

Education and Training Panel – 27 September 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
Anglia Ruskin University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	FT
Anglia Ruskin University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	PT
Bournemouth University	FdSc Paramedic Science	FT
Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT
Liverpool John Moores University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences	FT
Liverpool John Moores University	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences	PT
Liverpool John Moores University	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science	FT
Liverpool John Moores University	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science	PT
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	PT
London South Bank University	MSc Physiotherapy	FT
London South Bank University	DipHE Operating Department Practice	FT
Northumbria University at Newcastle	MSc Physiotherapy	FT
Northumbria University at Newcastle	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	PT

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-09-07	a	EDU	PPR	COVER SHEET Approve Programme (Conditions met) - Sept 2007	Publication DD: None	Public RD: None

Northumbria University at Newcastle	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT
Queen Margaret University	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT
Queen Margaret University	Graduate Diploma Speech and Language Therapy	FT
Sheffield Hallam University	DipHE Operating Department Practice	FT
University of Wales, Bangor	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	FT
University of East Anglia	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT
University of East Anglia	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT
University of Plymouth	BSc (Hons) Dietetics	FT
University Campus Suffolk	Non Medical Prescribing	PT
University of Ulster	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT
University of Ulster	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT
University of Ulster	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)	FT
University of Ulster	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic)	FT
University of Ulster	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT
University of the West of England, Bristol	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical)	FT
University of Westminster	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences	PT
University of Worcester	Non Medical Independent and Supplementary Prescribing	PT

Decision

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

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

Visitors' reports (19)

Date of paper

17 September 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

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

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<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 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	20
--	----

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

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

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

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

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

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

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

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

5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must be appropriately registered

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

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

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

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

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

Deadline for conditions to be met:	9 July 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:	5 July 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:	2 August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

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

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

COMMENDATIONS

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

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training. We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Bill Gilmore
David Houlston

Date: 20 May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Fd Sc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	11 th and 12 th July 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	October 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Vince Clarke (Clinician) Paul Burke (Educationalist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Geoff Willcocks - Chair Nicki Finnes - Secretary Simon Dykes - External Bob Fellows - BPA representative John Martin - BPA representative Jacqueline Geoghegan - Independent, Internal Beryl Ratcliffe - Joint Programme Leader

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"/>
New Profession	<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	20 - 30
--	---------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the admission documentation to remove the entry requirement of 'a provisional C1 license'.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, it became apparent there are no driving licence requirements for entry to the programme and therefore these must be removed. Examples can be found on the website and in the applicant information pack.

and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to correctly name the Health Professions Council and to clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and entry to the HPC Register.

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

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The programme team must forward documentation which shows the course management structures, including committees and associated responsibilities.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and the review of course documentation, the Visitors noted recent changes to the joint programme leads. To provide the Visitors with information about the systems in place to manage the programme and the individuals involved, an up to date management structure must be forwarded.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the references to an HPC requirement of 1,500 hours of practice-learning experience and a portfolio.

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

and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the Practice Placement 1 unit descriptor to remove the key learning resource; IHCD (undated) Ambulance service ambulance driving.

Reason: During discussions the programme team confirmed there were no learning outcomes associated with driving in the programme and as such, the Visitors felt this key learning resource must be removed from the unit descriptor.

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 redraft and resubmit the student consent form to inform students they can decline to participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: Currently the student consent form does not inform students they can decline to act as a patient or client. To ensure students are aware they can opt out of these situations, the Visitors felt the form must be updated.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to clarify the attendance policy for the taught elements of the programme.

Reason: It is clear from the student handbook that an attendance policy is in place for the practice element of the programme. However, it is unclear whether there is an attendance policy for the taught element of the programme and the Visitors felt that should there be one in place, it must be clearly stated in the student handbook.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to identify that upon completion of the programme, students will be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 of the International English Language Testing System, with no element below 6.5.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation is unclear at what level the students will exit the programme and to comply with standard of proficiency 1b.4, the Visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must submit a full list of mentors, which includes their qualifications, experience, location and attendance at mentor training days. In addition, the programme team must submit the action plan designed to increase the number of appropriately trained mentors.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team and South West Ambulance Services NHS Trust (SWAST), the Visitors were provided with information about the number of mentors within the Dorset area. To provide a complete picture of the numbers and training of mentors in SWAST, a full list of mentors must be provided. SWAST did recognise that more appropriately trained mentors are needed and the Visitors would therefore like to see an action plan which will address this.

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

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

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

Reason: Currently the Practice Placement Handbook refers to the Professional Code of Conduct for the HPC. To ensure students are able to locate the correct documentation on HPC's website, the Practice Placement Handbook must be updated.

SET 6. Assessment standards

Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

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

Condition: The programme team must forward a copy of regulations which show that an External Examiner will be appointed, from the appropriate part of the register.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and SWAST, it was noted the appointment of an External Examiner was in the early stages. The Visitors would like confirmation that the appointment is in the programme regulations.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 21 August 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 27 September 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 27 September 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including, in the service level agreement, details about the practice placement provision within the trust.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and SWAST, it was clear a service level agreement had recently been signed and that this will be reviewed in a year's time. The Visitors believe it may be beneficial to include information about the provision of placements in the service level agreement, due to the changing nature of the health service.

COMMENDATIONS

- ***The Visitors would like to commend the programme team and SWAST on the creation of the practice placement co-ordinator role.***
- ***The Visitors would like to commend the university on their use of an external adjudicator in the academic appeals policy and procedure process.***

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 Clarke

Paul Burke

20th July 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	20-22 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Professor Norma Brook Mrs Kathleen Bosworth
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Nina Thompson – QA Officer, the Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Marilyn Andres – Head of School of Health and Rehabilitation, Keele University (The Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
First visit since publication of QAA benchmarks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	Max120
--	--------

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 3 Programme Management and Resource Standards

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

Condition:

The programme team need to ensure that the implementation of the attendance regulation is clearly and firmly articulated within the course document and student handbook. Also statements referring to the regulations for both the regulatory body and professional body need to be rectified, so that it does not imply that HPC stipulates the number of clinical hours, for e.g. course document p63, paragraph 5.2.2 and within the student handbook, appendix 11.

The programme team must redraft and submit evidence to ensure this condition has been met

Reason:

The visitors felt that the information provided within the documentation relating to the attendance regulation was not clearly articulated. Students need to be clearly informed of the attendance regulations.

Also, statements within the documentation referring to HPC number of clinical hours are misleading for HPC does not stipulate number of hours. This needs to be rectified.

Condition 2

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Condition:

Reference of HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics need to be included within the PPD Module. Also in the course document, p63 paragraph 5.2, there needs to be clarification that the learner is governed by both the rules for the professional conducts for Chartered Physiotherapists and the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

The programme team must redraft and submit evidence to ensure this condition has been met

Reason:

All students need to be fully aware that they are required to meet the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics prior to registration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met:

21 May 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS**Recommendation 1**

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

Recommendation:

The University should build upon its unique portfolio of programmes and setting by developing with some urgency an inter-professional learning programme for all four disciplines under review and within the University as a whole.

Reason:

There is currently little evidence that inter-professional learning takes place, however the wide range of programmes offered and the unique physical location of all the programmes in the same building provide very good opportunities for this situation to change.

Commendations

1) The visitors commend the research facilities and evidence based teaching and learning.

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:

**Professor Norma Brook
Mrs Kathleen Bosworth**

Date: 12/04/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time Part time
Date of Visit	9 th & 10 th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Phil Warren (Biomedical Scientist, Educationalist) Martin Nicholson (Biomedical Scientist, Clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Tony Hall (Chair) Debbie Richardson (Secretary) Robert Williams (IBMS visitor) Alan Wainwright (IBMS) Sarah May (IBMS) Joanne Knowles (LJMU) Chris Rostron (LJMU) Dhiya Al-Jumeily (LJMU)

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"/>
New Profession	<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	12 - 15
---	----------------

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: The programme team must review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove references to 'state registration'.

Reason: The term 'state registration' is no longer used by the professions which the HPC regulates and must be removed from the programme documentation. An example of where this can be found is in the university prospectus.

and

Condition: The programme team must review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly state that the programme leads to eligibility to apply for admission for the HPC Register.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation indicates that there is direct entry to the HPC Register and to provide students with clear information, this must be updated. Examples of this can be found in the university prospectus and student handbook 2007-8.

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:

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the practice placement handbook to include reference to HPC's Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Reason: Currently students are referred to the Code of Ethics. To ensure students are able to easily locate the correct documentation on HPC's website, these references must be amended.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.3 for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register; and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the University Modular Framework Assessment Regulations to clearly inform students that an aegrotat award does not lead to eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: Currently the University Modular Framework Assessment Regulations lists those programmes which the aegrotat policy does not apply to. The BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme does not appear in this list and must be added.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 25th June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

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

Visitors' signatures:

Phil Warren

Martin Nicholson

Date: 16th May 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Foundation Degree Sciences Paramedic Studies
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	FT / PT
Date of visit	26 – 27 June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Paul Bates (Educationalist, Paramedic) Bob Dobson (Clinician, Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Tony Hall (Chair), Faculty of Business and Law, LJMU Helen Summers (Secretary), Quality Support Officer, LJMU Rosie Essay (Internal Panel Member), Faculty of Health, LJMU Lesley Wright (Internal Panel Member), Faculty of Technology and Environment, LJMU Bernie Garrett (External Panel Member), Edgehill University Jim Petter (British Paramedic Association), Great Western Ambulance Service

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"/>
New Profession	<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	September Cohort - 30
	March Cohort - 30

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the relationship between successful completion of the award and eligibility to apply for registration with the Health Professions Council as a paramedic.

Reason: In the submitted documentation there were two instances (page 1 and page 11 of the main validation document) which indicated the programme led directly to registration or to license to practice. The Visitors felt the programme documentation must be amended to ensure applicants and students understand completion of the programme does not entitle automatic registration.

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 redraft and resubmit the student consent form to clearly articulate that in instances where student information is disclosed to fellow students confidentiality requirements will be adhered to.

Reason: In the submitted documentation, a student consent form was provided but did not include a statement clearly articulating that information obtained during student interaction is confidential. In order to protect students practicing on each other during the course, the Visitors feel a confidentiality statement is required.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 16th August 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 27th September 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 27th September 2007

COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- The PLSS practice placement database which records an impressive level of detail about placement environments, student allocations and practice placement educators and their qualifications.
- The innovative approach towards patient assessment, which is enhanced by the use of consenting live patients.
- The developmental work which has taken place over the last two years to secure resources and train mentors before the commencement of the pre-registration 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:

Bob Dobson

Paul Bates

Date: 27th June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Part time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	BSc = September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Margaret Curr, Physiotherapist Anthony Power, Physiotherapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair), London Southbank University Catherine Moss (Secretary), London South Bank University Jenny Carey, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Helena Johnson, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Professor Mike Molan, London Southbank University Professor Geoffrey Elliott, London Southbank University Lisa Greatrex, London Southbank University

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" 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 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	BSc 22
---	---------------

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English.

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that IELTS level 6.5 is required for admission to the programme.

Reason: The documentation is currently inconsistent, with some documentation specifying that 6.0 is required, while other parts specify 6.5. The programme team explained that 6.5 is required so the documentation needs to be revised to make this clear.

2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including ensure that the education provider has an equal opportunities policy and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this must be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The age restriction preventing students under the age of 18 entering the programme should be removed.

Reason: This restriction is inconsistent with the anti-discrimination policy.

**Deadline for Conditions to be met:
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:**

**29 June 2007
2 August 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

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

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

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

COMMENDATIONS

- 1. The Visitors were impressed by the continual operation of the service users strategy and how this has enhanced ongoing programme improvement.**

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:

**Margaret Curr
Anthony Power**

Date: 9 March 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	MSc – Approximate Start date 2008
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Margaret Curr, Physiotherapist Anthony Power, Physiotherapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair), London Southbank University Catherine Moss (Secretary), London South Bank University Jenny Carey, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Helena Johnson, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Professor Mike Molan, London Southbank University Professor Geoffrey Elliott, London Southbank University Lisa Greatrex, London Southbank University

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 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	MSc 10
---	---------------

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English.

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that IELTS level 6.5 is required for admission to the programme.

Reason: The documentation is currently inconsistent, with some documentation specifying that 6.0 is required, while other parts specify 6.5. The programme team explained that 6.5 is required so the documentation needs to be revised to make this clear.

2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including ensure that the education provider has an equal opportunities policy and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this must be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The age restriction preventing students under the age of 18 entering the programme should be removed.

Reason: This restriction is inconsistent with the anti-discrimination policy.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: Three months before the MSc programme commences a written statement explaining what student numbers, timing and resource allocation will be required, together with an explanation of any impact this will have on other existing programmes.

Reason: The University have indicated that the programme is not likely to start until September 2008 and could not provide firm information on the impact the programme is likely to have on the commissioning numbers for other programmes or on the resources available to other programmes.

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 assessment requirements for each module should be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with the revised learning outcomes.

Reason: The current assessment is inconsistent with the requirements of an M level programme.

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

Condition: The learning outcomes of the MSc modules should be revised to ensure that they are consistent with the level expected of an M level programme.

Reason: The current learning outcomes are insufficiently different from the BSc to justify its higher level status.

Deadline for Conditions to be met:

29 June 2007

Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

2 August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

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

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

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

COMMENDATIONS

- 1. The Visitors were impressed by the continual operation of the service users strategy and how this has enhanced ongoing programme improvement.**

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:

**Margaret Curr
Anthony Power**

Date: 9 March 20

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma in Higher Education in Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full Time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	David Bevan (ODP) Angela Duxbury (Radiography acting as the education specialist.)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair) Catherine Moss (Secretary) Helen Booth CODP, day three only Professor Mike Molan LSBU Professor Geoffrey Elliott LSBU Lisa Greatrex LSBU

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	20
---	-----------

All Conditions S.M.E.

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:

Condition:

2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Condition: The education provider must reword and resubmit the selection and entry requirements in the programme documentation.

Reason: This would ensure that the appropriate and or professional entry standards are adhered to.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

Condition

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a CV for Jacqueline Kent

Reason: This CV was missing from the documentation provided prior to the visit.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

Condition

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

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The education provider must resubmit the mentor database.

Reason: The database in its current form lacks information regarding evidence of appropriate registration, relevant qualifications and the appropriate practice placement educator training. In order for the SETS to be met this database should be updated and adhered to by the education provider.

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

Condition

Condition: The education provider must submit a sample of minutes for the collaborative meetings between the education provider and the practice placement educators.

Reason: There was strong evidence that these meetings take place but no minutes were provided to support this position.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Recommendation: The Programme Teams consider student declaration for criminal convictions and health requirements on an annual basis.

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

Commendations

The good support from the senior team to the Programme team is evident.

The collaborative nature between the programme team and the practice placement providers is a good example of best practice.

The buddy system for newly appointed staff is to be commended.

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

Angela Duxbury

Date: 9 March 2007

All Conditions Met

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Northumbria University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	BSc (Hons) - FT/PT MSc - PT
Date of Visit	8th & 9th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Joanna Jackson - Physiotherapy Katie Bosworth - Physiotherapy
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock – Education Officer Daljit Mahoon – Education Officer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ian Shell (Chair) - Associate Dean, Learning & Teaching Support, Newcastle Business School Colin Chandler - Director of Postgraduate Studies Helen Smith - Principal Lecturer, Learning in Organisations Jim Clark - Subject Division Leader, Pre and School learning Jackie Waterfield - CSP Nina Thomson - CSP Linda Charlton - Secretary Colin Keiley - Team leader A & R, Stockport Health Stephen Wordsworth - Head of department, UCE Birmingham Sarah Johnson - Occupational therapist, University of Plymouth, HPC Visitor Bernadette Waters - Occupational therapist, University of Southampton, HPC Visitor

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

programme			
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 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	65
---	-----------

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

Condition: The programme team are to provide evidence that they have an adequate number of staff by resubmitting documentation to include staffing complement and their current workload with evidence of opportunities for CPD and research

Reason: Documentation did not include CVs or the workload of each member on the programme team. It became evident through meeting the programme team and students that the staffing was affecting various aspects of the

programme and there was no evidence supplied to show the potential for staff to engage in staff development opportunities.

Condition 2

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

SET 6 Assessment Standards

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to include evidence that by the end of the programme every student is able to meet the standards of proficiency

Reason: The wording in the module descriptors and assessment forms did not make it clear that all the standards of proficiency were being met. There was also no mapping against the learning outcomes of modules to illustrate the relationship between the achievement of learning outcomes and the demonstration of standards of proficiency.

Condition 3

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition: The programme team are to provide evidence that there is the placement capacity to offer the number, range and duration of placements to achieve the learning outcomes

Reason: It became apparent throughout the programme team, student and placement provider meetings that there had been problems in the last academic year with finding enough placements to cover student numbers. Although reassurance was given that this problem had been resolved there was no clear evidence provided about the actual placements and their capacity to support the student numbers as given.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team recommended the removal of old editions of publications from the library.

Reason: There seemed to be a number of extremely old texts in the library and it was felt that students could be unaware that they were not the most up to date texts available.

Recommendation 2

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team are recommended to review and reinforce the use of PPDF

Reason: The planned use of the PPDF is a very positive development. However, previous use of similar tools seemed quite inconsistent across programme teams so it was recommended that sufficient staff development in its use should take place prior to the start of the academic year.

COMMENDATIONS

- **Commendation is given to the programme team on their plans for new clinical facilities which will enhance inter-professional learning opportunities**

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:

Joanna Jackson

Katie Bosworth *Katie Bosworth*

Date: 23/05/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy Graduate Diploma Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	28 th June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Gillian Stevenson – Speech and Language Therapy Aileen Patterson – Speech and Language Therapy
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ann Marie Conway – Chair Shelia Adamson - Secretary

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<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 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 Staffing provision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Demand for Clinical Placements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Reduction in contact hours	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc(Hons) 40 G Dip 6
--	-------------------------

All conditions met

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

CONDITIONS

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that the advertised role the replacement member of staff has been filled with an appropriately qualified and experienced speech and language therapist.

Reason: The programme team are severally understaffed due to the retirement of a member of staff and reduced staffing hours of two members of staff. It was felt that even though the programme team had the relevant expertise and knowledge there was a shortage of speech and language therapists to give profession-specific teaching and clinical education and to support the roles of others on the team. The programme team explained that they are currently advertising for a new member of full time staff and hope to fill the role as soon as possible.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that an appropriately qualified speech and language therapist has been recruited and appointed to teach paediatric dysphagia

Reason: The documentation could not provide the module lead for this subject due to a recent retirement. No one had been recruited for this role which was felt to be of significance and importance in the light of the comments made during annual monitoring which resulted in this visit. This may or may not be the newly appointed speech and language therapist but someone appropriately qualified and experienced must be recruited to teach this area of the curriculum.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit a programme which outlines staff development for the speech and language therapists including details on how they will develop their clinical practice

Reason: Due to staff shortages the programme team expressed that there is no time for clinical practice or a chance to further their professional development and additionally research targets were being compromised. It was not clear whether or not a programme to address this was in place and being implemented.

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.

Condition: The programme team must provide confirmation that the space secured for this programme at the new campus will not result in any reduction in the amount of designated clinical teaching space/clinical SLT treatment area (including allocated space large enough for clinical group work)

Reason: Due to the relocation of the campus there was doubt from the programme team whether there would be use of a large space available for clinical work. The programme team said that there was space in the new building but clarity was needed to guarantee access to these particular rooms for specialist SLT work.

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 and implement the use of an appropriate protocol for obtaining student consent where students participate as patients or clients in practical or clinical teaching

Reason: Currently there is no protocol obtaining consent from students for their participation in practical teaching and learning.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that there is a consistent approach to monitoring student attendance and that associated monitoring mechanisms are in place.

Reason: The programme team did not have any mechanisms in place. It was felt that each member of staff had their own ways of monitoring students. The documentation also claimed that full attendance was expected and students' attendance "may be" monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the access students have to core texts and books by outlining the quantity and loan types of required and recommended texts and journals and online publications. They should also indicate how they intend using WebCT to support student learning and facilitate access to relevant publications.

Reason: When meeting with the students they indicated with illustrations that they did not have enough access to core texts and they would welcome better use of short term loans and fairer distribution of existing resources. It was unclear whether this was due to the type of loans allocated to each book or whether there was a genuine insufficient supply of core and supporting texts. Staff and students did not appear to be using WebCT to its maximum capacity; the documentation did state however that this will be increased when the campus re locates.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition: The programme team must submit a procedure that is in place to approve and monitor all placements outside Scotland and overseas. This must include details of how they allocate students to and monitor their placements.

Reason: Queen Margaret University use English speaking placements outside Scotland such as Canada and the Republic of Ireland There was no auditing or mechanisms in place to monitor these placements; however there is training for local clinicians and monitoring of Scottish placements,

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators

5.8.1 must have relevant qualifications and experience

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

Condition: The programme team must confirm that practice placement educators outside Scotland are either HPC registered or otherwise appropriately qualified and trained to supervise students.

Reason: The programme team currently have a system in place to monitor practice placement educators at their UK placements; however, the programme team stated they do not have mechanisms in place to monitor placements outside Scotland.

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: The programme team must confirm the procedure in place to inform students of equal opportunities and anti discriminatory procedures at placements and a mechanism to monitor this.

Reason: The students on placement will need to know how to access these policies and what they should do if they feel they are discriminated against. It is the education provider's responsibility to monitor and support placements. The programme team stated they monitor placements but not specifically these policies. When meeting the placements providers it became clear that there was not a formal procedure in place. Informal talks were given at the start of each placement. A procedure in place will ensure cross site consistency.

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.

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

Recommendation: In light of current staffing levels, even when at full complement, with their commitment to research and to other programmes, the programme team should not increase the cohort size, including International students without further staffing increase.

Reason: Visitors acknowledged that once conditions are met there would be an adequate number of staff to teach on the programme as well as have involvement in other programmes outside Scotland, however, they felt the team would be stretched to capacity and any increases in student numbers would need to be offset with an increase in staffing.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider their placement capacity when planning to increase graduate diploma students

Reason: The programme team said there was a possibility of taking on more Graduate Diploma students and fewer BSc (Hons) students. Although the total number of students would remain constant the difference in design of these two programmes would lead to a larger number of students on placements simultaneously. The visitors discussed placement capacity with the programme team and any changes to the balance of the two programmes could prove problematic. Already some students had reported that they had had to take their placements in a different mode than the majority of their peers to gain sufficient numbers of sessions.

Commendations

- **The programme team is to be commended on the strong commitment to supporting students**
- **A strong relationship is evident between placement providers and the programme team**
- **The team to be commended on engendering and maintaining a strong research ethos in speech sciences despite pressures of other demands.**

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:

Gillian Stevenson

Aileen Patterson

Date: 11th July 2007

All conditions met

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	24 th – 25 th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Tracey Huggins - Operating Department Practitioner David Bevan - Operating Department Practitioner
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock Abigail Creighton (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Roger New - Chair (Head of Quality and Enhancement, Faculty of Arts, Computing Engineering and Sciences) Jenny Shelton - (Faculty Head of Quality and Enhancement) Eleanor Willcocks - Secretary (Faculty Validation Officer, Academic Approvals, Registry) Helen Booth - College of Operating Department Practitioners (CODP) Visitor (University of Surrey)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New profession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
New programme	<input 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	38
---	-----------

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 programme information; the redrafted information should clearly reflect the HPC registration guidelines.

Reason: The submitted information did not clearly articulate that completion of the Dip HE leads to eligibility rather than entitlement for registration with the Health Professions Council.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit programme information to give clear guidelines on the health requirements for registration with the Health Professions Council

Reason: The submitted information included health requirements which did not clearly reflect the Health Professions Council's guidelines. Examples of specific illnesses were outlined which gave the impression these may hinder an applicant's chances of registering. The programme team were advised to read the 'Information about a health reference' and 'A disabled person's guide to becoming a health professional' publications.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme information to clearly outline the APEL criteria

Reason: The submitted information did not clearly articulate that the Health Professions Council is not involved in the university's APEL system. It also did not make clear the differences between the professional body and the regulatory body.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

Condition: The programme team must confirm the maintenance of the 5 full time staff or provide a contingency plan if there are difficulties within the time frame. Recruitment of a new member of staff must have relevant expertise and knowledge applicable to the Dip HE in Operating Department Practice.

Reason: The programme team are in the process of recruiting a new member of staff onto the programme team. Presently it appears that there are not enough staff in place to adequately support the student cohort until this member has been recruited. The programme team are confident that they can recruit a fifth team member to start in September 2007, and explained that they would recruit visiting lecturers and part-time staff if they were unsuccessful.

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 redraft and submit documentation to include a form utilised to obtain consent from students prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, e.g. role plays, practicing profession-specific techniques.

Reason: The documentation lacked evidence which ensured that this standard is met. A consent mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that potential candidates are aware of the expectations of the programme regarding the level of participation expected by and from the student.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must submit evidence that students completing the programme meet all of our standards of proficiency. There needs to be clear indication that on completion of the learning outcomes, the HPC standards of proficiency are being achieved, both in theory and in practice.

Reason: In the documentation and through discussion it became clear that the learning outcomes did not ensure that all standards of proficiency were met. The visitors were

unclear where the standards of proficiency 1a5, 2a1, 2b1, 2b2, 2b4, 3a1 were met as students have limited exposure to emergency situations and post anaesthesia care. There was flexibility for students as to whether they met learning outcomes. The programme team did not demonstrate assessment of practical skills and knowledge in all clinical areas as articulated in the standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The programme team must up date mentors on the use of reflective accounts by redrafting and submitting documentation to include a planned agenda or programme of subjects taught during mentor training.

Reason: In discussion it became apparent that mentors did not feel comfortable asking students to complete reflective accounts as part of their portfolio assessment, even though the programme team felt that placement coordinators would find this a useful part of assessment for students. In the meeting with students, it became apparent that they had completed limited reflective accounts and the visitors felt that the mentors needed to receive training to allow them to use reflection more confidently. In turn, this would allow students to develop as autonomous and reflective thinkers.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placements educators must have relevant qualifications and experience

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

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

Condition: The programme team are to submit an up to date and comprehensive mentor database which reflects their qualifications, experience, registered status and the mentor training they have received. The database must include all practice placement areas.

Reason: Although a list of mentors was produced, it did not cover all placement sites or provide updated information on all mentors qualifications and registered status. There was also no clear mechanism to effectively monitor, on a regular basis, the number of appropriately qualified, registered and experienced staff during student placement.

5.3.2 The practice placement settings must provide safe and effective practice.

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

Condition: The programme team need to provide evidence to show there is a mechanism in place for students to both confidentially and formally evaluate practice placements.

Reason: The documentation does not give clear advice on the communication channels for the student whilst on placement. Detail on the student's workplace assessment is not adequate to ascertain that the student will, on completion of the placement, have achieved the learning outcomes and the skills to practise safely and effectively. A mechanism needs to be in place for students to confidentially feedback on their placement experience. Although informal mechanisms are in place between individual students and mentors, there is no formal mechanism whereby the education provider can receive and action (where necessary) feedback from students.

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

5.11 Practice placement providers must ensure necessary information is available at the appropriate time for both the education provider and students.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to provide evidence that practice placements are monitored by way of clinical placements audits and an action plan for future audits.

Reason: Although evidence was provided to indicate a system was in place to audit placement settings the visitors felt it did not clearly articulate that a thorough and effective system for approval and monitoring placements was in place

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: The programme team must redraft and resubmit mentor handbooks.

Reason: The HPC does not visit practice placements and therefore needs to be assured that mentors have accessible information as to their responsibilities and what is expected of them. Even though mentor handbooks were asked for throughout the visit and provided at the end of the visit, as the visitors did not have time to look through them, they could not be confident that this standard was met by the time the conditions were made.

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to show re-evaluation of assessment methods used in practice placements.

Reason: Throughout discussion during the visit the HPC representatives were not assured that mechanisms are in place to monitor and review the quality and consistency in the questioning and observation by placement mentors, to ensure students are always fit to practice. The programme did not demonstrate assessment of practical skills and knowledge in all clinical areas as articulated in the standards of proficiency.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 25th June 2007

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

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team re-validate the programme within the time scale given by the education provider.

Reason: The programme team expressed a need for this due to recent changes in the professional body and the new approval by the Health Professions Council.

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

Recommendation: There is a need, in light of the forthcoming appointment of another permanent member of staff, to review the module leads.

Reason: It was not clear during the visit as to what members of staff are leading which modules. Through discussion, the team confirmed that modules are currently led by existing staff due to the unfilled position. The visitors were confident that the existing staff has the relevant expertise and knowledge to teach the modules, but recognised that the modules would need to be re-allocated once a fifth member of staff joined the team.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The university and faculty are to be commended for the high level of support for the programme team and the programme.
2. The HPC representatives thought the resource infrastructure for the student experience was excellent.
3. There was a clear show of support for students by the programme team and placement providers which has created an effective system of development and support for students.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

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

Visitors' signatures:

Tracey Huggins

David Bevan

Date: 16th May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The University of Wales, Bangor
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	17th – 18th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr Derek Adrian Harris – Director of Radiography Education , University of Portsmouth Mr Colin Keiley - Surgical Team Manager, South Manchester University Foundation Trust.
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon Miss Katherine Lock
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr David Wright – (Chair) University of Wales Bangor. Miss Rachel Ley – (Secretary) University of Wales Bangor. Professor K Janet Pritchard – University of Wales Bangor, Head of School Education Dr Dei Huws – University of Wales Bangor, Lecturer, School of Ocean Science. Dr Ioan Ap Dewi - University of Wales Bangor, Academic registrar

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<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	9
---	----------

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme Admissions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme.

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.

6.7.3 for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register

Condition:

Statements presented within the documentation relating to HPC need to be corrected. This refers to:

- 1) The reference made for the IELTS level of English on application of 7, which should be on completion of the programme.
- 2) The statement on page 4 within the student handbook under the attendance policy needs to be amended or removed.
- 3) A statement needs to be included within the student handbook, clearly specifying awards which do not provide eligibility to register with the HPC.
- 4) A statement needs to be included within the student handbook, clearly specifying the aegrotat awards are not considered within this programme and to not provide eligibility to register with the HPC.

Reason:

- 1) It is not a requirement for students who do not speak English, on entry to the programme, to have an English language standard of IELTS 7.0. An IELTS level of 6.0 is acceptable providing on completion of the programme the student reaches IELTS 7.0, which is the requirement for them to meet the Standards of Proficiency, requirement under 1.b.4.
- 2) On page 4 within the student handbook under Attendance Policy, it reads: 'A course requirement, in order for you to be eligible to register with the Health Professions Council (HPC) is that you undertake and successfully complete ALL of the theoretical and practical elements during the next two years', this is untrue. This is not a specific requirement from the HPC. Our standard on attendance is to ensure that a system of monitoring attendance is in place and students are informed on when attendance is mandatory, ensuring that all students can meet the Standards of Proficiency to be able to practice safely and effectively, on completion of the programme.
- 3) There was not mention within the documentation provided for students of awards that do not provide eligibility to register. A statement should be included so students are well informed.
- 4) There was no mention within the documentation provided for students that Aegrotat awards are not considered. A statement should be included so students are well informed.

Condition 2:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition:

The programme team must produce and submit a paper which demonstrates how in light of the subsequent conditions and recommendations, that the course will be managed effectively in the future.

Reason:

With the prospect of conditions being met and recommendations being considered, enhancements to the programme will be made. Through producing an outline demonstrating how these changes will affect and enhance the management of the programme, it would help to assure the visitors that the programme team understand the implications and their thoughts in specific to the quality and improvements of staffing in the future.

Condition 3:

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

Condition:

The programme team must resubmit a complete set of up to date CVs , demonstrating the programme teams areas of expertise, their relevance to this programme and their roles within it.

Reason:

The visitors found it difficult to gage whether staff had relevant expertises and knowledge for it was not clearly articulated within the CVs that were submitted.

Condition 4:

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

Condition:

The programme team must produce a clear plan, outlining the staff development for each member of the programme team.

Reason:

It was unclear within the documentation and CVs, what the programme team have and are presently doing to ensure their continual professional development is being carried out. Examples need to be provided for each member of the programme team, to enable the visitors to be assured that this set is being met.

Condition 5:

SET 2 Programme Admissions

2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition:

The course documentation needs to be revised to make it more explicit where attendance is mandatory.

Reason:

After meeting the programme team it became apparent that some students were negotiating holidays during lecture periods. A clearer and consistent outline of where attendance is mandatory needs to be clearly articulated within the documentation.

Condition 6:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition:

The programme team must revise and submit a mapping document which maps the learning outcomes against the assessments and the HPC Standards of Proficiency.

Reason:

It was not clearly articulated within the documentation how the HPC Standards of Proficiency are being achieved by the students through the learning outcomes and the assessments.

Condition 7:

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

Condition:

The programme team must revise and submit an outline of how autonomous practice and reflective thinking is developed by students within the programme.

Reason:

It was not clear within the documentation how students develop autonomous practice and reflective thinking within the programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

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;

Recommendation:

To revise the admissions process, such as the CRB, health checks and the entrance criteria, to consider the appropriateness of 5 GCSEs

Reason:

The visitors felt that the processes for CRB and health checks could be improved and the level of the academic entry standards, consisting of 5 GCSEs could be seen to be quite low.

Recommendation 2:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation:

The programme team should seriously consider appointing another Operating Department Practitioner

Reason:

At present there are two main members of the team within which there is only one Operating Department Practitioner who is the programme leader. In order to develop the programme and its profession specific knowledge and skills, the Visitors felt the appointment of an additional (Registered) Operating Department Practitioner with the relevant academic qualifications and experience would enhance the development of the programme and assist the programme leader.

Also, even though there is also another member of the team to support the programme leader, concerns were raised that if one were off sick, there is pressure

on the other to manage the workload, which reinforces the positive impact an additional member of staff would make.

Recommendation 3:

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

Recommendation:

The visitors encourage the programme team to accelerate a programme for ICT and library support, such as library returns and use of blackboard.

Reason:

Students needed to be kept informed of library offers and felt blackboard would be a good way of doing this. At present the use of blackboard has not been implemented and flexibility in library returns across sites could be improved. The visitors felt that more use of ICT and exploring extending library opening hours would enhance communication and support students in these areas.

Recommendation 4

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation:

The University of Bangor should consider as a matter of urgency the development and implementation of Inter professional learning programmes, relevant to all of the health and social care students.

Reason:

The visitors felt the university has significant opportunities to develop an inter-professional learning programme for all the health and social care students. This would enhance student experience and students would benefit from the exposure to the skills and knowledge for each professional group.

COMMENDATIONS

- 1) The diligence and enthusiasm of the programme leader.**
- 2) The availability of protected time afforded by the trust hospitals for practice facilitators to support students.**
- 3) Obvious enthusiasm and involvement of practice educators on the ethos of the 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:

Mr Derek Adrian Harris

Mr Colin Keiley

Date: 26/4/07

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of Visit	24 th and 25 th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapist, clinician / educationalist) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist, educationalist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist, clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Geoff Moore (Chair) Nathalie Brown (Secretary) Rosie Doy (UEA) Gibson D'Cruz (UEA) Lyn Westcott (COT visitor) Catriona Khamisha (COT visitor) Karen Holmes (COT Education Officer) Ann Green (CSOP visitor) Nina Thomson (CSOP Education Officer)

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<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	30 PT 45 OT
---	------------------------------

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: The programme team must review, and where necessary, redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure that references to registration with the HPC, clearly state that the programmes lead to eligibility to apply for admission for the HPC Register.

Reason: Currently the programme documentation states that there is automatic entry to the HPC Register. Examples of this can be found in the university prospectus and Appendix IV (Programme Conditions) of the Course Re-approval Document.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: The programme team must submit and implement guidelines for the use of Blackboard technology, so that when e-learning facilities are utilised, students can expect a consistent and effective approach.

Reason: Student feedback indicated some confusion when locating information on Blackboard. In order to provide students with clear access to e learning, guidelines must be implemented.

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:

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to include reference to HPC's Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Reason: Currently students are referred to the Code of Conduct, Performance and Ethics or the Standards of Conduct. To ensure students are able to easily locate the correct documentation on HPC's website, these references must be amended.

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the unit descriptors to include further details on how and when students are assessed against the learning outcomes.

Reason: Currently the unit descriptors do not provide sufficient detail in order for the visitors to determine whether a student is assessed against the learning outcomes and therefore able to demonstrate fitness to practice.

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 unit descriptors to show which assessment method is used to assess each learning outcome.

Reason: Although a range of assessment methods are utilised, the visitors were unable to determine whether the methods used are in line with the learning outcomes for each unit.

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.3 for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to inform students that an aegrotat award does not lead to eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: Students must be provided with full information about the requirements of HPC.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY SPECIFIC CONDITION

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.

and

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

and

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the unit descriptors to clearly articulate how students undertaking the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme meet HPC's Standard of Proficiency 3a.1.

Reason: Currently there are omissions within the unit descriptors of basic underpinning knowledge regarding health, disease, disorder and dysfunction.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 15th June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

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

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

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

Visitors' signatures:

Carol Lloyd

Joanna Jackson

Anthony Power

Date: 26 April 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

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

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
New Profession	<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 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
1 New premises which have not been visited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Staffing compliment and relevant qualifications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Appropriately registered External Examiner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	45
--	----

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

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

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

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Deadline for conditions to be met: 13th July 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

COMMENDATIONS

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

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

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

Visitors' signatures:

Jennifer Caldwell

Alexa Scott

Date: 15th June 2007

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-06-11	d	EDU	RPT	Uni of Plymouth, visitors' report, Dietetics	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Suffolk College
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	5 th July 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	October 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Simon Walker – Radiographer Glyn Harding - Paramedic
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock Marva Stewart (Observing)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Nigel South, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Academic and Regional Development), University of Essex – Chair Alison McQuinn, Administrative Officer – Secretary Graham Avery, Lecturer in Nursing, University of Essex Jonathan Mason, Lecturer in Nursing, University of East Anglia Tom Foster, Senior Lecturer, School of Post-Registration Studies and Social Work, Suffolk College Denise Knight, Academic Group Leader: Primary Care Nursing, Department of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Hertfordshire Alex Seabrook, Project Officer, Academic Partnerships, University of Essex Sue Winterburn, Senior Lecturer in Nursing, Sheffield Hallam University

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"/>

Deleted: Non Medical Prescribing Suffolk College

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"/>

All conditions met

Deleted: Non Medical Prescribing Suffolk College

Date
2007-07-06

Ver.
a

Dept/Cmte
EDU

Doc Type
APV

Title
[Non Medical Prescribing Suffolk College](#)

Status
Draft
DD: None

Int. Aud.
Internal
RD: None

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
--	----

All conditions met

Deleted: Non Medical Prescribing Suffolk College

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 student application form to take into account the intake of allied health professionals.

Reason: The documentation included an application form for students. Although the form stipulated the required number of years experience in for prospective students in nursing and pharmacy it did not include this for AHPs. It stated that unless Section 5 tick boxes were all completed the student could not enrol onto the programme.

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including; criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to outline the process that is in place to monitor CRB checks in the admission procedure.

Reason: The documentation did not outline any process in place to monitor student CRB checks in the admission procedures. When the panel asked the programme team what system was in place they explained that the responsibility was in the hands of the employer in the past but now will be the responsibility of the education provider. This was not explained in the documentation for student information.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit both the Masters level and Honours level module descriptors to include HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics

Reason: The module descriptors specified NMC's standards. The programme team had entitled this section of the module descriptor 'Professional Accountability and Responsibility' as this programme will now enrol registrants from HPC the documentation must include information for relevant professions.

Deleted: Non Medical Prescribing Suffolk College

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-07-06	a	EDU	APV	Non Medical Prescribing Suffolk College	Draft DD: None	Internal RD: None

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

Recommendation: The programme team are recommended to inform the HPC through the Major/Minor process when the campus is relocated.

Reason: The programme team explained that the provision will be, at some time next year, moving to another nearby campus. This may result in a Major Change under the HPC's requirements.

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 are recommended to consider formalising quality standards of student support in placement.

Reason: The Visitors felt that there was currently an informal process of monitoring of student support in placement. As the HPC do not approve placements a more rigorous system may be needed to ensure equity of support in the range of placements used.

Commendations

- **The visitors would like to commend the strong sense of student support from the programme team.**

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:

Simon Walker

Glyn Harding

Date: 6th July 2007

Deleted: Non Medical Prescribing Suffolk College

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-07-06	a	EDU	APV	Non Medical Prescribing Suffolk College	Draft DD: None	Internal RD: None

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	13-15 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	<p>Radiography Linda Mutema (Radiographer - Diagnostic, Educationalist) Anne-Marie Conway (Radiographer - Therapeutic, Educationalist)</p> <p>Speech and Language Therapy Gillian Stevenson (Speech and Language Therapist, Clinician) Lorna Povey (Speech and Language Therapist, Clinician) Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapist, Educationalist)</p> <p>Physiotherapy Katie Bosworth (Clinician, Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Educationalist/Clinician, Physiotherapist)</p> <p>Occupational Therapy Margaret Shanahan (Educationalist, Occupational Therapist) Carol Lloyd (Educationalist, Occupational Therapist) Katie Bosworth (Clinician, Physiotherapist)</p>
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	<p>Professor D McAlister (Chair) Pro-Vice Chancellor, Teaching and Learning, University of Ulster</p> <p>Professor B Hannigan, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Research and Innovation, University of Ulster</p> <p>Ms C Roulston, Head of School of Economics and Politics, University of Ulster</p> <p>Mrs C Avery, Academic Office, University of Ulster</p>

	<p>Mrs R McCluskey, Academic Office</p> <p>Ms G Dooher, Quality Management and Audit Unit</p> <p>Mrs J Davison, Programme Leader for Occupational Therapy, University of Teesside</p> <p>Mrs J Hussey, Head of Department for Physiotherapy, The University of Dublin</p> <p>Mr M West, Senior Lecturer in Radiography, Cardiff University</p> <p>Ms R Williams, Senior Lecturer in Speech and Language Therapy, City University</p> <p>Mrs R Heames, College of Occupational Therapy, Head of Occupational Therapy, Coventry University</p> <p>Ms J Jepson, College of Occupational Therapy, Senior Lecturer Occupational Therapy, University of East Anglia</p> <p>Ms K Holmes, Education Officer (Accreditation), College of Occupational Therapy</p> <p>Ms S Eastburn, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists, Head of Division of Rehabilitation, University of Huddersfield</p> <p>Ms J Carey, Education Officer, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy</p> <p>Mr R Price, College of Radiography, Head of School Health and Emergency Professions, University of Hertfordshire</p> <p>Ms P Pimm, College of Radiography Radiotherapy Services Manager, Velindre Hospital, Cardiff</p> <p>Professor J Stansfield, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy, Professor of Speech Pathology, Manchester Metropolitan University</p> <p>Ms R Hussain, Professional Development Standards Manager, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy</p>
--	---

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Programme not visited since publication date of QAA subject benchmark statements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

programme			
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"/>

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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 For BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, the annual monitoring submission raised issues for investigation under SET 3, specifically around staff number adequacy.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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	RAD (D) – 50 RAD (T) - 12 SLT - 30 PH - 70 OT - 60
--	--

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

GENERIC CONDITIONS

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include increased referencing in required reading lists of the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Reason: Across all the programmes, the Visitors felt that reference was made to professional body standards for conduct, performance and ethics, but that more direction to the HPC standards is required to ensure students are aware of thresholds they are expected to meet whilst in education and when registered.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include greater detail in the information provided on assessment methods in the module descriptors.

Reason: Across all the programmes, the Visitors noted details regarding particular assessments, such as word limits and durations of examinations, were absent from some module descriptors, but in particular in modules shared across all the programmes. In order to be able to determine the effectiveness of the assessment methods in measuring attainment of learning outcomes, the Visitors felt this information is required.

RADIOGRAPHY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to review all module descriptors in the therapeutic and diagnostic disciplines to ensure the inclusion of the most relevant and current texts. In this review, the programme team should ensure that there is consistency in selection of texts across modules.

Reason: The Visitors commented that the reading lists issued in the module descriptors contained texts that were not the most recent editions. Further, the Visitors felt there was a range of texts being recommended and required across modules and that that it would be more appropriate to the curriculum to have consistency in texts required and recommended.

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:

5.7.1 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.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit the placement handbook issued to placement educators in the therapeutic discipline and re-draft and resubmit the student handbook for both therapeutic and diagnostic disciplines. These documents must be submitted electronically.

Reason: The placement handbook issued to radiotherapy placement educators was not received until the day of the event and as is the case with the student handbook contained outdated information and terminology regarding regulatory status. The Visitors felt the documentation must be resubmitted in order to ensure that placement educators and students received up to date and correct information regarding placements.

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition: The programme team must submit evidence of a consistent formal documentary process for providing feedback on coursework assessment.

Reason: In discussion with the students, the Visitors noted that the process of providing feedback on coursework assessments was not consistently applied across all modules. In order to evidence students will receive similar levels of feedback to be able to adequately measure their own performance and progression against objective criteria the Visitors felt it was necessary to put in place a consistent process of feedback.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY SPECIFIC 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 information which details the relationship between the programme and the Health Professions Council. The redrafted information should clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and access to the HPC Register.

Reason: The current handbook, in places, does not make clear to applicants that completion of the BSc (Hons) programme leads to eligibility to apply for, rather than automatic entitlement for registration with the Health Professions Council.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the overall aims of the programme to ensure that the programme produces graduates who are safe practitioners.

Reason: The current overall aims for the programme seek to produce students who are competent and effective practitioners; there is no reference to producing students who are safe practitioners. Through the learning outcomes at the module level, it is clear that the programme will produce practitioners who are safe and in discussion with the programme team, it was clear that the word was omitted from the documentation in error. The visitors agreed that the programme aims should be revisited to provide clarity.

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition: The programme team must review the documentation relating to the placement components of the programme so that it is explicit how students progress through the placements modules at the different levels. This revised information should make clear the number of re-sit opportunities (at each level and overall) as well as the implications of failure and the procedure for re-attempting each placement module.

Reason: Currently it is not clear from the documentation how students progress through each of the placement modules and in particular what the implications are for failing one of the year two placements. The visitors need to be clear of the arrangements and the implications of failure, so they can ensure themselves that there is a balance between supporting students and making sure that those who complete the programme are fit to practise.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 24th May 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 12th June 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

RADIOGRAPHY SPECIFIC 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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-05-10	c		APV	Visitors' Report - University of Ulster - Multiprofessional Event March 2007	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Recommendation: The University of Ulster should review the staffing level on both the diagnostic and therapeutic programme teams to bring it in line with other healthcare disciplines and to ensure there is adequate support to both disciplines.

Reason: The visitors noted the staff-student ratio on the radiography programme was higher than in than in other programmes of study. However, the Visitors felt from discussions with students and staff that there was adequate support to deliver an effective programme. In discussion it was clear that consideration was being made to transfer a member of staff from one discipline to another and the Visitors wanted to ensure that this would not cause an imbalance in the adequacy of staff numbers between disciplines.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should map the programme to the College of Radiography curriculum framework.

Reason: In discussion, it was clear that the professional body representatives and the Visitors felt the programme did meet the curriculum guidance issued for the profession, however, the Visitors noted that through a comprehensive mapping of the programme to the College of Radiography curriculum framework it would be clearer how the programme relates to the guidance and therefore how the programme meets this standard of education and training.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revising the learning outcomes in the module 'Psychosociocultural Influences on Occupation and Health' (OTH311J1) which relate specifically to counselling skills and techniques.

Reason: The Visitors were concerned that the current wording in the learning outcomes was misleading to students as it suggested that those who successfully completed the module could be competent in selecting and applying counselling skills and techniques. These are the specific skills and techniques of the counselling profession and not achievable by students on an occupational therapy programme.

GENERIC COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- The Learning Resource Centre viewed in the tour of facilities. The Visitors were impressed by the facilities available for IT, and study spaces as well as the high standard of the accommodation.

- The transition from four-year programmes to three-year programmes which the Visitors viewed as being well managed, particularly in reference to stakeholder involvement.

PHYSIOTHERAPY SPECIFIC COMMENDATIONS

- The strong link exhibited between research informing teaching and practice.

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY SPECIFIC COMMENDATIONS

- The excellent collaboration between the University speech and language therapy team and the practice placement providers.
- The pastoral, clinical and academic support for students on the programme from the University speech and language therapy team.
- The speech and language therapy programme team's use of research to inform clinical teaching.

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:

Radiography

Linda Mutema
Anne-Marie Conway

Speech and Language Therapy

Gillian Stevenson
Lorna Povey
Carol Lloyd

Physiotherapy

Katie Bosworth
Anthony Power

Occupational Therapy

Margaret Shanahan
Carol Lloyd
Katie Bosworth

Date: 30/03/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical)
Mode of delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of visit	20 - 21 June 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Robert Keeble, Principal Biomedical Scientist, Ipswich Hospital NHS Trust Philip John Warren, Senior Lecturer, Biomedical Sciences, University of Portsmouth
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Neil Larsen (Chair), UWE, Tracey Horton (Secretary), UWE, Neil Willis (IBMS), Chas Chowdery (IBMS), Reg England (IBMS), Mrs Sue Yilmaz (Internal Panel Member), Assistant Academic Registrar, UWE Ms Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member), Assistant Academic Registrar

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"/>
New Profession	<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"/>
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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	15
--	----

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The University must rename the programme in such a way that prospective and current students will not be given the impression that completion of the programme automatically leads to registration with the HPC.

Reason: By using the word 'Registration' in the title of the programme students may be given the impression that registration will be automatic.

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear to students that successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration and that this process is not automatic.

Reason: The documentation refers to state registration upon completion of the course, however the term state registration is no longer appropriate and students could also be given the false impression that registration will be automatic.

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 advertising material provided to prospective students must make a clear distinction between the programme that leads to eligibility to apply for HPC registration and the programmes that do not.

Reason: There are several pathways that students can take and it needs to be very clear from the outset which programmes will lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration and which ones will not.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The University must put in place an appropriate mechanism to monitor student attendance.

Reason: The University does not currently have a formal mechanism for monitoring student attendance in place.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-07-17	b	APV	APV	Visitors' Report - UWE - BSc (Hons) BMS	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Condition: The University must put in place an appropriate pre-placement approval process and ongoing monitoring system to ensure that placement laboratories have an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff, provide a safe environment for practice, and have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies in place.

Reason: There is currently no formal process for approving practice placements. The process used by placement laboratories selecting students was a poor experience for students.

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

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

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

5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The University must put in place a more comprehensive handbook or set of guidelines for practice placement educators to ensure that they are aware of all the learning outcomes to be achieved, the records to be kept, the expectations of the placement provider, and the lines of responsibility.

Reason: There is currently too much emphasis on the portfolio as the only means of managing the placement, the University needs to ensure that steps are taken to ensure that there is a well balanced placement experience.

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

Condition: The University must put in place a formal mechanism for ensuring the placement educators receive appropriate placement educator training.

Reason: There is currently no formal practice placement educator training programme in place.

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

Condition: The University must put in place a more regular and structured mechanism to ensure greater engagement with placement providers, particularly with regard to ongoing programme and curriculum development.

Reason: Placement providers indicated that they had little input into the development and delivery of the on-campus components of the programme and suggested that they had little contact with the University aside from specific placement issues.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.7.1 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The University must revise the documentation to make it clear to students what will happen if they do not meet progression requirements.

Reason: This information is not currently stated clearly in the documentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: Where possible and appropriate staff should be encouraged to engage in further professional development of their skills in current laboratory practice.

Reason: While there is a good programme of staff development in place, a stronger emphasis on currency of clinical skills could be beneficial.

COMMENDATIONS

- The University's e-portfolio system is an exciting innovation that provides an effective tool for supporting management of the student placement experience.

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:

Philip John Warren

Robert Keeble

Date: 22 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

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

Scope of visit (please tick)

New programme	<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"/>	X
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

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

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

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

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

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

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

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Deadline for conditions to be met: 30 June 2007

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.5 accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

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

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

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

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

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

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

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

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.3 Undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

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

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

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

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

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

COMMENDATIONS

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

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the standards of education and training.

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

Visitors' signatures:

Neil Willis

Jackie Campbell

Date: 1 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

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

Scope of visit (please tick)

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

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

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

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

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

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

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

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

Commendations

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

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

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

Visitors' signatures:

Jim Pickard

Simon Walker

Date: 7th June 2007