teaching Development – Chair
	Fiona Terry – Secretary
	Roy Connell – HLSP Reviewer
	Marion Grieves – School of Health and Social Care
	Carol Wylie – School of Health and Social Care
	Jill Kent – Senior Lecturer - Physiotherapy

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐

IT facilities	⊠	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	⊠	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	60

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:
2.1 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 programme team must resubmit documentation so that it clearly specifies what numeracy skills are required prior to admission and what procedures are in place if these skills are deficient.

Reason: Through reading the documentation and meeting with the programme team it became evident that a certain level of numeracy was a requirement for admission and it was unclear as to how each student's numeracy skills will be assessed. Also, it was not clear whether the outcome of the assessment would then lead to numeracy skills being included into the academic learning or withdrawing the applicant from the programme.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.11 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 programme team must resubmit documentation to include where attendance is mandatory and what procedures are in place if this is not met.

Reason: The documentation does not clearly outline where attendance is mandatory and when meeting the programme team it was unclear what percentage of attendance is expected of students and what systems are in place if students do not meet the required amount.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:
5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Condition: The programme team must resubmit documentation to include specific clinical learning hours and a student timetable.

Reason: It was not clear in the documentation how many hours constituted a full day with regards to the amount of clinical learning hours. It is indicated as 12 learning days but not clear what constitutes a day. There was no outline or clear breakdown of what aspects of the curriculum would be taught within these learning hours.

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure;

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

Condition: The programme team must resubmit documentation to include any action to be taken in the case of student failure in the Mentor handbook

Reason: There was no information for students in the documentation as to what procedures are in place for both mentors and students if they fail to meet all of the learning outcomes.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The assessment process for OSCEs must show students can achieve fitness to practise by identifying the core elements of the OSCE that must be passed.

Reason: The score for a pass mark within this assessment is 60% and above. It was not clear in the documentation what the criteria was for a pass mark and whether if learning outcomes were not all achieved a student could still pass the module as they scored higher in a different aspect of the OSCE.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should keep student numbers at an adequate number for the programme team to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The programme team stated that the cohort for this module was to be up to 60 which was felt to be the maximum cohort for the size of the programme team. If the provision for numbers can be greater, thought needs to be given as to the efficiency of the staff if this was the case.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should use the undergraduate policy for consent where students participate as patients in practical settings.

Reason: Students were not currently participating as patients in practical settings. However, if students are required to in future or are used in OSCEs then a system will need to be implemented.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Recommendation: The programme team should update the audit system to include the potential for AHP students and placements.

Reason: It was evident that placements were audited for the purpose of monitoring them but the current auditing form did not have any scope for AHP placements that may be needed in the future.

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:

Kathy Burgess

Jane Topham

Date: 25th June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Teesside (in partnership with Yorkshire Ambulance Service and Tees and North East Yorkshire Ambulance Service)
Name and titles of programme(s)	Foundation degree Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of visit	16/17 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	David Halliwell (Paramedic) Jim Petter (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Alyson Tonge - School of Arts & Media (Chair) Fiona Terry - Quality Manager (Secretary) Janet Brown - Assistant Dean of the School of Health & Social Care (Internal panel member) Julie Watson – School of Science & Technology (Internal panel member) Lesley Greer – Centre for Learning & Quality Enhancement (Internal panel member) Shirley Congdon Liverpool John Moores University (External panel member)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

1

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	20 students per cohort
	Two cohorts per year
	Cohort spilt between two sites of delivery

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the documentation, so that the relationship between obtaining the Foundation Degree qualification and access to the Register is clarified and accurate.

Reason: The current documentation is not consistently clear to applicants that completion of the Foundation Degree leads to eligibility rather than to entitlement to register with the Health Professions Council. It should be clear to applicants that the use the protected title 'paramedic' comes as a result of registration with the Health Professions Council and not completion of the programme.

2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria, including the Accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme specific APL/AP(E)L documentation, so that the Certificate of Higher Education in Paramedic Science (120 credits at Level 1) does not lead to exemption from the first year of the Foundation Degree.

Reason: In the current programme handbook, the programme specific APL/AP(E)L includes the statement "Students who have completed the Cert HE in Paramedic Science (120 credits at Level 1) would exempt the first year". In the meeting with the students and the programme team, the visitors discussed the intention that students who completed the Certificate of Higher Education in Paramedic Science, would progress automatically into year two of the Foundation Degree. The Certificate of Higher Education in Paramedic Science (not approved by the HPC) ran for the first time in the 2006/07 academic year and included the same modules and programme structure as the first year of the Foundation Degree.

The conditions attached to SETs 4, 5 and 6 will require the programme team to revise the programme curriculum and placement arrangements. As a result, it is likely that the first year of the Foundation Degree will be amended in terms of its curriculum design, content and assessment. Consequently, those students who complete the Certificate of Higher Education in Paramedic Science will have studied a different first year to that of the Foundation Degree. The visitors and programme team and placement providers discussed the possibility of a bridging programme to address any 'mismatches'. Keeping this in mind, the visitors believe that the programme specific APL/AP(E)L arrangements need to be amended so that the completion of the Certificate of Higher Education in Paramedic Science alone guarantees entry into the second year of the Foundation Degree.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider and partners must provide evidence of their finance and resource commitment to the revised programme; with particular attention paid to the placements and supernumerary hours.

Reason: The conditions attached to SETs 4.1 – 4.6 will require the programme team to revise the current programme substantially. The creation of new 'non ambulance service' placements and explicit arrangements for supervision will inevitably have an associated finance and resource cost. Under the current management arrangements, it is likely that these costs will be borne by the two partner ambulance services. In the meeting with the senior team and placement providers, there was recognition of these additional costs. The visitors were confident that the current programme was secure within the education provider's and partner ambulance services' business plans, but wished to see a renewed finance and resource commitment, given the changes in placement capacity and supervision.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how each member of the programme team contributes to the delivery of modules. It should be clear how, and to what extent, the individuals lead, teach and/or assess on each module.

Reason: The programme team supplied a number of CVs prior to the event, along with the module descriptors and indicative module leads. During the meeting with the students, the visitors realised that the majority of the teaching was being delivered by tutors in the ambulance training centres, not by the academic staff at Teesside, who's CVs had actually been supplied. During the meeting with the programme team and placement educators, it became clear that recent and current academic achievements of all staff were not included on the CVs. However, the visitors got the general impression that the programme team was either trained, or being trained to deliver a programme at HE level. During the meeting with the programme team, it was explained that the information supplied prior to the event about module teams and leads was a little out of date and that it was explained that all of the modules would be delivered separately at the two partner ambulance services, apart from the Introduction to Evidenced Based Practice module, which they intended to deliver by Teesside staff. The visitors felt that clarification was needed to ensure that the expertise and knowledge of the individual staff was appropriate to the aspects of the programme for which they had designated responsibility to teach and assess.

3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the documentation relating to the academic and pastoral support available to students, so that it clearly distinguishes the support available to individuals when they are acting as students of the University of Teesside and the role of employment policies which take effect when individuals are employees of one of the partner ambulance services.

Reason: The parts of the documentation which refer to the academic and pastoral support available to students currently relate to employment policies of the partner ambulance services. The visitors' explained in the meeting with the programme team that it is not appropriate for these policies to be used when the status of the individuals is a 'full-time student' (in contrast to when they are acting as 'employees'). The academic and pastoral support system information could include how the University of Teesside and partner ambulance services support students, for example, mature students, disabled students, support students with dyslexia, support students through periods of sick leave or carers' leave.

3.11 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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the documentation relating to the attendance policy and monitoring mechanisms. The information should clearly distinguish the when individuals are acting as students of the University of Teesside and when individuals are employees of one of the partner ambulance services and include an attendance policy and monitoring mechanism for the periods when they are students.

Reason: There is a lack of clarity in the current documentation about the attendance policy and monitoring mechanisms that students should adhere to. In the meeting with the programme team, the programme team gave details of how they intended to deal with problematic attendance on a case-by-case basis and referred to the documentation. The visitors' explained that it is not appropriate for employment policies to be used to monitor the attendance of individuals when they are students and that a formal attendance policy would be needed to act as a point of reference for all students. The HPC do not have any specific requirements about attendance, but an education provider needs to make sure that their attendance policy for the taught and placement components of the programme ensures that students can meet all of the standards of proficiency to be able to practice safely and effectively. This means, for example, that aspects of the programme which are essential to make sure that students meet the standards of proficiency will need to be compulsory, with attendance monitored, and lack of attendance followed up to make sure that students gain this knowledge before they complete the programme. An education provider's requirements, and any consequences of missing compulsory teaching, should be clearly communicated to students.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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.

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

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Condition: The programme team and partners must review the programme content and design so that it explicitly reflects the curriculum guidance for the profession* and demonstrate clearly where the standards of proficiency are taught and assessed throughout the programme, including the ambulance and non-ambulance placements.

*(British Paramedic Associations' 'Curriculum Framework for Ambulance Education' (February 2006) and Quality Assurance Agency's subject benchmark statements for paramedic science)

Reason: The visitors received an assortment of documents (including mapping documents, programme handbooks, operational manuals and supplementary information) both before and during the visit. There were minimal references in the documentation to the curriculum guidance for paramedics. In the meeting with the programme team, a presentation was given and a discussion followed on the input of the British Paramedic Associations' 'Curriculum Framework for Ambulance Education' (February 2006) and Quality Assurance Agency's

subject benchmark statements for paramedic science in the design of the curriculum and the choice of teaching and learning methods.

A detailed discussion on the curriculum followed, which focused on a number of areas, namely the number of hours that students had dedicated specifically to the Foundation Degree programme (including the taught and independent study hours and the time spent in supervised placements); the 50:50 spilt between the theory and practice components of the programme; the length and range of placement areas and the role and guarantee of clinical supervision.

During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors questioned whether the programme reflected the curriculum guidance of no less than 3000 cumulative learning hours on a educational programme, as the hours given in the documentation calculated to a lot less than this. The programme team explained that there were hidden notional days, not explicit in the documentation, and that students did receive the contact hours outlined in the module descriptors and that there was a balance between theory and practise. In the meeting with the students, it was apparent that students did not currently have designated time slots for independent study and there was difficulty in accessing mentors, due to work patterns and the geographical distances involved. Consequently, the visitors also queried the time allocated to independent study days and accessing mentors, outside of the front loaded teaching blocks. It is important that the curriculum design creates a learning environment wishes guarantees a time for reflection and independent study.

In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors discussed the current mismatches in the documentation between the placement hours and lengths with the curriculum guidance (for example, no less than 1500 cumulative clinical practice learning hours) and the range of placements and with the curriculum guidance (for example, a range of twenty one placement settings). The visitors were not confident that the balance between placements in acute and primary settings, or the length, location and quality of placement learning had been designed with sufficient safeguards in place, to ensure that students could achieve all of the standards of proficiency. For example, it was not clear how long and to what extent a student would be exposed to a range patients groups (such as learning disabilities, mental health, paediatrics, obstetrics and trauma) and how they would be assessed in each of these areas. In the meeting with the students, they gave examples of how they had proactively arranged observations in CCU and maternity settings, as they felt these placement areas were relevant to their learning and achieved of portfolio competencies in year one of the programme.

During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors discussed the role of the clinical supervisor in both ambulance and non ambulance placements. The curriculum guidance recommends a minimum of 750 hours of clinical practice for each stage of the programme, with a minimum of 150 in a supernumerary capacity and the remaining 600 in a supervised capacity and the visitors were not convinced that the programme design reflected this. In the meeting with the placement providers, there was acknowledgment that the students were not utilised in a supernumerary capacity on ambulance placements. Whilst the visitors appreciated the requirements of the workforce and the difficulty of students always being able to work under the supervision of a paramedic, or with their assigned mentor, they were doubtful that the programme could produce graduates who meet the standards of proficiency without appropriate periods of clinical supervision within their training.

In the meeting with the students, they explained that on the occasions when their mentors had been the 'third man' on an ambulance (i.e. operated in a supernumerary capacity) they had found this the most valuable learning environment. In parallel, the students cited access to mentors as one of the most frustrating aspects of the programme, as they wished to gain more experience through working with them.

Much of the current curriculum design is based on the underlying premise that the individuals taking the programme hold a dual status (they are students as well as employees). The programme team explained that the students were considered full-time students because of the accreditation of their work based learning. The visitors recognised the education

6

provider's experience in work-based learning and the value of it in contributing towards an academic award, but felt that additional safeguards were needed as this work based learning acted as a route to professional registration. In approving the programme the HPC are focused on the individual as a student (as opposed to an employee) and the opportunities that the curriculum design and content gives them to meet the standards of proficiency upon completion of the programme. Currently, the visitors were doubtful whether the programme design enabled a student to meet the standards of proficiency and practise safely and effectively, given their overlapping employment commitments as an ambulance technician and the lack of protected 'student' time as a 'paramedic student'.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

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

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that 'non ambulance trust' placements are mapped to the British Paramedic Associations' 'Curriculum Framework for Ambulance Education' (February 2006) and an integral part of the overall programme design and operation.

Reason: The conditions attached to SETs 4.1 – 4.6 will require the programme team to revise the current programme's placement system considerably. In particular, section 5.6 and 6 of the BPA's 'Curriculum Framework for Ambulance Education' provide guidance on the themes, areas and hours of clinical practice based learning.

In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors discussed the current mismatches in the documentation between the placement hours and lengths with the curriculum guidance (for example, no less than 1500 cumulative clinical practice learning hours) and the range of placements and with the curriculum guidance (for example, a range of twenty one placement settings). The programme team explained that students experienced non-ambulance settings as part of their induction process when they begin employment within the ambulance services and also as part of their work-based learning. The programme team and visitors discussed how the work based learning (detailed in section 3.7 of the programme handbook) would operate in practice and the programme team acknowledged that the scope, length and importance of the non-ambulance placements was not clear from the current documentation. The links to the assessment process and module descriptors and credit accumulation process were also unclear.

The representatives from the partner ambulance services explained that they had begun work on developing a wider range of placements. Yorkshire Ambulance Service has developed links with twelve placements to date and confirmed that they expected to students to experience all placements on the twenty one on the BPA's recommended list. Tees and North East Yorkshire Ambulance Service plan to utilise placements already used by other students in the strategic health authority.

The visitors consider the recommended hours and range of placements in the curriculum guidance necessary for students to be able to meet the standards of proficiency and be able to practise safely and effectively upon completion. To ensure this, it was felt that confirmation of how the 'non ambulance trust' placements would operate was required (For example, indicative hours of each placement, location within the programme structure, attendance requirements, supervision and assessment arrangements)

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:
5.7.1 the learning outcomes to be achieved;
5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;
5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and
5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how placement educators in 'non ambulance trust' placements will be fully prepared for students undertaking the Foundation Degree programme.

Reason: It is not clear from the current documentation how the 'non ambulance trust' placements will operate and contribute to the overall programme assessment. During the meeting with the programme team, the programme team explained how they envisaged students completing placements in a wide range of settings and outlined plans for recruiting and communicating with placement educator in these settings. The visitors felt that clarification was needed to ensure that the information given to placement educators guaranteed that students were able to meet the standards of proficiency relevant to particular placements.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

6.3 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external reference frameworks can be measured.

6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.

Condition: The programme team should update the assessment design, procedures and methods, following their review of the curriculum and learning outcomes, to ensure that the students who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency and are fit to practise.

Reason: The conditions attached to SETs 4 and 5 will require the programme team to revise the programme curriculum and placement arrangements. As a result, it is likely that new and/or amended learning outcomes will be proposed. The visitors need to receive evidence that the assessment procedures and methods appropriately test academic and theoretical learning and knowledge as well as the practical application of skills and knowledge in all the standards of proficiency.

Deadline for conditions to be met: To be confirmed
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2 August 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: To be confirmed

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements

Recommendation: The programme team should review the entry criterion that stipulates that "insulin dependant drivers are excluded from driving an emergency vehicle and therefore will not be able to apply for this programme".

Reason: The standards of proficiency for paramedics do not include require an individual to drive an emergency vehicle, therefore this entry criterion is not essential to gain registration with the Health Professions Council and use the protected title of 'paramedic'. The visitors highlighted the difference between being registered as a health professional and being employed as a health professional. The visitors appreciated that the programme has been designed to meet workforce needs, but emphasized the HPC's role in guaranteeing 'fitness to practise' and distinguished this from a guarantee of the opportunity to practise or fitness to work. The visitors noted that existing ambulance technicians within the two ambulance services were the target group for the first few years of operation of the programme, so the criterion would not disadvantage applicants, but they strongly recommended that it be reviewed before the programme is opened up to a wider market. The programme team is recommended to consult the HPC's guidance document 'information about a health reference'.

2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation: The programme team should review the entry standard that stipulates that any applicant who applies must have a full clean driving licence including C1.

Reason: The standards of proficiency for paramedics do not include require an individual to drive, therefore this entry criterion is not essential to gain registration with the Health Professions Council and use the protected title of 'paramedic'. The visitors highlighted the difference between being registered as a health professional and being employed as a health professional. The visitors appreciated that the programme has been designed to meet workforce needs, but emphasized the HPC's role in guaranteeing 'fitness to practise' and distinguished this from a guarantee of the opportunity to practise or fitness to work. The visitors noted that existing ambulance technicians within the two ambulance services were the target group for the first few years of operation of the programme, so the criterion would not disadvantage applicants, but they strongly recommended that it be reviewed before the programme is opened up to a wider market. The programme team is recommended to consult the HPC's guidance document 'information about a health reference'.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Recommendation: The education provider is strongly encouraged to recruit and utilise two academic paramedic posts, within the School of Health & Social Care.

Reason: During the meeting with the senior team, a verbal commitment was given to the creation of two new paramedic posts within the School. The visitors would welcome the inclusion of two paramedic lecturers into the programme team as it would strengthen the

profession-specific skills and knowledge within the School, which in turn could help future developments of the programme and its opportunities for using inter-professional learning and resource available within the School already.

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider and partners are recommended to review the IT facilities available to students, when they are off site, or 'on placement'.

Reason: The visitors were confident that the IT facilities currently available to students at both the University of Teesside and at the ambulance services' training centres are acceptable. However, during the meeting with the students, it became apparent that it was often difficult for students to access IT facilities, when they were 'on placement' (i.e. whilst working under supervision, located at different ambulance stations). The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider review the access to IT facilities in both ambulance and non-ambulance placements to ensure that the resources were available to facilitate students' work-based learning.

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 education provider and partners are recommended to review the resources available, to ensure that current levels increase in line with future cohort sizes and intakes.

Reason: The visitors were confident that the profession-specific resources currently available could support the programme's learning and teaching activities. In the meetings with the programme team and senior team, the possibility of increases in cohort sizes, or intakes were discussed. The visitors felt that some equipment paediatric ALS manikins would not be able to sustain a big increase in student numbers and recommended that the education provider and partners monitored the overall numbers and overlap in cohorts to ensure resources maintained their current levels.

COMMENDATIONS

- The students showed signs of becoming reflective practitioners.

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

Given the nature of the conditions recommended, we further recommend that confirmation of the meeting of conditions in done by way of a further visit.

Visitors' signatures:

David Halliwell

Jim Petter

Date: 13 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Thames Valley University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma in HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of visit	6th – 7th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Julie Weir** – Operating Department Pracitiner, Lecturer, clinical teacher – BUPA, LSBU **Penny Joyce** – Principle Lecturer – University of Portsmouth.
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Daljit Mahoon**
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Patricia Morton** (Chair) – Deputy Academic Registrar **Frank McMahon –** Programme Leader, Journalism, TVU **Patrick Laryea –** Pre-Qualifying Nursing, Common Foundation Co-ordinator **Amalia Tsiam** – Senior Lecturer, Nutritional Medicine **Dieter Herde –** CAT's Co-ordinator

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐

IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	14

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
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 programme team needs to develop and submit a specific consent form utilised to obtain consent from students prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, e.g. role plays, practicing profession-specific techniques.

Reason:
At present a Health and Safety form is being used prior to simulation and laboratories areas. This form however does not clearly address the specific requirement for obtaining student consent prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching. A more specific form for obtaining consent needs to be used.

Condition 2

3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place.

Condition:
A system of academic and pastoral student support must be made explicit within the programme handbook.

Reason:
In light of student feedback it became apparent that students were not fully aware of the academic and pastoral support available to them from the university. This information needs to be made more explicit to students.

Condition 3:

3.11 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 programme team must provide evidence of how attendance will be recorded and monitored through the use of the Personal Development Plan (PDPs)

Reason:
A system of recording and monitoring attendance needs to be in place to ensure that students attend all mandatory aspects of the programme which are essential in making sure they meet the standard of proficiency. Through discussions with the programme team it became apparent that the Personal Development Plans will be used for this. This needs to be made available to students prior to the start of the programme.

Condition 4:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
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.
SET 6. Assessment standards
6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition:
The programme team needs to submit a mapping document to show the HPC Standards of Proficiency are fully mapped only against the mandatory modules.

Reason:
Currently, some of the HPC Standards of Proficiency's are mapped into an optional unit, which presents the possibility that some of the Standards of Proficiency would not be achieved if a student decided not to take this module. It was not clearly articulated within the documentation how all the HPC Standards of Proficiency are being achieved by the students through the mandatory modules. This needs to be made more explicit.

Condition 5:

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.
5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition:
The programme team needs to produce and submit a mentor database showing the designation, qualifications and clinical specialism of all mentors including when last updated. This should be across all sights where Operating Department Practice students are on placement.

Reason:
It was difficult to see within the documentation, clear up to date information regarding placement mentor staff, such as who they are and what qualifications they hold. Through producing a clear database, this will help ensure this information is kept up to date and can also act as a monitoring aid.

Condition 6:

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition:
The programme team must provide evidence to show how the Practice Environment Profiles (PEPs) reflect the needs of Operating Department Practice students.

Reason:
The current PEPs used to audit placements are more specific for nursing requirements. Audits need to also reflect the specific needs for the Operating Department Practice programme.

Condition 7:

Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:
5.7.1 the learning outcomes to be achieved;
5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;
5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and
5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition:
The programme team must submit the completed programme handbook

Reason:
The current documentation did not include the programme handbook. This needs to be completed and available to students prior to the start of the programme and should include all relevant information regarding the programme ensuring that the above SETs are included and are being met.

Condition 8:

> **SET 5. Practice placements standards**
> **5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;**
> **SET 6. Assessment standards**
> **6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.**
> **Condition:**
> The programme handbook should include the relevant professional and regulatory body expectations of conduct.
>
> **Reason:**
> Students should be fully informed of the relevant professional and regulatory body expectations, specifically the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition 9:

> **5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.**
>
> **Condition:**
> The programme team must submit a completed mentor handbook
>
> **Reason:**
> The current documentation did not include a mentor handbook. This needs to be completed and available to mentors prior to the start of the programme so that the mentors are fully informed of their role as mentors and what all the relevant information in relation to the programme and students.

Condition 10:

> **SET 6. Assessment standards**
> **Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:**
> **6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;**
>
> **Condition:**
> The programme handbook must clearly state the expectations of feedback, for e.g. assessment and feedback timeline.
>
> **Reason:**
> Through discussions with students it became apparent that students were unaware of the duration for receiving feedback on assignments once submitted. The visitors felt it is important to provide timely feedback for students on assignments to enable them to progress and improve.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

> **SET 2 *Programme admissions***

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
2.2.4 apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;
2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Recommendation:
To standardise all pre-information to prospective students in relation to standard and non-standard entrants.

Reason:
Through student discussions it became apparent that students were not provided with the same pre-information. To avoid confusion and keep consistency it would be better if all pre-information for both standard & non standard prospective students were the same.

Recommendation 2

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation:
To have Operating Department Practice specific skills facilities, so students are able to practice in a safe environment prior to practice, e.g. gowning , gloving and instrumentation trays.

Reason:
At the present site and with consideration of the new building, there is no indication of Operating Department Practice specific skills facilities. The visitors encourage any possibilities specific skill facilities to be available for students which would enhance student learning and experience.

Recommendation 3

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

Recommendation:
To make the links between theory and practice are made more explicit to students throughout the duration of the programme.

Reason:
The visitors were assured that there are links between theory and practice within the programme, but felt that this could be made more explicit to students so they can clearly see the relationship between the two.

Recommendation 4

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

Recommendation:
Where pre and post-registration students learn together, the needs of the pre-registration students must be facilitated.

Reason:
The visitors felt there is the possibility that the needs of the pre-registration students may at times not be facilitated when learning takes place with the post registration students.

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:

Mrs Julie Weir

Mrs Penny Joyce

Date: 22/6/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Westminster
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Part time
Date of visit	30 and 31 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr Neil Willis (Biomedical Scientist) Professor Jackie Campbell (Lay Visitor for Education)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Mike Browne (Chair) Evelyne Rugg (Secretary) Paul Phillips Internal Panel Member Tasos Ptohos Internal Panel Member Robert Munro External Panel Member David Rogers External panel Member Bill Gilmore IBMS Nick Kirk IBMS Alain Wainwright IBMS

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	X
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	X	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐
IT facilities	X	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	**X**
2	☐	☐	**X**
3	☐	☐	**X**

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	30

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 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 programme team must ensure that the website is updated to reflect that students must apply for registration on graduation from the programme.

Reason: Currently the website says that graduates from the programme are eligible to register with the HPC and this might give the impression to prospective (and current) students that registration is automatic on graduation. This is not the case and students need to apply to the HPC for registration on graduation.

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition: The University must put in sufficient support to ensure that students who do not have English as a first language reach a minimum of IELTS 7 on graduation.

Reason: : The Visitors felt the entry requirement to the programme was sufficiently clear but that a student might not take steps to ensure their language proficiency developed unless the requirement for entry to the register was also clear.

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The University must ensure that an enhanced CRB check for the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme is carried out prior to admission to the programme.

Reason: Currently the documentation refers to this being operated by the work placements. It is the responsibility of the University to ensure this is carried out when students enter the programme so that any potential issue is adequately reviewed to ensure that the students are eligible to apply for registration on graduation.

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements;

Condition: The University must ensure that health checks for the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science students are carried out prior to admission to the programme and the students are given clear information on the health requirements for entry to the programme.

Reason: Currently the documentation refers to this being operated by the work placements. It is the responsibility of the University to ensure this is carried out when students enter the programme so that any potential issue is adequately reviewed to ensure that the students are eligible to apply for registration on graduation

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*
SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The programme team must provide a current list of all of the part time clinical tutors teaching into the programme, and provide copies of their curriculum vitae and their subject specialisms.

Reason: The curriculum vitaes (CVs) provided to the visitors for review did not include all CVs of all part time clinical tutors in the programme and the CVs provided indicated a bias towards microbiology. On discussion with the programme team it became evident that there was a larger pool of part time clinical tutors with experience in other biomedical science fields.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

Condition: The programme team must have explicit processes in place to ensure that each student has an appropriate workplace tutor.

Reason: During discussion with the students it became apparent that there were some instances where students were not aware of who was their workbased tutor. This had led to students feeling unsupported and unable to complete the clinical placement portfolio. Currently there is no mechanism in place to ensure that a work based tutor is replaced in the event of illness or leaving the laboratory and this could also lead to students being unsupported and unable to complete the required work based learning.

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The programme team must provide detailed written evidence to show how all placements are managed effectively.

Reason: Through discussion with the programme team it is clear that visits to the laboratories used as the placements do occur, however there was no clear audit trail and indication that the programme team made regular visits to the work based placements.

5.8   Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.1 must have relevant qualification and experience;

Condition: The programme team must provide explicit criteria on the qualifications and the experience required to be a workplace tutor.

Reason: This was not apparent from the visitors reading of the documentation provided.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The University must ensure that all of the HPC Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) that are linked to fitness to practice are met.

Reason: Currently the practice placement portfolio follows the IBMS portfolio leading to the Certificate of Competence and the programme team must ensure that in taking ownership of the portfolio the SOPs continue to be met within the duration of the Programme

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

Condition: The University must ensure that there is no opportunity to condone failed learning outcomes that relate to the SOPs.

Reason: Currently the University regulations allow condonement of failed modules and this could potentially mean that the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science students miss out on SOPs that would affect their fitness to practice.

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:
6.7.2 for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title;

Condition: The programme team must ensure that the intermediate awards do not include any reference to the protected title.

Reason: At the moment information provided regarding the intermediate awards was not clear in what would be written onto the certificate provided to students who take these awards.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 30 June 2007

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.5 accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Recommendation: The APEL process including the entry to level 5 should be clarified to include the requirements for accrediting prior work based learning

Reason: The process was described to the visitors during the programme team meeting, but it would be helpful if this was included in all documentation to ensure the students and staff can make an informed decision regarding claims for advanced standing

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.11 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the attendance of students is logged.

Reason: This would enable early identification of potential problems and enable appropriate feedback to students

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.4 Learning, teaching and supervision must be designed to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Recommendation: Where documentation refers to the HPC Professional Code of Conduct reference should instead be made to the HPC Standards of Proficiency and HPC Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics.

Reason: Currently the documentation refers to the Standards of Performance which is not an HPC document.

5.8   Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.3 Undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that records should be kept of the educational development activities undertaken by work based tutors.

Reason: This provides the programme team with a list that shows where training may be required and will enable monitoring of the suitability of the workplace training environment.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

 6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that an effective internal mechanism for adjudication should be put in place in the event of a disagreement in the grades awarded to the trainee by the University tutor and the work based training officer.

Reason: The existing system has the potential to produce anomalous marks, which was confirmed by example during the meeting with students. It would be preferable to resolve any marking disagreements using internal processes, rather than rely on the external examiner which we understand is the current system.

COMMENDATIONS

- ***The enthusiasm of the programme team***

- ***The supportive comments of the training officers seen by the visitors.***

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:

Neil Willis

Jackie Campbell

Date: 1 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non medical independent and supplementary prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	5th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	1st September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jim Pickard, Podiatrist Simon Walker, Radiographer
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Jan Quallington, Quality Assurance Officer acting as Chair Jo Rouse, Senior Lecturer, Child Health Roy Pierce-Jones, Worcester University, Department of Drama and Performance Studies. Sharon Hardwick, Course Co-ordinator Pre-Hospital Care Debbie Holmes - Secretary

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	⊠
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	⊠	☐	☐
Programme team	⊠	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	⊠	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	⊠	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	⊠	☐	☐
IT facilities	⊠	☐	☐

| Specialist teaching accommodation | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**30**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:
2.1 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 programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to provide clear information regarding the delivery of the programme and accurate outcomes of the programme.

Reason: A number of errors within the documentation were identified which should be corrected in order to provide accurate information to potential students. The number of learning hours needs to be clarified. The programme specification needs to articulate more clearly that the pre-requisite module at level 7 is optional and the reference to 'most' students completing the learning outcomes needs to be changed to 'all'.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition: The learning outcomes must be re drafted to ensure that reference is made to the demonstration of safe and effective practice. Learning outcomes are to be reduced at each level of provision and mapped to elements of assessment and relevant external curriculum documents.

Reason: The learning outcomes did not articulate that on successful completion of the programme the student was safe and effective to practice. The documentation stated that the learning outcomes had been mapped to the HPC learning outcomes (of which there are none) rather than to the curriculum guidance for allied health professionals published by the DOH in 2004. The current learning outcomes are not all mapped to the assessment tasks.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well-being of students must be both adequate and accessible.

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: Whilst WebCT remains the primary electronic interface, the programme team should offer students alternative methods of accessing electronic resources

Reason: Both staff and in particular students expressed difficulties in accessing core material found within the WebCT environment. The visitors were advised that a new system was to be introduced in the future. As an interim measure it would be helpful to students if alternative approaches were to be adopted to ensure that students can gain easy access to resources off site.

Commendations

- We would like to commend the programme team on the open door policy to student support

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:

      Jim Pickard

      Simon Walker

Date: 7th June 2007