

**Health Professions Council
Education & Training Panel – 1 February 2007**

PROGRAMME APPROVAL

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The visitors have confirmed that the conditions relating to the following programmes approval have been met. The visitors are now satisfied that the programmes meet the standards of education & training and wish to recommend approval. The attached visitors' reports have been updated to reflect that the conditions have been met.

Education provider	Programme name	Delivery mode
University of Bradford	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals	Part time
Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich	Postgraduate Diploma in Speech & Language Therapy	Full time
University of Hull	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	Part time
Roehampton University	MA Art Therapy	Full time
Staffordshire University	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	Part time
University of Worcester	Foundation Degree in Pre-Hospital, Unscheduled and Emergency Care	Full time

Decision

The panel is asked to approve the above named programmes, in line with the visitors' recommendations that the programmes now meet the standards of education and training.

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

Visitors reports (6)

Date of paper

22 January 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Name and titles of programme(s)	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	P/T
Date of Visit	13 th December 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	February 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mark Woolcock – Paramedic Robert Cartwright - Paramedic
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins – Education Officer Abigail Creighton – Education Manager, Observer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	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)*

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

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

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

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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.

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

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: 19th December 2006

Health Professions Council

Visitors' Report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University University of Greenwich
Name and titles of programme(s)	Postgraduate Diploma in Speech & Language Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	3/4 October 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	March 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Martin Duckworth (SLT) Caroline Sykes (SLT)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar Abigail Creighton (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mrs Jenny Hawkins – Chair, Canterbury Christ Church University Ms Gemma Houghton, Secretary, Canterbury Christ Church University Professor Jois Stansfield – External Advisor, Professor of Speech Pathology, Manchester Metropolitan University Mrs Shelagh Titchener – Director of Curriculum and Quality, Faculty of Health and Social Care, Canterbury Christ Church University Dr Christopher Stevens – Manager of Academic Partnerships, Quality and Standards Office, Canterbury Christ Church University Professor Melanie Jasper – Head of Department, Health and Social Welfare Studies, Canterbury Christ Church University Ms Lynne Jump - Senior Lecturer, School of Health and Social Care, Greenwich University Mr Steve Naylor - Quality Officer, Learning and Quality Unit, Division of Learning Enhancement, Greenwich University

Mrs Rosalind Rogers – Representative from
 Royal College of Speech and Language
 Therapists, Head of School of
 Communication, University of Ulster
 Mrs Sharon Woolf – Head of Professional
 Development, Royal College of Speech and
 Language Therapists

Scope of visit (please tick)

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	25
---	-----------

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: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich should submit the information (both documentary and web-based), which is given to prospective students about the programme. This information should accurately explain the role and relationship with HPC in terms of approving the programme and providing eligibility to register as a Speech and Language Therapist and the role of the RCSLT.

Reason: According to the documentation and web site information, there is still some confusion over the role of the HPC and the specific protected title that graduates would be eligible to use. The Visitors acknowledged that former terminology had been used, but felt that in order to meet this Standard; they needed to be satisfied that future applicants would be fully prepared for the joining the profession.

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

Condition: The information given to prospective students must include entry standards for English language requirements.

Reason: The current admissions criteria do not refer to English language requirements (e.g. IELTS)

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

Condition: The information given to prospective students must specify the specific academic standards.

Reason: The current admissions criteria include the word 'normally', which suggests that students may be admitted who have an equivalent to a BSc (Hons) degree. Through discussions, it became apparent that Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich has already considered this issue and they had agreed to only accept applicants with BSc (Hons) degrees. It was felt that the admissions criteria needed to be made updated to reflect this.

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

Condition: The documentation and memorandum of agreement must be revised to reflect the agreed policy on APL.

Reason: There is currently a variation in the stated policy on APL. The handbook suggests that APL follows Canterbury Christ Church University regulations, whilst the draft memorandum of agreement suggests that APL follows the base institution. Through discussions, it became apparent that whilst infrequent, the programme would be validated with the capacity to allow APL credits and as an academic matter, it would follow Canterbury Christ Church University regulations. It was felt that it needed to be made explicit to students which mechanism for APL would be followed.

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 equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy of both institutions should be submitted, along with an indication of how they are implemented and monitored.

Reason: The Visitors were aware that these policies were in place and discussions were held over the parity between the two versions. Further clarification is needed on their implementation and monitoring.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: A final version of the memorandum of agreement must be agreed.

Reason: The memorandum of agreement was in draft form and through discussions it was agreed that updates were required to the areas including record keeping, external examiner and APL regulations.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: Confirmation that both Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich have validated the awards.

Reason: Canterbury Christ Church University have deferred the final validation decision of the award until December 2006. Following validation by Canterbury Christ Church University, the University of Greenwich will confirm the validation of the award at their institution. The Visitors felt that in order to meet this Standard; they needed to be satisfied that both universities had agreed to validate the award.

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

Condition: There must be evidence of a commitment to increase staff numbers in the event student numbers double when the programme moves into its second year.

Reason: The core programme team currently includes 2.2 FTE Speech and Language Therapists. Whilst the Visitors accepted that this was an adequate number to support the first cohort of students, there was concern with long-term plans. In discussion, the senior and programme teams explained that they had were already intending to review the staffing at the end of the first year and the Visitors required more information about the remit of the review at the end of the first year of the programme.

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

Condition: There must be evidence to show that phonetics and linguistics for clinical applications, and communication problems resulting from acquired neurological problems can be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: It is not clear from the current documentation who will be responsible for teaching the key areas of clinical phonetics and linguistics, or the management of acquired neurological communication problems. From the available CVs, the Visitors were not assured that there were staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

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.

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: There must be evidence of a commitment to provide all learning resources to support the programme from both universities. This must include budget and acquisition plans for library resources, specialist equipment (inclusive of resources for teaching phonetic transcription skills), technical support and estates refurbishment.

Reason: The Visitors acknowledged that prior to validation the purchasing of resources was unlikely, due to the financial risk. However, on the tour of facilities the Visitors were made aware of the planned purchases, rebuilding and support provision. Intended plans for the use of one virtual learning environment were also discussed. The Visitors felt that in order to meet these Standards; they needed to be satisfied that

both universities were both committed to the plans and progressing with implementation.

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

Condition: There must be evidence that an appropriate protocol must be provided.

Reason: Through discussions, it was confirmed that a consent form existed and that students would be asked to complete it before participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching. The Visitors wish to see a copy of the form.

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: There must be evidence of how the attendance policy is monitored and how the transition period is incorporated into the policy and monitoring mechanisms.

Reason: The Visitors were confident that the stated attendance policy would allow students to meet all the standards of proficiency, but they required more clarification on how the policy was monitored. Through discussions, it was confirmed that the transition period was included in the required hours of attendance for the programme. The Visitors felt that this needed to be clarified in the documentation, so students were clear of the role of the transition period and the repercussions of non-attendance during it.

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.

Condition: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich must revisit the documentation so that it is clear where the Standards of Proficiency will be met in learning outcomes for the programme.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent the module descriptors would require amendment. The Visitors felt the programme required greater specificity in the management and treatment of adults with acquired neurological disorders in particular. Moreover, the Visitors noted that some modules have a very wide range of learning outcomes which needs to be reviewed. This relates particularly to phonetics and clinical phonetics which the Visitors felt was a core subject area needing a specific teaching time commitment. It was also noted that there were limitations in the specified reading which therefore needs to be reviewed and updated.

SET 5. *Placements standards*

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:

5.3.1 a safe environment; and for

5.3.2 safe and effective practice.

Condition: There should be evidence available to demonstrate that the Educational Audit of Practice Placements will be carried out on all placements prior to students commencing their first placement and will be used as part of the ongoing placement monitoring.

Reason: The Educational Audit tabled during the visit is comprehensive but the Visitors were not informed that it had actually been undertaken for any of the proposed speech and language therapy placements.

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

Condition: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich must revisit the documentation to clarify the number, duration and range of placements.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent that the second placement which utilised conversation partner work would no longer form a discreet placement in its own right. Accordingly, the arrangements for placements and the application of learning outcomes to placements will require clarification in the documentation.

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

Condition: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich must revisit the documentation to specify how the Educational Audit will be used in the process of placement approval and monitoring.

Reason: Though the Education Audit was tabled, insufficient time was available to determine how the tool was used as a method of approving and monitoring placements. Inclusion of this information in the documentation will allow the Visitors to determine the effectiveness of the placement approval and monitoring arrangements.

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;

Condition: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich must revise the information to be provided to students and placement educators to include changes to the number, duration, range and learning outcomes ascribed to placements.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent that the second placement which utilised conversation partner work would no longer form a discreet placement in its own right. Accordingly, the arrangements for placements and the application of learning outcomes to placements will require clarification in the documentation.

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.

Condition: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich must revise the assessment design in both academic modules and practice placements.

Reason: In order to ensure that graduates of the programme are fit to practise as Speech and Language Therapists the Visitors felt the assessment design for the modules needed to adequately assess the number of learning outcomes prescribed to each module. Furthermore, the Assessment of Practice Tool requires further work to ensure competencies are recorded as attained only when appropriate, and to adequately incorporate changes in the learning outcomes from the proposed re-design of the modules.

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

Condition: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich must revise the Assessment of Practice Tool.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent the Assessment of Practice Tool would require revision to successfully ensure competencies are recorded as attained only when appropriate. It was felt by the Visitors that the protocol for confirming the achievement of learning outcomes were not adequately described to include where responsibility lay for determining a competency being met and moderation arrangements.

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 University of Greenwich must confirm that they will award a Postgraduate Certificate, which does not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register and does not contain any reference to an HPC protected title in its title.

Reason: Through Panel discussions, it became apparent that the University of Greenwich had not included a Postgraduate Certificate in the proposal. Representatives explained that it should be possible to include a similarly titled award and that it would need to be considered by the relevant Committee in their institution.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 11th December 2006

Report to be submitted to Approvals Panel on

5th December 2006 for approval of report

1st February 2007 for approval of programme

ALL CONDITIONS MET

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

Recommendation: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich should consider accelerating their plans for the appointment of a qualified Speech and Language Therapist as programme leader.

Reason: In order to develop the programme and its profession specific knowledge and skills, the Visitors felt the appointment of a Speech and Language Therapist with the relevant academic qualifications and experience would be appropriate.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Recommendation: Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich should further develop the foundation of effective collaboration that exists with current placement providers.

Reason: Through discussion it was apparent the placement providers and education providers have worked closely to provide the impetus for a postgraduate Speech and Language Therapy programme in the area that will prioritise placements for Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich students. The Visitors felt that this collaboration should be encouraged as too should its development to increase the effectiveness of placement provider and education provider co-operation.

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

Caroline Sykes

Date: 20/10/06

Feedback Report following visit to the PG Dip in Speech and Language Therapy at Canterbury Christchurch University and the University of Greenwich, Wednesday 20 December 2006.

Following the visit to the PG Dip in Speech and Language Therapy at Canterbury Christchurch University and the University of Greenwich, Wednesday 20 December 2006, the visitors were happy to report that the conditions had been met.

The visitors wanted to make the following commendations to the Programme Team:

- To commend the team on the work with speech and language therapists and managers in establishing the Programme and in particular its clinical components.
- Congratulations on creating a proactive and enthusiastic team and the coherence of the nature of the programme.
- To commend the team on meeting the conditions made in October. The visitors said they will recommend to Committee that the PG Dip in Speech and Language Therapy at Canterbury Christchurch University and the University of Greenwich is approved. The next Committee is set for 1st February 2007 so providing approval is agreed by Committee a letter should be sent shortly afterwards.

← - - - - Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

The visitors wanted to ensure that the programme team ensure that the documentation given to students states that students on graduation have to apply for registration with the HPC, so that the students know that registration is not automatic.

The visitors were pleased to hear that the Equal Opportunities policies were implemented and monitored and the visitors looked forward to seeing evidence of the monitoring methods through the annual monitoring process.

After discussion with the Programme team the visitors were happy that the programme team were to pursue the inclusion of a phonetic hand book as part of the overall programme of assessment.

Caroline Sykes
20 December 2007

Martin Duckworth
20 December 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Name and titles of programme(s)	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	P/T
Date of Visit	23 November 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Sue Boardman (Paramedic) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood Katherine Lock (Observing)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	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)

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	2 cohorts of 15 each
---	-----------------------------

ALL CONDITIONS SAME

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 Professionals Council
Department of Education and Policy

Name of education provider	University of Roehampton
Name and titles of programme(s)	MA in Art Therapy
Mode of Study	Full time
Date of event	21 st and 22 nd April 2005
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2005
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Michael Edwards, HPC Registered Arts Therapist (A) Simon Willoughby-Booth, HPC Registered Arts Therapist (A)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ms Fiona Nixon (Director of Education & Policy) Ms Sharon Woolf (Education Manager)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	HPC Approval Event – no joint panel

Scope of visit (please tick)

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

Part 1.

1.1 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 planning team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

1.3 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"/>

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

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

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 information must give clear information about what the intensive induction week entails.

Reason: Prospective students must have clear information about what to expect in the first week of the course since this differs from other parts of the programme.

Condition Met

Condition 2

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

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

Condition: Students for whom English is not their first language should have at least a British Council IELTS Band 6 in both the reading and writing sections.

Reason: Students will be on practice placement in the first term of the programme and will require to communicate with the public and placement staff and to provide written reports in practice settings and need to have a good command of English.

Condition Met

Condition 3

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The Admissions information must include that students will be required to provide an enhanced criminal convictions check at the start of the course.

Reason: Students will require to have satisfactory criminal conviction checks before they are able start practice placements in the first term.

Condition Met

Condition 4

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: A student handbook must be prepared and submitted to HPC for approval.

Reason: Students require to have clear guidance as to course content, programme structure, assessment and progression criteria and the expectations of them in both academic and practice placement settings.

Condition Met

Condition 5

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 provide a written protocol for the informed consent of students to participate as patients/clients in practical, clinical and placements settings.

Reason: The protocol is needed so that students are fully briefed as to what they are signing, the consequences of not signing and thus give informed consent.

Condition Met

Condition 6

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice .

Condition: The course team should review the module "Theory and Practice of Art Therapy 2" and ensure that it reflects the breadth of contemporary Jungian theory and that the bibliography incorporates appropriate contemporary texts.

Reason: The curriculum must remain relevant to current theoretical standpoints to provide a clear and comprehensive model for art therapy practice to enable students to articulate an informed and critical appraisal of Jungian and other models of therapy.

Condition Met

Condition 7

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:

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

Condition: The programme team must provide a written policy that articulates the opportunities for students who fail a placement to re-sit that element of the course. This should also be included in the student handbook.

Reason: As successful completion of placements is a requirement for progression, an explicit statement of the procedure that allows students to re-take this element of the course and the implications this may have for the time taken to complete the course.

Condition Met

Condition 8 Set 5. Practice Placement Standards

5.8.3 Undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

Condition: The course team should develop a plan for the introduction of more formal training for practice placement supervisors and report on this in the next Annual Monitoring Report.

Reason: The development of training opportunities for placement supervisors is a component in enhancing the quality assurance of the practice placement element of the course. The institution needs to formalize its role & responsibility in providing placement managers & supervisors with appropriate training.

Condition Met

Condition 9

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.

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Condition: The protocol for clinical placement assessment should be included in Annex B Assessment Methods Summary and Assessment Criteria – Definitions of Assessment Methods Used.

Reason: Clinical Placements must be successfully completed for students to progress on the course and the method of assessment should be made explicit as it is an integral part of the programme.

Condition Met

To be submitted to Approvals Committee on: 12 January 2006

Visitors' signatures:

Simon Willoughby-Booth
Michael Edwards

20 October 2005

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

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

Scope of visit (please tick)

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	40 per year in 4 intakes
---	-------------------------------------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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: 20th December 2006

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

Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval: 1st 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: 7th December 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Name and titles of programme(s)	Foundation Degree in Pre-Hospital, Unscheduled and Emergency Care
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of Visit	06 th & 07 th September 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	January 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Vince Clarke Paramedic Norma Brook Physiotherapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Marie Stowell (Chair) Theresa Nahajski Sara Gibbon (Wednesday))Secretary Lucy Robson (Thursday))Secretary Gareth Jones Internal Panel Member Robert Dudley Internal Panel Member Professor Wollard External Panel Member Sue West External Panel Member Thursday only

Scope of visit (please tick)

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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 1:

The Programme team must include details on placement hours, travel to placements, driving issues relating to subsequent employment and fitness test requirements with clear explanations in the information provided for applicants.

Reason:

The necessity to complete a range of placements at locations covering a large geographical area was not made clear, neither was the responsibility of the student to facilitate and finance their own travel to and from such placements.

The employability of students by other UK Ambulance Trusts upon completion of the course was unclear as there is no inclusion of emergency driving as part of the programme.

Also the relevance, type and format of the fitness test was not clear. The relevance for the fitness test must be made clear in the advertising and admissions material. All material must clearly state that this and the other skills such as the ambulance driving test could be required for future employment as well as holding the award.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register (for the following professions: arts therapists, chiropodists and podiatrists, dieticians, occupational therapists, orthoptists, paramedics, physiotherapists, prosthetists and orthotists and radiographers) or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

Condition 2:

There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason:

The position of programme leader is subject to a selection process which has not yet been completed.

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

Condition 3:

The University must produce a memorandum of co-operation, or equivalent, with the newly amalgamated West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust.

Reason:

The continued support of the partner ambulance Trust is required to deliver practice elements of the course.

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

Condition 4:

The University must provide the appropriate form for obtaining student consent.

Reason:

No evidence was produced pertaining to consent protocols for students on the programme.

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 5:

The visitors require further clarification of the attendance requirements, and how these requirements will be monitored.

Reason:

There was a lack of clarity regarding the attendance requirements of the course and no formal process in place to monitor student attendance at mandatory sessions.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition 6:

The Programme team must demonstrate that appropriately qualified mentors, in adequate numbers, are in place prior to commencement of the programme.

Reason:

The proposed mentorship scheme requires completion of an initial two day training course. As yet these courses have not been run resulting in low number of appropriately qualified mentors in the locality. With placements forming a major part of the programme, it is vital that enough suitably qualified mentors can be shown to be in place prior to the start of the course.

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

Condition 7:

The visitors want to see a diagrammatical representation of the format of the course timetable/time-line, indicating how theory and practice are integrated.

Also clarification is sought by the visitors on how clinical competencies will be assessed if not encountered in the practice setting.

Reason:

It was not clear how practice placements and theoretical input would combine throughout the two year programme. It was suggested that the scheme would follow a 'normal' academic year comprising of two semesters, however provision for sufficient practice placement hours within this time was not clearly identified.

The Work Based Learning Handbook did not include details on how clinical skills that were not encountered would be assessed. In the course of two years patient contact it is highly unlikely that all patient types/clinical presentations will be seen. A clearly structured method of overcoming these deficits in practice needs to be evidenced.

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition 8:

The Work Based Learning Handbook must be revised to reflect formative progression of skills.

Reason:

Currently the workbook requires only one signature of competency from a mentor for each skill area. This does not represent a development of skills and does not demonstrate how the student has progressed from being fully supervised to carrying out skills with no input from their mentor.

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

Condition 9:

The university must provide examples of OSCE's and associated marking criteria.

Reason:

The visitors would like to see examples of the OSCEs to indicate the nature and validity of such assessments.

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

Condition 10:

The revised programme documentation must include evidence of methods used to assess classroom based skills, to include how moderation will take place.

Reason:

The Programme team stated that formative skills assessment would take place in the simulated setting of the classroom prior to students entering into such skills in practice. There was, however, no documentation supporting this method of assessment.

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

Condition 11:

The programme regulations must reflect the requirement for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason:

External examiner not yet appointed and current University regulations do not stipulate HPC registration as a requirement for the post.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 20 October 2006

Commendations

The development of a new quality assurance tool for placements was an area of expanding good practice.

The move to include more e-books will make texts available to more students and was seen as being 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:

Vince Clark

Norma Brook

Date: 18 September 2006

ALL CONDITIONS MET