

**Health Professions Council  
Education & Training Panel – 1 February 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.

<b>Education provider</b>	<b>Programme name</b>	<b>Delivery mode</b>
University of Bedfordshire	Diploma HE in Operating Department Practice	Full time
University of Bradford	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals	Part time
University of Brighton	Non-medical supplementary prescribing	Part time
University of Hull	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	Part time
The Robert Gordon University	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics	Full time
Staffordshire University	Supplementary prescribing for allied health professionals	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 (6)

**Date of paper**

22 January 2007

## Health Professions Council

### Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bedfordshire
<b>Name and titles of programme(s)</b>	Diploma HE in Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)</b>	FT
<b>Date of Visit</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> - 21 <sup>st</sup> November 2006
<b>Proposed date of approval to commence</b>	September 2007
<b>Name of HPC Visitors attending (including member type and professional area)</b>	Stephen Wordsworth (Operating Department Practitioner) David Bevan (Operating Department Practitioner)
<b>HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)</b>	Osama Ammar Chris Hipkins (Observing)
<b>Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):</b>	Richard Harris (Dean of Quality and Students, University of Bedfordshire) Graeme Naylor (Secretary, Administrator, Quality Procedures, University of Bedfordshire) Kathryn Ellis (Principle Lecturer, Department of Applied Social Studies, University of Bedfordshire)

#### Scope of visit *(please tick)*

<b>New Profession</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>New programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Major change to existing programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Placements providers and educators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
---	-------------------------------------	--	--

**Confirmation of facilities inspected**

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Specialist teaching accommodation			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**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
<b>1 New Profession to the HPC requiring a full approval visit</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Proposed student cohort intake number please state</b>	<b>26</b>
---	-----------

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 the advertising and recruitment information. The redrafted information should include more detail on entry requirements and clarification of the relationship between holding the qualification and access to the register.

**Reason:** The submitted information did not clearly articulate the specific access course applicants must complete to meet entry requirements or that a portfolio submission will be subject to the University of Bedfordshire APeL process. Further, the Visitors felt it was not clear to applicants that completion of the Dip HE leads to eligibility rather than entitlement for registration with the Health Professions Council.

### **SET 3: *Programme management and resource standards***

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

**Condition:** The team must redraft and resubmit module descriptors to clearly articulate the module leads and responsibilities within each module.

**Reason:** Whilst the programme team had submitted modular information and CV's it was still unclear which member of staff held overall responsibility for individual modules

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 definitive documents clearly articulating the attendance requirements for both theory and practice elements of the programme.

**Reason:** Through discussion it became clear there was uncertainty amongst students as to the percentage of hours required for attendance and there was a lack of specific clarity within the documentation.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2006-12-07	b	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - Dip HE ODP - University of Bedfordshire	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

#### **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.

**Condition:** The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to correct misappropriations of the names of the professional body and statutory regulator.

**Reason:** The submitted documents mis-referenced key documents relating to the philosophy, values and skills of the HPC. There was a lack of clarity between the role of the professional body (AODP) and the statutory regulator (HPC).

#### **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 an outline strategy for an effective mechanism for monitoring and recording the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at a placement with an indication of when the strategy will be implemented.

**Reason:** Although a register of placement mentors was available, there was no clear mechanism to effectively monitor on a regular basis the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff during student placement.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate the system for monitoring and approving existing and new placements respectively.

**Reason:** Although evidence was provided to indicate a system was in place to audit placement settings, the Visitors felt the documentation provided did not clearly articulate an effective monitoring system as the regularity and depth of assessment was not made clear. Further, the Visitors were not provided any information regarding the process for approving a new placement environment.

5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

**Condition:** The programme team must redraft and resubmit the Practice Assessment Documentation (PAD) to include the attendance records for placement hours.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2006-12-07	b	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - Dip HE ODP - University of Bedfordshire	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

**Reason:** Through discussion it became apparent a record of placement hours was in use and omitted from the documentation through error, however, the HPC Visitors felt that the current practice of separating the existing documents did not facilitate effective monitoring of the students and this documentation would be most appropriate within the PAD.

### **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 must redraft and resubmit the PAD to show evidence of assessment planning and appropriate mentor and student feedback. The PAD should also include evidence of student reflection.

**Reason:** The Visitors felt that given the discussed difficulty in linking theoretical and competency based learning outcomes in the minds of practice placement mentors and students, the PAD should include both theory and practice learning outcomes to strengthen the integration within the assessment process. The Visitors felt the PAD also provides an opportunity to formally introduce action planning and reflective thinking which were previously undertaken but as separate components.

**Deadline for Conditions to be met: 14<sup>th</sup> February 2007**

**Date Visitors' Report submitted to Panel for approval: 1<sup>st</sup> February 2007**

**Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval: 28<sup>th</sup> March 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:** In light of the strong commitment of the programme team, the Visitors felt that the University of Bedfordshire should consider increasing the number of core staff.

**Reason:** Although the core programme team evidenced their ability and commitment to effectively lead the programme and support the students, the Visitors determined the risk from key staff dependency to be high and felt this should be managed by consideration of increasing the number of core staff available to the programme.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2006-12-07	b	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - Dip HE ODP - University of Bedfordshire	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

**Recommendation:** The programme team should explore the learning and teaching opportunities offered by simulation and specialist clinical laboratories.

**Reason:** In light of the proposed new facilities and the new opportunities this will provide for the programme to develop, the Visitors felt it was prudent to commence preparation prior to the development of the new build.

## **COMMENDATIONS.**

The HPC representatives were impressed at the high level of support that the programme received. This was evident throughout the visit by the commitment of the programme team, the University staff and the practice placement staff.

The HPC representatives considered that the innovative use of Information Technology for supporting the students was an excellent additional tool for both team and peer development.

The planned provision of the new teaching facilities was seen as a positive move to create an effective system of development and support for both students and practice areas.

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:**

**David Bevan**

**Stephen Wordsworth**

**Date: 23/11/06**

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2006-12-07	b	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - Dip HE ODP - University of Bedfordshire	Final DD: None	Public RD: None



## Health Professions Council

### Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Name and titles of programme(s)</b>	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals
<b>Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)</b>	P/T
<b>Date of Visit</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> December 2006
<b>Proposed date of approval to commence</b>	February 2007
<b>Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)</b>	Mark Woolcock – Paramedic Robert Cartwright - Paramedic
<b>HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)</b>	Chris Hipkins – Education Officer Abigail Creighton – Education Manager, Observer
<b>Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):</b>	Dr PG Morgan, School of Management (Chair) Mr TD Lodge, Division of Radiography, School of Health Studies Ms FEM Phipps, Division of Midwifery & Women's Health, School of Health Studies Dr SM Picksley, Dept of Biomedical Sciences, School of Life Sciences Ms J Radice, Learning Technology Adviser, School of Health Studies Ms S Reed – Nursing & Midwifery Council

**Scope of visit (please tick)**

<b>New programme</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Major change to existing programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Confirmation of meetings held**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Confirmation of facilities inspected**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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.**

<b>Requirement (please insert detail)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Proposed student cohort intake number please state</b>	<b>15</b>
---	-----------

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

## CONDITIONS

### ***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 Register.

**Condition:** The University needs to provide evidence that it is seeking the appointment of an External Examiner from the relevant part of the Health Professions Council Register for this programme.

**Reason:** The documentation does not indicate how this individual will be selected, qualifications and experience necessary to hold the post and timescale for appointment.

<b>Deadline for Conditions to be met:</b>	<b>17 January 2007</b>
<b>Date Visitors' Report submitted to Panel for approval:</b>	<b>1 February 2007</b>
<b>Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval:</b>	<b>1 February 2007</b>

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### ***SET 3. Programme management and resource standards***

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

**Recommendation:** The Programme Team should consider greater inclusion of physiotherapists, chiropodists/podiatrists and radiographers who teach within the university.

**Reason:** The programme team explained that physiotherapists, chiropodists/podiatrists and radiographers had been involved in the development of the programme. Including these people in the programme team could help contextualise the teaching and learning for Allied Health Professions students.

### ***SET 4. Curriculum standards***

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

**Recommendation:** The Programme Team should further integrate with the Allied Health Professionals who currently teach within the university.

**Reason:** To ensure that all students benefit from the skills and knowledge for each professional group and that the learning requirements specific to each profession are adequately addressed.

### **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 work to enhance their existing monitoring system of quality checks for placements.

**Reason:** An enhanced system would better ensure that placements are appropriate for the student and support the learning requirement of the programme. The enhanced system would also provide guidance to new Designated Medical Practitioners on best practice.

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

**Recommendation:** The Programme Team should review the guidance given to the Designated Medical Practitioners to ensure greater consistency of assessment across placements.

**Reason:** To ensure that there is equity for all students in the quality of placements and assessment.

### **Commendations**

The Programme Team are commended on the development of an innovative process of Designated Medical Practitioners preparation and placement visits.

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:**

*Mark Woolcock*

*Robert Cartwright*

**Date: 19<sup>th</sup> December 2006**

## Health Professionals Council

### Visitors report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Name and titles of programme(s)</b>	Non-medical supplementary prescribing
<b>Date of event</b>	6 December 2006
<b>Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)</b>	Part time
<b>Proposed date of approval to commence</b>	February 2007
<b>Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)</b>	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Bob Fellows (Paramedic)
<b>HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)</b>	Mandy Hargood Daljit Mahoon (Observer)
<b>Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):</b>	Dr Phil Mandy (University Chair) Ms Sue Reed (HLSP on behalf of the NMC)

#### 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 planning team	✓		
Placements providers and educators	✓		

#### 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.**

<b>Requirement (please insert detail)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>1</b>			✓
<b>2</b>			✓
<b>3</b>			✓

<b>Proposed student cohort intake number please state</b>	<b>20 (3 AHPs)</b>
---	--------------------

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 apply selection and entry criteria including:

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

2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

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 1**

**Condition: The student handbook must detail information relating to programme attendance and resulting consequences of failure to meet the attendance policy, along with details of the APL policy for this course.**

**Reason: Currently there is a school policy on attendance but this was not detailed in the student information. In order for the student to make an informed choice on the programme, attendance requirements should be detailed. The course team discussed that no APL for examinations are permitted but this was not articulated in the student information.**

2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.1 evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards

#### **Condition 2**

**Condition: The HEI must produce a memorandum of understanding with its partners that details role and responsibilities for admission and course progression. The HEI must also produce an admission policy for private/independent students.**

**Reason: There is a process for admission that relies on the Strategic Health Authority performing checks on suitability of students to undertake the programme. There is no written agreement between them on sharing and access**

to information. There is also no written procedure for independent/private students.

### ***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 3**

**Condition: The HEI must have a written protocol for obtaining students consent.**

**Reason: Students do participate in role play and scenarios within the HEI.**

### ***SET 5. Practice placements standards***

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

5.13 The placement providers must have 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 4**

**Condition: The HEI must have an audit tool for approval of all new practice placement areas.**

**Reason: Currently only existing nursing placement areas have been visited. New practice placement areas involving AHP's should be audited.**

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.1 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 5**

**Condition: The HEI must have a method to ensure that practice placement educators formally understand the requirements of them addressing the SETs above.**

**Reason: Both the course team and students alluded to the difficulty in ensuring the practice placement educators receive appropriate preparation for placements. The HEI should ensure that the medical practitioner is prepared for students addressing the SETs above.**

**Deadline for Conditions to be met: 15 January 2007**

**Date Visitors' Report submitted to Panel for approval: 1 February 2007**

**Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval: 1 February 2007**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

**Recommendation: The HEI should introduce a policy on the currency of printed material and replacement held within its library facilities.**

**Reason: There is currently no written policy and on inspection some printed material was produced a significant time ago.**

## **COMMENDATIONS**

**The visitors would like to commend the HEI and programme team for the diversity in the teaching faculty.**

**The visitors would like to commend the programme team for the robust content of the course and objectives.**

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:**

**Marcus Bailey**

**Bob Fellows:**

**Date 6/12/2006**



## Health Professions Council

### Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hull
<b>Name and titles of programme(s)</b>	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)</b>	P/T
<b>Date of Visit</b>	23 November 2006
<b>Proposed date of approval to commence</b>	September 2007
<b>Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)</b>	Sue Boardman (Paramedic) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic)
<b>HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)</b>	Mandy Hargood Katherine Lock (Observing)
<b>Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):</b>	Kath Lavery Chair (Hull PCT) Sue Murphy Secretary Tim Burton Senior Quality Officer Jayne Lowton Chair of Curriculum Approval FHSC

**Scope of visit (please tick)**

<b>New programme</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Major change to existing programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Confirmation of meetings held**

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Confirmation of facilities inspected**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Library learning centre	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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.**

<b>Requirement (please insert detail)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Proposed student cohort intake number please state</b>	<b>2 cohorts of 15 each</b>
---	-----------------------------

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

## **CONDITIONS**

### ***SET 2 Programme Admissions***

#### **Condition 1**

2.2.5 This admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

**Condition: The Programme Team must put in a statement in the documentation that AP (E) L and other inclusion mechanisms are not applicable to this programme.**

**Reason: It was not clear to the visitors that this policy was in place in the documentation.**

**Deadline for Conditions to be met: 8 January 2007**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### ***SET 5. Practice placements standards***

#### **Recommendation 1**

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.

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

**Recommendation: That the Programme Team continue to monitor fully all practice placements.**

**Reason: To ensure that all practice placement settings will provide a safe environment for safe and effective practice.**

## **Recommendation 2**

5.13 The placement providers must have 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.

**Recommendation: That the Programme Team continue to monitor equal opportunity and discriminatory policies of private placements if they are to continue recruiting students from such placements.**

**Reason: As this is likely to be an area of student growth there is a need to ensure that these mechanisms are in place.**

## **COMMENDATIONS**

- **The visitors identified that the resources provided more than adequately supported the required teaching and learning activities of the programme.**
- **The level of academic and student pastoral support was clearly evident and of a high level.**
- **The programme is managed both effectively and efficiently**
- **The visitors were impressed with the overall dynamics of the Programme Team in producing a robust and student focused programme.**

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 Boardman  
Mark Woolcock

**Date:** 11 January 2007

## Health Professions Council

### Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	The Robert Gordon University
<b>Name and titles of programme(s)</b>	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)</b>	FT
<b>Date of Visit</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> October 2006
<b>Proposed date of approval to commence</b>	September 2007
<b>Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)</b>	Sylvia Butson (Visitor – Dietitian) Derek Adrian-Harris (Visitor – Radiographer)
<b>HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)</b>	Osama Ammar (Education Officer)
<b>Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):</b>	Robert Newton (Chair) Lucy Jack, Quality Officer, Faculty of Health and Social Care (Secretary)

**Scope of visit (please tick)**

<b>New programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Major change to existing programme</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Confirmation of meetings held**

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Confirmation of facilities inspected**

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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
<b>1 Indications from Annual Monitoring that specialist subject teaching staff numbers were inadequate</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2 Investigation of new facilities and impact on existing approval of the programme from Major/Minor Change process</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Proposed student cohort intake number please state</b>	<b>35</b>
---	-----------

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

## CONDITIONS

### ***SET 3. Programme management and resource standards***

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

**Condition:** The Robert Gordon University must produce a schedule of approval and monitoring for all NHS institutions for which it is the link HEI. The schedule will indicate that all placements are visited and assessed for suitability to receive students by the commencement of academic session 2007-2008.

**Reason:** In order to satisfy the Visitors that the programme team have assumed full responsibility in terms of the management of placement provision, it is required that the commitment to approve and monitor all placement environments within the remit of The Robert Gordon University is outlined in the schedule.

**Deadline for Conditions to be met: 14<sup>th</sup> December 2006  
To be submitted to Committee on:**

**1<sup>st</sup> February 2007 for approval of report.**

**1<sup>st</sup> February 2007 for approval of programme.**

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### ***SET 3. Programme management and resource standards***

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

**Recommendation:** The Robert Gordon University should initiate and develop in conjunction with the component HEIs in the Scottish Cluster the mapping of HPC Standard of Education and Training 5 onto the UDEG document used currently for placement provision. Particular reference should be made to the processes in place to handle any problems that may arise in the placement environment, the development of a common assessment tool for student competencies and the capping of student numbers across the cluster.

**Reason:** The Visitors felt assured that the placement arrangements met the Standards of Education and Training as a result of being derived from the UDEG document which is a national guidance document across the profession. However, to develop ownership of the placement arrangements within the Scottish Cluster, the visitors felt it was appropriate for The Robert Gordon University to make a start with the process

of mapping the document to the HPC standards to ensure that all Scottish Cluster placements were approved, monitored and assessed with parity.

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

**Recommendation:** The Robert Gordon University should consider accelerating the implementation of a more ambitious inter-professional learning programme.

**Reason:** Through discussion it became apparent that the senior management and the programme team were committed to an inter-professional approach to teaching and learning. The Visitors felt with the significant opportunities available at The Robert Gordon University and through its existing link with the University of Aberdeen, that this strategy should be encouraged and promoted.

## COMMENDATIONS

The Panel welcomes the programme leader's intimation that the cohort number will be limited to 35 students for BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics for all future intakes.

The Panel commends The Robert Gordon University on the implementation of the virtual learning environment.

The Panel received positive feedback from students and graduates in relation to the whole of their learning experience especially the excellent support received from all the staff.

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:

**Derek Adrian-Harris**

**Sylvia Butson**

**Date: 31/10/06**

## Health Professions Council

### Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Name and titles of programme(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing for allied health professionals
<b>Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)</b>	Part time
<b>Date of Visit</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> December 2006
<b>Proposed date of approval to commence</b>	February 2007
<b>Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)</b>	David Whitmore (Paramedic) Norma Brook (Physiotherapist)
<b>HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)</b>	Osama Ammar Chris Hipkins (Observer)
<b>Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):</b>	Steve-Wynn Williams (Chair) Shirley Keeling (Administrative Quality Manager/Secretary) Carol Parton (Quality Administrator/Observer)

#### Scope of visit *(please tick)*

<b>New programme</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Major change to existing programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Proposed student cohort intake number please state</b>	<b>40 per year in 4 intakes</b>
---	-------------------------------------

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 apply selection and entry criteria including:

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

**Condition:** The course team must revisit and resubmit the definitive documentation and any advertising materials to clearly articulate the Department of Health imposed entry requirement for three years post-registration experience of practice.

**Reason:** From the submitted documentation and discussion, the course team demonstrated an awareness of the Department of Health requirement; however the Visitors felt the stipulation required clarity in all the documentation relating the course admission requirements.

### 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.

**Condition:** The course team must revisit and resubmit the definitive documentation to include in a single document the information contained in the *Validation support document; Module handbook, Briefing notes prescribing mentor*. This definitive document must have as appendices the various types of assessment and the marking policy, the student handbook, the criteria checklist for entry, the proforma for educational audits and curriculum vitae. Throughout the resubmitted the documentation the programme team must alter incorrect referencing as follows: ‘professional body’ to read ‘regulatory body’ when in relation to HPC; ‘accreditation’ to read ‘approval’; and ‘registration’ to read ‘annotation’ when in relation to prescribing entitlements.

**Reason:** The Visitors felt that the submitted documentation contained all the relevant information, but that through re-organisation of the component documents, the definitive document would bring greater clarity to the design and operation of the course. The Visitors also identified in the submitted documentation misrepresentations, through misuse of terminology, of the process of professional regulation under HPC.

## **SET 6. *Assessment standards***

6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

**Condition:** The course team must revisit and resubmit the definitive documentation to include the stipulation that at least one external examiner must be from the relevant part of the Register.

**Reason:** In order to include profession specific knowledge within the quality management of assessment procedures, the Visitors felt the course required the input of an appropriately registered allied health professional as an external examiner.

**Deadline for Conditions to be met: 20<sup>th</sup> December 2006**

**Date Visitors' Report submitted to Panel for approval: 1<sup>st</sup> February 2007**

**Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval: 1<sup>st</sup> February 2007**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **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.

**Recommendation:** The course team should consider obtaining written consent from students participating as patients or clients in teaching if in future the decision is made to include role-play in the teaching and learning strategy.

**Reason:** Through discussion it was clear that consent protocols were not required for the course at the current time; however the Visitors wanted to raise awareness so the course team would be in a position to implement a process if required.

### **SET 5. *Practice placements standards***

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

**Recommendation:** The course team should consider the inclusion within the definitive documentation of the statement that "all mentors must attend a training day prior to working as a mentor".

**Reason:** Through discussion it became apparent there was an historical problem of attendance which has now been addressed; however the Visitors felt in order to

prevent the training day being considered optional it would be prudent to include a statement in the mentor information.

5.13 The placement providers must have 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.

**Recommendation:** The course team should consider that, if practice placements were ever to be outside NHS environments, assurances will be required to demonstrate the equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies are satisfactory.

**Reason:** With the inclusion of allied health professionals on the course, the range of placement opportunities may accordingly increase to include private practice centres and the Visitors wanted to draw the course team's attention to this likelihood so appropriate considerations can be made.

## COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend the team on their integration of innovative research into the effectiveness of non-medical prescribing in all its facets. In addition, the visitors were pleased to see the inclusion of up to date reports of that research being presented to new cohorts.

The Visitors also commend the teaching and learning methods and their appropriateness to the learning outcomes. The Visitors felt the course team exhibited responsiveness to the requirements of students, to the demands of the learning outcomes and the overall responsibility of producing graduates fit to 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:

**Norma Brook**

**David Whitmore**

**Date: 7<sup>th</sup> December 2007**