

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical Scientist
Date of visit	21-22 May 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	12

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical Scientist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Wednesday 16 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Wednesday 16 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Professor William Gilmore (Biomedical Scientist) David Houlston (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	10
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2008
Chair	Dr Chakib Kara-Zaitri (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Sally Holmes (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Jenny Beaumont (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member) Fiona Sellers (Institute of Biomedical Science) Dr Neil Emmison (Institute of Biomedical Science) Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) Anne Costigan (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member) Andrew Coutts (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member) Dr Christine Horrocks (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member) Dr William McIlagga (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as these have not been produced as the programme is new.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation and advertising materials, including the website, for the programme to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the programme team it was clear that the documentation did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by the HPC. In particular the term “state registered” is no longer used and should not be incorporated into HPC approved programme documentation. It should also be made clear that completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply for HPC registration. In addition, the term “biomedical science practitioner” should be removed, as this term is not the protected title for the profession, and the references to “biomedical sciences” as this was a programme title formally used by the education provider which is no longer in use. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion amongst students on the programme, the visitors felt the programme documentation must be amended.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state who the programme leader is.

Reason: Following discussions with the programme team it was clear that there was a named programme leader who is appropriately qualified and experienced. However, in the documentation submitted by the programme team this information was not clear. The visitors felt that this information should be clearly stated in the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the module descriptors in the programme documentation to clarify the module leaders allocated for all modules.

Reason: In the documentation supplied by the programme team information about module leaders was not provided in all of the module descriptors. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine if these members of the programme team have the relevant expertise and knowledge in this area in order to confirm that this standard has been met.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly state the attendance requirements and reporting procedures in relation to placements.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the programme team the attendance requirements on placements were not stated. In discussion with the programme team it became apparent that the students on this programme would need to follow the conditions that the placement set. The visitors felt that as this information, and the reporting process behind attendance on placements, were not stated clearly in the documentation, that these should be included, and that the programme team set the attendance requirement on placements to ensure parity of student experience across the programme.

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, in conjunction with the placement providers, must review the mapping of the HPC standards of proficiency against the curriculum and learning outcomes of the programme modules.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the programme team the visitors found it difficult to see how the HPC standards of proficiency could clearly be met by students who complete the course. In discussion with the programme team it was evident that the mapping documentation did not reflect a lot of the work relating to the standards of proficiency that would be part of the programme. The documentation needs to be clearer to make more explicit within the mapping exercise where, across the whole programme, the standards of proficiency are being addressed so that the visitors can verify that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must review the module descriptors to clearly identify, within the learning outcomes, where students will meet the standards of proficiency for this profession.

Reason: From the standards of proficiency mapping document provided by the programme team it was not clear where several of the standards of proficiency would be met as they were missing from this mapping exercise. The visitors were also unable to determine from the learning outcomes whether all of the standards would be met. The visitors therefore felt the module descriptors must be updated to clearly identify where students will meet these 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 learning outcomes for the programme modules to clearly reflect how standard of proficiency 1b.3, “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”, is addressed and assessed on the programme.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team the visitors felt that the programme did not clearly link the learning outcomes to successful attainment of standard of proficiency 1b.3. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must clearly articulate where this standard of proficiency is met in the programme to ensure that those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners.

5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation in order to clarify the length of the practice placement in the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the programme team there was conflicting information regarding the length of the programme placement. To

prevent confusion the visitors felt that this should be corrected throughout the documentation.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved by the education provider before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Condition: The programme team, in conjunction with the placement providers, must review the mapping of the HPC standards of proficiency against the curriculum and learning outcomes of the programme modules.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the programme team the visitors found it difficult to see how the HPC standards of proficiency could clearly be met by students who complete the course. In discussion with the programme team it was evident that the mapping documentation did not reflect a lot of the work relating to the standards of proficiency that would be part of the programme. The documentation needs to be clearer to make more explicit within the mapping exercise where, across the whole programme, the standards of proficiency are being addressed so that the visitors can verify that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must review the programme documentation to clarify how practice placement educators are trained and updated with refresher training.

Reason: Following a request from the visitors the programme team provided a list of current placement staff utilised by the education provider which indicated that 18 out of 39 of the staff did not have educator training. The visitors therefore wished to receive information of the training that the remaining staff will have undertaken. The visitors also wished to receive evidence of how parity across the placement experience is achieved by the programme team demonstrating how they update the placement staff on programme amendments and developments.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the learning outcomes for the programme modules to clearly reflect how standard of proficiency 1b.3, “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”, is assessed on the programme.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team the visitors felt that the programme did not clearly link the learning outcomes to successful attainment of standard of proficiency 1b.3. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must clearly articulate where this standard of proficiency is met in the programme to ensure that those who complete the programme will have demonstrated fitness to practise through the assessment methods.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the programme team did not contain the policy regarding external examiner recruitment. The visitors felt that this

needs to be included within the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the programme team holds meetings with the placement providers and on-site tutors as scheduled.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it became apparent that scheduled meetings between the programme team and the placement staff previously have not taken place due to illness. The visitors wished to recommend that arrangements are made to ensure that these meetings take place as scheduled for the programme to receive maximum benefit.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the programme team are given wider access to subject specific training and development to ensure that their clinical knowledge is up to date.

Reason: In discussion with the senior team it was apparent that funding for subject specific training was allocated on a competitive basis. Due to the importance of staff keeping their clinical knowledge current and the benefit this has in the development of the programme, the visitors wished to support the widening of access and financial support to the programme team.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage that students rotate through a range of specialties where possible on placements.

Reason: In discussion with the students who had undertaken an optional placement it was clear that currently some students had the opportunity to experience a range of specialities on their placements but others did not. The visitors understand that this may be due to the facilities available at placements but wished to support that students receive a wide range of specialty experience on their placements in this programme to ensure that there is parity of placement experience on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to support the placement providers in their request to have an opportunity to provide formal feedback and hold discussions with the programme team at their scheduled meetings.

Reason: In discussion with the placement providers it was mentioned that there did not appear to be a formal forum or opportunity for placement providers to feedback to the programme team. The visitors wished to recommend that this is included in the meetings between the programme team and placement providers in order to assist the development and improvement of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to support the placement providers in their request to have an opportunity to provide formal feedback and hold discussions with the programme team at their scheduled meetings.

Reason: In discussion with the placement providers it was mentioned that there did not appear to be a formal forum or opportunity for placement providers to feedback to the programme team. The visitors wished to recommend that this is included in the meetings between the programme team and placement providers in order to assist the development and improvement of the programme.

Professor William Gilmore
David Houliston

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Part Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical Scientist
Date of visit	21-22 May 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	11

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical Scientist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Wednesday 16 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Wednesday 16 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Professor William Gilmore (Biomedical Scientist) David Houlston (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	10
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2008
Chair	Dr Chakib Kara-Zaitri (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Sally Holmes (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Jenny Beaumont (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member) Fiona Sellers (Institute of Biomedical Science) Dr Neil Emmison (Institute of Biomedical Science) Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) Anne Costigan (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member) Andrew Coutts (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member) Dr Christine Horrocks (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member) Dr William McIlagga (University of Bradford, Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as these have not been produced as the programme is new.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 13 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation and advertising materials, including the website, for the programme to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the programme team it was clear that the documentation did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by the HPC. In particular the term “state registered” is no longer used and should not be incorporated into HPC approved programme documentation. It should also be made clear that completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply for HPC registration. In addition, the term “biomedical science practitioner” should be removed, as this term is not the protected title for the profession, and the references to “biomedical sciences” as this was a programme title formally used by the education provider which is no longer in use. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion amongst students on the programme, the visitors felt the programme documentation must be amended.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 the programme documentation to provide clarification of how candidates are admitted on to the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the programme team it was unclear how candidates were admitted on to the programme. The visitors would like to see evidence that information regarding the application process is communicated to candidates, to ensure that there is consistency in the information provided to candidates across both the full and part time routes, to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state who the programme leader is.

Reason: Following discussions with the programme team it was clear that there was a named programme leader who is appropriately qualified and experienced. However, in the documentation submitted by the programme team this

information was not clear. The visitors felt that this information should be clearly stated in the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the module descriptors in the programme documentation to clarify the module leaders allocated for all modules.

Reason: In the documentation supplied by the programme team information about module leaders was not provided in all of the module descriptors. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine if these members of the programme team have the relevant expertise and knowledge in this area in order to confirm that this standard has been met.

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, in conjunction with the placement providers, must review the mapping of the HPC standards of proficiency against the curriculum and learning outcomes of the programme modules.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the programme team the visitors found it difficult to see how the HPC standards of proficiency could clearly be met by students who complete the course. In discussion with the programme team it was evident that the mapping documentation did not reflect a lot of the work relating to the standards of proficiency that would be part of the programme. The documentation needs to be clearer to make more explicit within the mapping exercise where, across the whole programme, the standards of proficiency are being addressed so that the visitors can verify that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must review the module descriptors to clearly identify, within the learning outcomes, where students will meet the standards of proficiency for this profession.

Reason: From the standards of proficiency mapping document provided by the programme team it was not clear where several of the standards of proficiency would be met as they were missing from this mapping exercise. The visitors were also unable to determine from the learning outcomes whether all of the standards would be met. The visitors therefore felt the module descriptors must be updated to clearly identify where students will meet these 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 learning outcomes for the programme modules to clearly reflect how standard of proficiency 1b.3, “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”, is addressed and assessed on the programme.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team the visitors felt that the programme did not clearly link the learning outcomes to successful attainment of standard of proficiency 1b.3. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must clearly articulate where this standard of proficiency is met in the programme to ensure that those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners.

5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for

placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Condition: The programme team, in conjunction with the placement providers, must review the mapping of the HPC standards of proficiency against the curriculum and learning outcomes of the programme modules.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the programme team the visitors found it difficult to see how the HPC standards of proficiency could clearly be met by students who complete the course. In discussion with the programme team it was evident that the mapping documentation did not reflect a lot of the work relating to the standards of proficiency that would be part of the programme. The documentation needs to be clearer to make more explicit within the mapping exercise where, across the whole programme, the standards of proficiency are being addressed so that the visitors can verify that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements are initially approved before the placement commences, and then regularly monitored by the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation regarding the proposed placement system submitted by the programme team the visitors felt that there was not enough evidence that the placements will need to be approved and monitored by the programme team. As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management on this programme they felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must review the programme documentation to clarify how practice placement educators are trained and updated with refresher training.

Reason: Following a request from the visitors the programme team provided a list of current placement staff utilised by the education provider which indicated that 18 out of 39 of the staff did not have educator training. The visitors therefore wished to receive information of the training that the remaining staff will have undertaken. The visitors also wished to receive evidence of how parity across the placement experience is achieved by the programme team demonstrating how they update the placement staff on programme amendments and developments.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the learning outcomes for the programme modules to clearly reflect how standard of proficiency 1b.3, “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”, is assessed on the programme.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team the visitors felt that the programme did not clearly link the learning outcomes to successful attainment of standard of proficiency 1b.3. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must clearly articulate where this standard of proficiency is met in the programme to ensure that those who complete the programme will have demonstrated fitness to practise through the assessment methods.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

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

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the programme team holds meetings with the placement providers and on-site tutors as scheduled.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it became apparent that scheduled meetings between the programme team and the placement staff previously have not taken place due to illness. The visitors wished to recommend that arrangements are made to ensure that these meetings take place as scheduled for the programme to receive maximum benefit.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the programme team are given wider access to subject specific training and development to ensure that their clinical knowledge is up to date.

Reason: In discussion with the senior team it was apparent that funding for subject specific training was allocated on a competitive basis. Due to the importance of staff keeping their clinical knowledge current and the benefit this has in the development of the programme, the visitors wished to support the widening of access and financial support to the programme team.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage that students rotate through a range of specialties where possible on placements.

Reason: In discussion with the students who had undertaken an optional placement it was clear that currently some students had the opportunity to experience a range of specialities on their placements but others did not. The visitors understand that this may be due to the facilities available at placements but wished to support that students receive a wide range of specialty experience on their placements in this programme to ensure that there is parity of placement experience on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to support the placement providers in their request to have an opportunity to provide formal feedback and hold discussions with the programme team at their scheduled meetings.

Reason: In discussion with the placement providers it was mentioned that there did not appear to be a formal forum or opportunity for placement providers to feedback to the programme team. The visitors wished to recommend that this is included in the meetings between the programme team and placement providers in order to assist the development and improvement of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to support the placement providers in their request to have an opportunity to provide formal feedback and hold discussions with the programme team at their scheduled meetings.

Reason: In discussion with the placement providers it was mentioned that there did not appear to be a formal forum or opportunity for placement providers to feedback to the programme team. The visitors wished to recommend that this is included in the meetings between the programme team and placement providers in order to assist the development and improvement of the programme.

Professor William Gilmore
David Houliston

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Date of visit	15-17 April 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	9
Commendations.....	11

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title "Dietitian" or "Dietician" must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Sylvia Butson (Dietitian) June Copeman (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	45
Initial approval	September 2000
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2008
Chair	Beverley Steventon (Coventry University)
Secretary	Parmjit Kaur (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Dr Louise Goff (British Dietetic Association) Mr J Devane (Coventry University, Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and the review of the website, it was clear that the documentation for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used for advertising must be amended.

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including criminal conviction checks.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to reflect that enhanced criminal records bureau checks are required for applicants to the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the programme team the references to criminal records bureau checks did not reflect that enhanced level checks were required. In order to clarify this issue for applicants to the programme the programme documentation must be amended.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to include the updated module descriptors for the common core modules.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the student handbook contained out of date module descriptors for the common core modules. To effectively support student learning, the visitors felt that the student handbook must be updated to include the latest module descriptors.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to include the updated versions of all of the module descriptors in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the student handbook contained several out of date module

descriptors. To effectively support student learning, the visitors felt that the student handbook must be updated to include the latest module descriptors for the programme.

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 clarify the relationship between holding the qualification gained on completion of the programme and entry to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear there were inconsistencies within the material regarding the relationship between completing the programme and entry to the HPC Register. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to remove references to 'state registration' and to clarify that those who complete the programme are eligible to apply to the HPC Register.

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 update the HPC standards of proficiency references to the most recent version of this document, and to remove out of date references to the Dietitians Board Statement of Conduct.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that there were out of date references within the material regarding the HPC standards of proficiency, and to the Dietitians Board Statement of Conduct. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to reference the current standards of proficiency in order to reflect current practice and guidelines for students on the programme.

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 module descriptors to clearly identify, within the learning outcomes, where students will meet the standards of proficiency 1a.6 - recognise that they are personally responsible for and must be able to justify their decisions.

Reason: From the standards of proficiency mapping document provided by the programme team it was not clear where standard of proficiency 1a.6 would be met as it was missing from this mapping exercise. The visitors were unable to determine from the learning outcomes whether these standards would be met. The visitors therefore felt the module descriptors must be updated to clearly identify where students will meet these 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 update the HPC standards of proficiency references to the most recent version of this document.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that there were out of date references within the material regarding the HPC standards of proficiency. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to reference the current standards of proficiency in order to reflect current practice and guidelines for the students, and so that it can be demonstrated that students will meet standards of proficiency 1a.1 – registrant dietitians must understand what is required of them by the HPC.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clarify which modules each external examiner is responsible for in order to ensure that their relevant experience relates to the specific areas of the programme they are addressing.

Reason: In the standards of education mapping provided by the programme team it stated that there are two external examiners, one of these being an experienced clinical educator in order to monitor that assessments are of the appropriate standard. To verify that this standard is being met the visitors wished to have clarification of the modules that each external examiner is responsible for, and that this clinical educator would be from the relevant part of the HPC Register.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must be appropriately registered with the HPC unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was clear that the experienced clinical educator mentioned in the standards of education mapping provided by the programme team is a registered dietitian, and therefore both of the current external examiners are from the appropriate part of the Register. However, the visitors felt that in order to ensure that this standard continued to be met in future the programme documentation must include the stipulation for at least one of the external examiners to be registered or alternate arrangements to be made.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage the utilisation of subject specialists in the teaching of relevant parts of the programme, for example using health science and social scientists, to enhance the students learning experience across the programme.

Reason: The visitors felt that additional input from various subject specialists, with the relevant academic qualifications and experience, would benefit the programme and enhance the continued development of the programme and its profession specific knowledge and skills.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage the programme team to re-visit the module descriptors and update them to better reflect the subject areas covered within them. In particular the visitors felt that areas listed under standards of proficiency 3a.1 (know and understand the key concept of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice) could be reinforced in the programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors felt that the detail provided within the module descriptors could be improved to enable students to have a clearer understanding of the subject areas covered and how the module descriptors reflect the learning outcomes.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage the continuing development of hands-on food preparation skills sessions, and that any developments are appropriate to student needs, particularly in relation to practical sessions carried out at Henley College. On meeting the students their feedback suggested that there had been a difference in their range of experiences across the course.

Reason: During discussions with students on the programme it was clear that there had been different experiences during the Henley College based food preparation skills part of the programme. Whilst the visitors felt that this had not affected the students meeting the standards of proficiency required they felt that, for there to be continuing parity of experience across the student body, the programme team could review this part of the programme experience.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage the continued development of “inter-professional learning online learning objects”, and for the programme team to ensure that they continue to be involved in the development of multiprofessional learning objects.

Reason: The visitors welcomed the work already put into the development of the inter-professional learning online resource and wanted to encourage the continuing development and input of the programme team to ensure that dietetic students continue to be catered for.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors wished to commend the use of the Centre for Interprofessional E-Learning on the programme.

Reason: The visitors felt that the use of the virtual e-learning resource by the students on the programme represented an innovative learning resource that had not been seen by the visitors on other dietetic programmes previously. It was felt that the Centre for Interprofessional E-Learning enhanced the student experience.

Sylvia Butson
June Copeman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time, Part time and Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapy
Date of visit	15-17 April 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Dietetics. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Dr Moira Helm (Occupational therapist) Dr Margaret Shanahan (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Miss Elisa Simeoni
Proposed student numbers	115 (Full time route) 30 (Part time, Part time in service route)
Initial approval	April 2000
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Mr Chris Bland (Coventry University)
Secretary	Miss Celine Szustakiewicz (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Dr Nigel Parker (Coventry University, Internal Panel Member) Ms Karen Morris (University of Cumbria, External Panel Member and College of Occupational Therapy visitor) Ms Remy Reyes (College of

	Occupational Therapy) Ms Sue Griffiths (College of Occupational Therapy visitor) Ms Claire Parkin (College of Occupational Therapy, Observer)
--	---

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 59 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The admissions procedures must give both applicants 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and a review of the education provider’s website, it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used for advertising must be amended. In particular, “state registration” and “licence to practise” are used as terms in the documentation and do not reflect the independence of the HPC or its performance of its regulatory function through protection of title.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to make explicit how evidence of spoken English is established in the selection process.

Reason: In the documentation provided, there was no reference made to the International English Learning Testing System (IELTS) level required for non English speaking students. The visitors felt that the education provider must include this information in the documentation in order to make this requirement clear to international applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to include the updated module descriptor for Inequalities in Social Care and Health (101SWW).

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the student handbook contained an out of date module descriptor for 101SWW. To effectively support student learning, the visitors felt that the student handbook must be updated to include the latest module descriptor for Inequalities in Social Care and Health.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to amend references to 1000 hours of practice based education being an HPC requirement.

Reason: In the submitted documentation there were references to HPC requiring a certain number of hours in practice education. The visitors felt this did not reflect the nature of HPC standards or those of the professional body. Accordingly, the visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to correctly attribute the requirement for number of practice hours to be completed to the professional body.

Recommendations

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

Condition: The faculty team should consider more face to face engagement in the third year Inter-professional learning (IPL) module.

Reason: The visitors recognised the work performed to deliver inter-professional learning opportunities to students. The visitors were confident that students on the occupational therapy programme received adequate focus on profession specific issues, but wished to encourage the education provider to enhance the third year IPL module. The visitors felt this module would provide greater benefit to students through increased inclusion of face-to-face engagement between tutor-led face-to-face engagement between students from different professional groups.

Dr Moira Helm
Dr Margaret Shanahan

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy
Date of visit	15-17 April 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 7 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Dietetics. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mr Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Mr Dugald MacInnes (Lay visitor)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Miss Elisa Simeoni
Proposed student numbers	116
Initial approval	January 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Prof Sarah Whatley (Coventry University)
Secretary	Mrs Sally Sykes (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Dr Valerie Cox (Coventry University, Internal Panel Member) Ms Elizabeth Hancock (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are often suggested when it is felt that the standards of education and training have been met at the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and a review of the education provider’s website, it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used for advertising must be amended. In particular, “state registration” and “licence to practise” are used as terms in the documentation and do not reflect the independence of the HPC or its performance of its regulatory function through protection of title.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly refer to the International English Learning Testing System (IELTS) level for international students who want to apply to the programme.

Reason: In the programme specification, there is a reference to IRLTS instead of IELTS. The visitors felt that the documentation must be amended to prevent confusion amongst applicants to the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to include the updated module descriptors for the common core modules.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the student handbook contained out of date module descriptors for the common core modules. To effectively support student learning, the visitors felt that the student handbook must be updated to include the latest module descriptors.

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 include updated versions of all module descriptors in the programme.

Reason: In the original documentation received by the visitors the module descriptors were, in some cases, out of date. The visitors received the most recent versions of the modules electronically prior to the visit. To effectively support student learning the visitors felt that the student handbook must be updated to include the latest module descriptors for the programme.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the team the inclusion of professional placement module 332PH Case-Load Management in semester 1 of the final year that provides an excellent link between theory and practice, allows students to demonstrate their ability to function as autonomous practitioners and enhances their employment prospect.

Reason: The visitors felt that the module 332PH is innovative best practice and therefore would like to commend the team for the inclusion of this module in the programme. The visitors recognised the added value that this module gave to those who complete the programme in terms of their employability.

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the system for approving and monitoring placements particularly the practice of visiting each placement three times over the period of this placement.

Reason: The visitors noted that the University made a practice of visiting each placement three times during the course of its duration. The visitors felt that this was an innovative strategy in that they did not know of any other similar programme that allows for three visits, and felt that it represented best practice, both as a model to follow and in the practical results it achieves - the thorough co-ordination between university, placement provider and student to ensure that an optimum benefit is derived from the process.

Mr Anthony Power
Mr Dugald MacInnes

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating Department Practitioner
Date of visit	15-17 April 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	10
Commendations.....	12

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Operating Department Practitioner' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 7 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 25 September 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Dietetics. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Stephen Oates (Operating Department Practitioner) David Bevan (Operating Department Practitioner)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	25
Initial approval	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2008
Chair	Ray Hulse (Coventry University)
Secretary	Michelle Brooker (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Dr Andrew Turner (Coventry University, Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and the review of the website, it was clear that the documentation for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used for advertising must be amended.

2.2.4 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the admissions policy to make explicit the essential and desirable selection criteria for success in the selection of candidates for entry on to the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided the visitors felt that the criteria to determine inclusion and exclusion on to the programme were unclear within the admissions process. In particular, it was felt that areas that required strengthening in this process included explicitly stating the minimum academic requirement, that the experience requested had to be suitable experience, and the minimum age required for entry on to the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team should provide the curriculum vitae for Leslie Dowding and submit CVs for visiting lecturers teaching on the programme.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it was clear that there had been an increased use of visiting lecturers that was higher than the perceived norm due to the absence of the operating department practice member of staff from the programme team. In order to verify that this standard is being met the visitors wished to review the CVs for Leslie Dowding and the visiting lecturers as this information was not included in the documentation provided for the visit.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to include the updated module descriptors for the common core modules.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the student handbook contained out of date module descriptors for the common core modules. To effectively support student learning, the visitors felt that the student handbook must be updated to include the latest module descriptors.

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 update all references to HPC standards of proficiency to the current version of this document.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the programme team it was clear that there were references within the material that did not refer users to the current version of the HPC standards of proficiency. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must be updated to reference the current standards of proficiency in order to reflect current practice and guidelines for the students on the programme.

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 any references included that refer to paramedic programmes rather than the operating department practice programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear that there were references within the material to the paramedic programmes which should have been referencing the operating department practice programme. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to prevent confusion amongst the students on the programme.

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 any references to the verifier role in relation to placements.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the programme team there were references within the material to a number of roles in relation to the practice placements. One of the roles referred to was “verifier” and in discussion with the programme team it became apparent that this role did not exist. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must be updated to prevent confusion.

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 mapping of the HPC standards of proficiency against the curriculum and learning outcomes of the programme modules.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the programme team the visitors found it difficult to see how the HPC standards of proficiency were clearly being met by students. They were assured that the HPC standards of proficiency are built into the learning outcomes however this needs to be made more explicit within the mapping documentation so that the visitors can verify that this standard is being met.

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 learning outcomes and module descriptors for the modules: Principles of Perioperative Care (115OD) and Practice 3 (212OD).

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the programme team the visitors could not ascertain all of the information required regarding some of the modules. The visitors require confirmation of patient groups and clinical urgency references in the module Principles of Perioperative Care (115OD). They also require confirmation of mandatory specialist placements within the module Practice 3 (212OD).

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the faculty and programme documentation to accurately reflect the roles of the HPC and the professional body.

Reason: In the submitted documentation there are references that show some confusion surrounding the roles of the statutory regulator and professional body. The Operating Department Practice programme is not amongst the programmes listed as being HPC regulated in the programme documentation. In addition, the AOAP is listed as the regulating body rather than the HPC. Given the precise function of the HPC in holding and maintaining the Register of individuals able to practice under the protected professional titles, the visitors felt the documentation must be amended to clearly articulate the correct function and current titles of both organisations.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the practice placement assessment methods which measure student performance and progression within the practice area.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team the visitors felt that the practice placement assessments required revisiting

in order to remove potential inconsistencies within the assessment process, and to clearly articulate how student performance and progression are monitored. The visitors felt that it was currently unclear how assessment standards were monitored within the practice area.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the practice placement assessment methods which measure student performance and progression within the practice area.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team the visitors felt that the practice placement assessments required revisiting in order to remove potential inconsistencies within the assessment process, and to clearly articulate how student performance and progression are monitored. The visitors felt that it was currently unclear how assessment standards were monitored within the practice area.

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 practice placement assessment methods which measure student performance and progression within the practice area.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team the visitors felt that the practice placement assessments required revisiting in order to remove potential inconsistencies within the assessment process, and to clearly articulate how student performance and progression are monitored. The visitors felt that it was currently unclear how assessment standards were monitored within the practice area.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the practice placement assessment methods which measure student performance and progression within the practice area.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team the visitors felt that the practice placement assessments required revisiting in order to remove potential inconsistencies within the assessment process, and to clearly articulate how student performance and progression are monitored. The visitors felt that it was currently unclear how assessment standards were monitored within the practice area.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage the programme team to consider increasing the number of mentor courses available to the practice placement staff.

Reason: The visitors felt that increasing the number of mentor courses offered to placement staff would benefit the programme by increasing the status of the current supervisors and would facilitate smoother completion of the practice grid and other assessment documentation.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the programme team clarify the red, amber, green alert conditions within the learning environment practice tool (LEPT) and to document and communicate the lines of responsibility for those conditions.

Reason: The visitors felt after discussions with the practice placements educators that there was a degree of uncertainty as to the actions and responsibilities of those involved in the practice areas around the red, amber, green alert conditions. They wished to encourage that this information is strengthened in communication between the programme team and practice placements.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the communication and lines of responsibility.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the programme team clarify the red, amber, green alert conditions within the learning environment practice tool (LEPT) and to document and communicate the lines of responsibility for those conditions.

Reason: The visitors felt after discussions with the practice placements educators that there was a degree of uncertainty as to the actions and responsibilities of those involved in the practice areas around the red, amber, green alert conditions. They wished to encourage that this information is strengthened in communication between the programme team and practice placements.

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage the programme team to consider increasing the number of mentor courses available to the practice placement staff.

Reason: The visitors felt that increasing the number of mentor courses offered to placement staff would benefit the programme by increasing the status of the current supervisors and would facilitate smoother completion of the practice grid and other assessment documentation.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors wished to commend the programme team for organising an Association for Perioptic Practice (AFPP) representative to be present during the student induction process.

Reason: The visitors felt that by organising for an Association representative to meet the students during their induction week the induction process was enhanced and benefited the student experience. The visitors felt that this enhanced induction was innovative and best practice.

David Bevan
Stephen Oates

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme name	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic Science
Date of visit	15-17 April 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	9
Commendations.....	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 2 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Dietetics, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mrs Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Mr Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mrs Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	35
Initial approval	March 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2008
Chair	Professor David Morris (Coventry University)
Secretary	Ms Julie Keane (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Ms Collette Souper (Coventry University, Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inter-Professional Learning Pathway documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to clarify that a driving licence is a requirement for employment.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, it was clear that applicants must hold a full UK driving licence. The visitors were concerned that the advertising materials did not explain that this is a requirement for employment and not for registration with the HPC. As such the visitors felt that the advertising materials must be updated.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to follow the guidance provided in the HPC "Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers".

Reason: From the documentation submitted and the review of the website, it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used for advertising must be amended.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and entry to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear there were inconsistencies within the material regarding the relationship between holding the qualification and entry to the HPC Register. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to remove references to 'licence to practice' and to clarify that those who complete the programme are eligible to apply to the HPC Register.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to include the updated module descriptors for the common core modules.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the student handbook contained out of date module descriptors for the common core modules. To effectively support student learning, the visitors felt that the student handbook must be updated to include the latest module descriptors.

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the protocols used to gain student consent.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team and students it was clear that volunteers are requested to act as patients or clients and that verbal consent is gained from these volunteers. The visitors were satisfied that appropriate protocols are in place and that students were happy with these arrangements. However, the visitors were concerned that the documentation submitted did not clearly articulate the protocols in place and as such, the visitors felt the material 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to include the revised sickness/absence policy.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team, it was clear that the sickness/absence policy included in the student handbook was applicable to the nursing programmes within the faculty. During the visit a revised sickness/absence policy was provided by the programme team and the visitors would like to ensure that this revised policy is reflected within the student handbook.

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the attendance policy for the academic and practice elements of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team it was clear that students must attend 80% of academic lessons and that there are appropriate

monitoring mechanisms in place. However this requirement is not clearly articulated in the programme documentation and the visitors felt that this must be updated to provide students with full and clear information.

During the course of the visit, the visitors were provided with a revised sickness/absence policy. This policy states 'If a student fails to attend a particular placement or *a substantial amount of practice*, he or she may be interrupted from the course'. The visitors were concerned there was no definition of 'substantial' within the policy and felt this must be clarified to provide students with definite information about the attendance policy within practice.

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

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

Reason: During discussions with the programme team, placement providers and students, it was clear that students are taught about the behaviour expected of them on their placement and that their placements help prepare them for entry to the profession. However, references in the documentation direct students to HPC's code of conduct. The visitors felt that in order to direct students to the standards HPC expects of them once they have joined the profession, the programme documentation must be updated to state HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme specification to clearly articulate which awards provide eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the programme specification stated the BSc Paramedic Science award provided eligibility to apply to the HPC Register. The BSc Paramedic Science programme is not an approved programme and as such, the visitors felt the programme specification must be updated.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider implementing a formal partnership agreement with the placement providers.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied that the relationship with the placement providers is strong and working well. However, they felt that a formal partnership agreement, such as a Memorandum of Understanding, could help to consolidate each party's roles and responsibilities.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including different areas of clinical experience in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, students and placement providers, it was clear that all placement experience is gained within the ambulance environment, in a supernumerary capacity. The visitors are satisfied that the number, duration and range of placements are appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes, however, they felt the education provider should consider implementing different areas of clinical experience to further enhance the students learning.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the education provider on the arrangement that allows students to gain all their practical experience within an ambulance environment, while being treated as supernumerary.

Reason: The visitors felt that this arrangement, while it is best practice, is highly unusual within paramedic programmes. This is owed to resource commitments within the Ambulance Trusts which normally inhibit this level of exposure to experience gained within an ambulance environment.

Mrs Susan Boardman
Mr Glyn Harding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic Science
Date of visit	15-17 April 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	9
Commendations.....	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 2 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Dietetics, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mrs Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Mr Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mrs Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	10
Initial approval	March 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2008
Chair	Professor David Morris (Coventry University)
Secretary	Ms Julie Keane (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Ms Collette Souper (Coventry University, Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and the review of the website, it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used for advertising must be amended.

2.2.4 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to clearly articulate all possible entry requirements.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and the review of the website, the visitors learnt that applicants must hold 5 GCSE’s. However, from the discussion with the programme team it became clear that alternative arrangements are in place for applicants who do not hold 5 GCSE’s. The visitors felt that to provide applicants with full and clear information, the advertising materials must be updated to reflect all possible entry requirements.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and entry to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was clear there were inconsistencies within the material regarding the relationship between holding the qualification and entry to the HPC Register. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to remove references to ‘licence to practice’ and to clarify that those who complete the programme are eligible to apply to the HPC Register.

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the protocols used to gain student consent.

Reason: From the discussions with the programme team and students it was clear that volunteers are requested to act as patients or clients and that verbal consent is gained from these volunteers. The visitors were satisfied that appropriate protocols are in place and that students are happy with these arrangements. However the visitors were concerned that the documentation submitted did not clearly articulate the protocols in place and as such, the visitors felt the material 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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the student handbook to include the revised sickness/absence policy.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion with the programme team, it was clear that the sickness/absence policy included in the student handbook was applicable to the nursing programmes within the faculty. During the visit a revised sickness/absence policy was provided by the programme team and the visitors would like to ensure that this revised policy is reflected within the student handbook.

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the attendance policy for the academic and practice elements of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team it was clear that students must attend 80% of academic lessons and that there are appropriate monitoring mechanisms in place. However this requirement is not clearly articulated in the programme documentation and the visitors felt that this must be updated to provide students with full and clear information.

During the course of the visit, the visitors were provided with a revised sickness/absence policy. This policy states 'If a student fails to attend a particular placement or *a substantial amount of practice*, he or she may be interrupted from the course'. The visitors were concerned there was no definition of 'substantial' within the policy and felt that this must be clarified to provide students with definite information about the attendance policy within practice.

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the module descriptors to clearly identify, within the learning outcomes, where students will meet the standards of proficiency under 2c.2.

Reason: From the documentation it was clear that the module 'Accountability and professional issues for Paramedics' (225PM) was expected to deliver to students the standards of proficiency under 2c.2. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the learning outcomes whether these standards would be met. The visitors therefore felt the module descriptors must be updated to clearly identify where students will meet these standards.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how the skills and knowledge of paramedic students will be adequately addressed during inter-professional learning.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team it was clear that inter-professional learning is undertaken within the programme and the visitors were directed to the module entitled 'Paramedic skills development across the age spectrum' (227PM). However, the visitors felt that inter-professional learning was not clearly defined within this module descriptor and they were unable to determine whether the skills and knowledge of paramedic students would be adequately addressed. The visitors would like to review redrafted information to make a full assessment of this standard.

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

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

Reason: During discussions with the programme team, placement providers and students, it was clear that students are taught about the behaviour expected of them on their placement and that their placements help prepare them for entry to the profession. However, references in the documentation direct students to HPC's code of conduct. The visitors felt that in order to direct students to the standards HPC expects of them, the programme documentation must be updated to state HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider implementing a formal partnership agreement with the placement providers.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied the relationship with the placement providers is strong and working well. However, they felt that a formal partnership agreement, such as a Memorandum of Understanding, could help to consolidate each party's roles and responsibilities.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including different areas of clinical experience in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, students and placement providers, it was clear that all placement experience is gained within the ambulance environment, in a supernumerary capacity. The visitors are satisfied that the number, duration and range of placements are appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes, however, they felt the education provider should consider implementing different areas of clinical experience to further enhance the students learning.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the education provider on the arrangement that allows students to gain all their practical experience within an ambulance environment, while being treated as supernumerary.

Reason: The visitors felt this arrangement, while it is best practice, is highly unusual within paramedic programmes. This is owed to resource commitments within the Ambulance Trusts which normally inhibit this level of exposure to experience gained within an ambulance environment.

Mrs Susan Boardman
Mr Glyn Harding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	East of England Ambulance NHS Trust Award validated by University of East Anglia
Programme name	Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Medical Care (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award)
Mode of delivery	Part Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic Science
Date of visit	26-27 March 2008

Contents

Executive summary.....	2
Introduction	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	21

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 20 June 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 3 July 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Trisha Fillis (Radiographer) Jim Petter (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
HPC observer	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	80 per biannual intake
Proposed start date of programme approval	November 2008
Chair	Ms Erica Towner (University of East Anglia)
Secretary	Ms Pat Vince (East of England Ambulance NHS Trust)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Local Trust Procedural documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review CVs for all relevant staff prior to the visit as the education provider only submitted one CV for scrutiny.

The HPC did not review a programme specification for the programme as it was intended that the panel would be visiting an IHCD paramedic award which would not normally have a programme specification.

In the case of the practice placement handbook and student handbook, the information provided to students and practice placement educators was provided in the submission, but not as consolidated documents.

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as it was not apparent until the visit that the panel was being asked to scrutinise a higher education award. Rather it was believed the panel was reviewing an IHCD paramedic award for which external examiners' reports would not be produced as the qualification does not have the same quality assurance procedures as higher education programmes.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 32 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 31 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to amend references to state registration of paramedics.

Reason: In the submitted documentation there were references to state registration of paramedics. The visitors felt, given the independent nature of the Health Professions Council, that this terminology did not reflect the true nature of registration as a paramedic. In order to prevent confusion between the previous and current methods of regulation, the visitors felt the documentation required updating.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate the English Language entry requirements for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing the entry requirements for the programme seeking approval, particularly the English language entry criteria.

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including criminal conviction checks.

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate the entry requirements relating to criminal convictions for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance

NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing the entry requirements for the programme seeking approval, particularly the entry criteria relating to criminal convictions. The visitors require assurance that criminal conviction status is checked at an enhanced level and monitored appropriately throughout the course of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate the entry requirements relating to health requirements for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing the entry requirements for the programme seeking approval, particularly the entry criteria relating to health requirements.

2.2.4 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate the entry requirements relating to academic and/or professional entry standards for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by

University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing the entry requirements for the programme seeking approval, particularly the entry criteria relating to academic and/or professional entry standards.

2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate the processes for accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing the entry requirements for the programme seeking approval, particularly the processes used for the application of accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

2.3 The admission procedures must 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 education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate the equality and diversity policies relating to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the

programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation relating the equality and diversity policies in place for applicants to and students on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate the management structure for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing how the programme is managed by both East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and University of East Anglia. In particular, the visitors require information to understand how University of East Anglia quality assurance mechanisms will extend out to the delivery of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate how the number of staff attached to the programme is appropriate for the delivery of the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing the individuals and their roles in contributing to the programme seeking approval. The visitors note that this is normally evidenced by submission of CVs for all individuals contributing to a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly articulate how the staff attached to the programme are appropriately experienced and qualified for the delivery of the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing the individuals and their roles in contributing to the programme seeking approval. The visitors note that this is normally evidenced by submission of CVs for all individuals contributing to a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly describe the resources available to students on the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing resources available at the three delivery sites for the programme and also information relating the resources available (if any) from University of East Anglia to support student learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly describe the resources available to support the welfare and well being of students on the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing resources available at the three delivery sites for the programme and also information relating the resources available (if any) from University of East Anglia to support welfare and well being of students. The visitors recognised from the meeting with students that there was uncertainty about the route of progression through the programme and considered that the education provider may consider consolidating information provided to students within one or two documents to address this challenge.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly describe the resources to support learning and teaching on the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing resources available at the three delivery sites for the programme and also information relating the resources available (if any) from University of East Anglia to support student learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly describe the resources to support learning on the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing resources available at the three delivery sites for the programme and also information relating the resources available (if any) from University of East Anglia to support student learning. Additionally, from meeting with the programme team it was apparent that an electronic learning platform was in use or intended to be used. The visitors felt it was necessary to understand how the platform was contributing the delivery of the programme.

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 education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly describe how the learning outcomes for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) are linked the standards of proficiency for Paramedics.

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing how the learning outcomes of the programme seeking approval are intended to ensure that an individual who completes the programme will have demonstrated an ability to meet the standards of proficiency. The visitors noted that the standards

of proficiency mapping document contained insufficient detail to allow them to understand how the programme team intended to deliver the standards of proficiency. Additionally, the programme seeking approval is comprised of eight modules which were not all included in the programme documentation. In order to assess how this standard is met, the visitors require detailed and complete documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit the module descriptors for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing how the programme assists autonomous and reflective thinking and evidenced based practice. The visitors were unable to assess how the programme team planned to do this as a result of not being able to scrutinise a full set of module descriptors. In order to make an assessment of this standard, the visitors require all the module descriptors to review the teaching and learning methods and the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for placement supervision not only in the hospital environment, but also whilst students are in other areas of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). In particular, information is required to describe how there are a sufficient number of practice placement educators to support the numbers of students.

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only

partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to evidence that there are sufficient appropriately qualified practice placement educators to ensure students are always appropriately supervised whilst training to become paramedics.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for placement supervision not only in the hospital environment, but also whilst students are in other areas of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to evidence that supervision arrangements in placement are designed to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for practice placements not only in the hospital environment, but also whilst students are in other areas of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care

Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to evidence that students and practice placement educators understand the learning outcomes that are to be achieved in the placement environment (within and external to the hospital environment).

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for practice placements not only in the hospital environment, but also whilst students are in other areas of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to evidence that students and practice placement educators understand the timings, duration of placements and records to be maintained both within and external to the hospital environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for practice placements not only in the hospital environment, but also whilst students are in other areas of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care

Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to evidence that students and practice placement educators understand the expectations for professional conduct both within and external to the hospital environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for practice placements not only in the hospital environment, but also whilst students are in other areas of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to evidence that students and practice placement educators understand the assessment procedures and the action to be taken in the event of failure both within and external to the hospital environment.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for practice placements not only in the hospital environment, but also whilst students are in other areas of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care

Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to evidence that students and practice placement educators understand the lines of communication and responsibility both within and external to the hospital environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for practice placement educator training for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to describe the arrangements for practice placement educator training. In particular, the visitors require information to assist them in understanding how consistency in approach to supervision and training is ensured across the multiple sites of delivery and the large geographical area in which students are placed.

5.12 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of patients or clients and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly indicate the arrangements for placement supervision not only in the hospital environment, but also whilst students are in other areas of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the

visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation to evidence that learning, teaching and supervision arrangements in placement are appropriate to meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit the programme specification, module descriptors and assessment regulations for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require documentation detailing how the assessment procedures can assure students can demonstrate fitness to practise. The visitors were unable to assess how the programme team planned to do this as a result of not being able to scrutinise a full set of module descriptors or understand how the programme's assessment regulations interacted with the individual assessments. In order to make an assessment of this standard, the visitors require the programme specification, all the module descriptors and assessment regulations.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit the module descriptors for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the

programme. In this case, the visitors require the module descriptors for the programme to review the variety of assessment methods being used in the programme to ensure that they measure the learning outcomes required for safe and effective practice.

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 education provider must submit the grade assessment criteria for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require the grade assessment criteria used to objectively measure performance and progression throughout the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit all operating procedures relevant to professional aspects of practice for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors require the operating procedures used by the Ambulance NHS Trust in relation to professional aspects of practice. As a result of the students on the programme being employees of the Trust, they are subject to these policies.

6.7.4 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Condition: The education provider must submit details of the appeal procedure for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the visitors were unable to determine the institutional / organisational processes for appeals for students on the programme seeking approval.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must submit documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must be from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed for the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award).

Reason: Prior to the visit, it was apparent that the visit was taking place in order to assess the IHCD paramedic award delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust. However, in the discussions with the senior team it became apparent that the award for which approval was being sought was the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award) delivered by East of England Ambulance NHS Trust and validated by University of East Anglia. The submitted programme documentation only partially referred to the Certificate of Higher Education in Emergency Care Practice (incorporating the IHCD paramedic award). As a result of this, the visitors require documentation to allow them to assess elements of the programme. In this case, the submitted programme documentation did not make clear that the external examiner will always be subject to above stipulation. The visitors recognised that the current external examiner was HPC registered but the visitors felt the documentation must be explicit in this instance to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the British Paramedic Association (BPA) curriculum guidance on the supernumerary status of students as the proposed transition is made to a Diploma of Higher Education award which does not incorporate the IHCD paramedic training award.

Reason: The visitors recognise in the context of an IHCD paramedic award, supernumerary status of students is difficult to achieve as the students are currently employed and contracted to work as employees of the Trust and are part of work-force planning (though not as paramedics). However, the education provider indicated that the intention was to develop a programme of study entirely delivered using a higher education framework. The visitors felt that at this time it was important that the education provider took the opportunity to develop the programme in reference to the BPA curriculum guidance.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider extending the period in which students are mentored before qualification after the completion of the hospital placement.

Reason: Though the visitors felt that those individuals who complete the programme will have demonstrated their ability to meet HPC standards, the feedback received from the students was that some additional time under mentorship after the hospital placement would be beneficial to students in their transition from student to paramedic.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the arrangements for practice placement co-ordination after the appointment of a new member of staff who will take responsibility for this area of the programme.

Reason: The visitors felt that if the education provider met the conditions above and performed placement co-ordination as it was described that the programme would meet this standard. However, there were indications in the programme team meeting that there would be a new appointment made for a practice placement co-ordination role. Given the potential for positive changes, the visitors wanted to support the changes with this recommendation to revisit the placement co-ordination processes once the new appointment has been made.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the assessment processes to ensure they reflect the external reference framework provided by the British Paramedic Association (BPA).

Reason: The visitors recognised that the programme was able to meet this standard but felt that through revisiting the curriculum guidance, the programme and students would benefit.

Vince Clarke
Trisha Fillis
Jim Petter

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy
Date of visit	28 and 29 May 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title Physiotherapist must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 30 June 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Monday 21 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the PGDip Physiotherapy programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ms Liz Holey (Physiotherapist) Mrs Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Proposed student numbers	35
Initial approval	4 April 2001
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2008
Chair	Ms Julie Wilkinson
Secretary	Mrs Kathy Sherlock
Members of the joint panel	Mr Jim Pickard (Huddersfield University) Ms Helena Johnson (External Panel Member) Mrs Sue Hammersley (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University prospectus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide: 5.3.1 a safe environment

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence of a risk assessment process in place before a new placement is used.

Reason: During various discussions it became apparent that student placements are not risk assessed by the education provider before a new placement is used. The visitors would like to be assured that a system is in place to risk assess any new placements should the need arise.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence of a detailed formal process of ongoing monitoring of all placements.

Reason: There is no current formal mechanism in place for the ongoing monitoring of placements. The programme team explained that the strategic health authorities assess each placement but the information is not then sent to and stored by the university, the university assumes that the assessment is effective. There is a detailed student evaluation of placements by students but no evidence of analysis and action with this information. The visitors would like to be confident that there is a mechanism in place to effectively monitor all placements in use by the university.

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 education provider must submit evidence of mechanisms in place to make sure equal opportunities and antidiscriminatory policies are in place within each placement used by the university.

Reason: There is no current formal mechanism in place for the ongoing monitoring of placements. The strategic health authorities assess each placement but the information is not then sent and stored by the university, therefore the university assumption that the assessment is effective. The education provider needs to be monitoring the existence of an antidiscriminatory policy and equal opportunity policy as part of the ongoing monitoring of placements.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting all documentation to standardise statements in relation to regulatory and professional body requirements.

Reason: All module descriptors stated that compulsory completion of the module is needed for membership with the professional body. However, students may get the impression that the professional body requires all learning outcomes to be completed and the Health Professions Council does not. This is not the case since the programme is approved due to the learning outcomes providing the students with the skills they need to meet the standards of proficiency.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider updating the use of terminology within the documentation.

Reason: Although the correct information has been given with regard to Health Profession Council registration, terms throughout the rest of the documentation, such as state registration and licence to practice, are out of date.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The use of students from other relevant disciplines to buddy the physiotherapy students on placement.

Reason: The visitors felt this learning technique was innovative and a good way in which students can gain inter professional learning skills. The students also were very complimentary of this style of learning.

Ms Liz Holey
Mrs Katie Bosworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme name	Pg Dip Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy
Date of visit	28 and 29 May 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title Physiotherapist must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 30 June 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Monday 21 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ms Liz Holey (Physiotherapist) Mrs Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Proposed student numbers	35
Initial approval	4 April 2001
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2008
Chair	Ms Julie Wilkinson
Secretary	Mrs Kathy Sherlock
Members of the joint panel	Mr Jim Pickard (Huddersfield University) Ms Helena Johnson (External Panel Member) Mrs Sue Hammersley (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University prospectus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide: 5.3.1 a safe environment

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence of a risk assessment process in place before a new placement is used.

Reason: During various discussions it became apparent that student placements are not risk assessed by the education provider before a new placement is used. The visitors would like to be assured that a system is in place to risk assess any new placements should the need arise.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence of a detailed formal process of ongoing monitoring of all placements.

Reason: There is no current formal mechanism in place for the ongoing monitoring of placements. The programme team explained that the strategic health authorities assess each placement but the information is not then sent to and stored by the university, the university assumes that the assessment is effective. There is a detailed student evaluation of placements by students but no evidence of analysis and action with this information. The visitors would like to be confident that there is a mechanism in place to effectively monitor all placements in use by the university.

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 education provider must submit evidence of mechanisms in place to make sure equal opportunities and antidiscriminatory policies are in place within each placement used by the university.

Reason: There is no current formal mechanism in place for the ongoing monitoring of placements. The strategic health authorities assess each placement but the information is not then sent and stored by the university, therefore the university assumption that the assessment is effective. The education provider needs to be monitoring the existence of an antidiscriminatory policy and equal opportunity policy as part of the ongoing monitoring of placements.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting all documentation to standardise statements in relation to regulatory and professional body requirements.

Reason: All module descriptors stated that compulsory completion of the module is needed for membership with the professional body. However, students may get the impression that the professional body requires all learning outcomes to be completed and the Health Professions Council does not. This is not the case since the programme is approved due to the learning outcomes providing the students with the skills they need to meet the standards of proficiency.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider updating the use of terminology within the documentation.

Reason: Although the correct information has been given with regard to Health Profession Council registration, terms throughout the rest of the documentation, such as state registration and licence to practice, are out of date.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The use of students from other relevant disciplines to buddy the physiotherapy students on placement.

Reason: The visitors felt this learning technique was innovative and a good way in which students can gain inter professional learning skills. The students also were very complimentary of this style of learning.

Ms Liz Holey
Mrs Katie Bosworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiography
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiography
Date of visit	9 - 11 April 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Radiographer' or 'Therapeutic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until Thursday 10 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Tuesday 22 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major changes affected the following standards - programme admissions standards, programme management and resources standards, curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Orthoptics and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Professor Angela Duxbury (Radiography) Mr Russell Hart (Radiography) Dr Martin Benwell (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	45
Initial approval	4 January 1998
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Ms Julie Walton (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Ms Janis Paine (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Professor Cynthia Pine (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member) Professor Gordon Tatlock (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Assessment handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Context document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and a condition should be set on the remaining SET. Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the student consent form and the policy associated with it to clarify the information provided to students regarding participation and consent as a client or patient in all practice settings.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the education provider for the visit the policy that accompanied the consent form stated “normally students will be expected to consent...” Therefore although consent was always obtained, students could opt out if there was an issue with a particular situation for that student. Although the education provider explained that students were counselled as to the consequences of opting out the visitors were concerned that if a student took this option then the student may not be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor and develop clinical placement capacity.

Reason: The visitors recognised that there were limited placements for the radiotherapy programme at present. However as the student numbers increase on the programme, the visitors felt that the education provider would need to keep the current placements and the need for the new placements under review in order to maintain the range on placements available for students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how student feedback on written coursework might be enhanced to maximise the benefits to the student.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with students that feedback on written coursework was often generic in nature and therefore was not always sufficient for the students needs. The visitors felt that there was an opportunity for the education provider to review the nature of the feedback given to enhance the student's knowledge and understanding of the subject material studied.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending the assessment marking descriptors to provide more detail on the learning opportunities and assessment outcomes.

Reason: From review of the submitted documentation, the visitors felt that the assessment marking descriptors are currently restrictive with regard to the learning and assessment opportunities available to students. To better reflect the wide range of learning and assessment opportunities, the visitors felt the programme team should revisit the assessment marking descriptors.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors wished to congratulate the School of Health Sciences on introducing monthly “drop-in” sessions for students within the School in support of the work of the Faculty Clinical Psychology Advisory Service to provide student counselling and support.

Reason: The visitors felt that this “drop-in” sessions was an enhancement to the School’s facilities for ensuring the welfare and well-being of the students during their time at University and a model for best practice.

Commendation: The visitors wished to congratulate the programme team on their partnership working with the clinical placements providers.

Reason: During the meeting with the placement providers the visitors were impressed by the obvious close collaboration between the programme team and the placement providers and the extraordinary support that both groups provided for the students in what is a relatively small area of specialist placements with the demands from a large group of learners. This was seen as best practice.

Professor Angela Duxbury
Mr Russell Hart
Dr Martin Benwell

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational Therapy
Date of visit	9 - 11 April 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until Thursday 10 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Tuesday 22 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee Monday 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major changes affected the following standards - programme admissions standards, programme management and resources standards, curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Orthoptics, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the education provider outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Dr Nicola Spalding (Occupational therapist) Ms Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Ms Kathleen Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Elisa Simeoni
Proposed student numbers	54
Initial approval	1 January 1998
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Ms Julie Walton (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Ms Janis Paine (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Professor Cynthia Pine (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member) Professor Gordon Tatlock (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Context document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining SET. Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the student consent form and the policy associated with it to clarify the information provided to students regarding participation and consent as a client or patient in all practice settings.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the education provider for the visit the policy that accompanied the consent form stated “normally students will be expected to consent...” Therefore although consent was always obtained, students could opt out if there was an issue with a particular situation for that student. Although the education provider explained that students were counselled as to the consequences of opting out the visitors were concerned that if a student took this option then the student may not be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider emphasising the rationale and justification for the study of physiology within Physiology (PHYG170).

Reason: From the submitted documentation and the discussion with the students it was apparent that the purpose of studying physiology within the programme was not wholly successfully communicated. The visitors felt that the purpose of the study of physiology was not made clear enough to the students. Therefore it would be beneficial for the education provider to elaborate on the importance of studying physiology in order to help students gain a sense of the subject.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how student feedback on written coursework might be enhanced to maximise the benefits to the student.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with students that feedback on written coursework was often generic in nature and therefore was not always sufficient for the students needs. The visitors felt that there was an opportunity for the education provider to review the nature of the feedback given to enhance the student's knowledge and understanding of the subject material studied.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending the assessment marking descriptors to provide more detail on the learning opportunities and assessment outcomes.

Reason: From review of the submitted documentation, the visitors felt that the assessment marking descriptors are currently restrictive with regard to the learning and assessment opportunities available to students. To better reflect the wide range of learning and assessment opportunities, the visitors felt the programme team should revisit the assessment marking descriptors.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the team for the inclusion in the curriculum, of the opportunity for students to engage in entrepreneurship, particularly in Occupational Performance 5 (OCCU 344).

Reason: This inclusion of entrepreneurship skills gives students a wider vision of the job market which is not restricted to the National Health Service (NHS) and helps them to consider more job opportunities. As a result of this, students are able to respond more efficiently to changing employment opportunities.

Commendation: The visitors wished to congratulate the School of Health Sciences on introducing monthly “drop-in” sessions for students within the School in support of the work of the Faculty Clinical Psychology Advisory Service to provide student counselling and support.

Reason: The visitors felt that this “drop-in” sessions was an enhancement to the School’s facilities for ensuring the welfare and well-being of the students during their time at University and a model for best practice.

Dr Nicola Spalding
Mrs Margaret Curr
Mrs Katie Bosworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Orthoptics
Date of visit	9 – 11 April 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Orthoptist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until Thursday 10 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Tuesday 22 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major changes affected the following standards - programme admissions standards, programme management and resources standards, curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the education provider outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ms Christine Timms (Orthoptist) Dr Helen Griffiths (Orthoptist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Proposed student numbers	35
Initial approval	1992
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Ms Julie Walton (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Ms Janis Paine (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Professor Cynthia Pine (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member) Professor Gordon Tatlock (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Context document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment regulations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining SET. Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the student consent form and the policy associated with it to clarify the information provided to students regarding participation and consent as a client or patient in all practice settings.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the education provider for the visit the policy that accompanied the consent form stated “normally students will be expected to consent...” Therefore although consent was always obtained, students could opt out if there was an issue with a particular situation for that student. Although the education provider explained that students were counselled as to the consequences of opting out the visitors were concerned that if a student took this option then the student may not be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider working with internal and external stakeholders to improve the security of current placements.

Reason: The visitors recognised that the current number of placements was appropriate to the size of the student cohort and the achievement of the learning outcomes, but wished to encourage the education provider to undertake further work to ensure that placements were available and utilised at every opportunity. The visitors appreciated the difficulties of obtaining clinical placements, especially given the programme structure and growing pressures on placement educators, but felt that there was growing evidence that the cancellation or non-availability of placements was not a one-off problem, but an emerging longer term difficulty which would benefit from further attention. The visitors were encouraged by the increased involvement of the Strategic Health Authority in securing placements in the local region and wished to encourage open and collaborative dialogue between the education provider and placements outside of the local region. The visitors also wished to recommend that the education provider considers utilising the placement unit within the school for administrative and planning support.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending the assessment marking descriptors to provide more detail on the learning opportunities and assessment outcomes.

Reason: From the review of the submitted documentation, the visitors felt that the assessment marking descriptors are currently restrictive with regard to the learning and assessment opportunities available to students. To better reflect the wide range of learning and assessment opportunities, the visitors felt the programme team should revisit the assessment marking descriptors.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors commended the system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Reason: The visitors identified in the discussions with the students that the system of academic and pastoral support was well designed and utilised effectively. The students had confidence in the system and as a result had an excellent rapport with members of the programme team. The system used a mixture of electronic and face-to-face opportunities. In particular, the visitors were impressed with the integration and accessibility of the IT systems (e.g. LUSID ‘the personal development planning package’ and TULIP ‘the assessment package’). Although similar packages are available at other education providers, the level of incorporation into the formal academic and pastoral support system was indicative of a model for best practice.

Commendation: The visitors wished to congratulate the School of Health Sciences on introducing monthly “drop-in” sessions for students within the School in support of the work of the Faculty Clinical Psychology Advisory Service to provide student counselling and support.

Reason: The visitors felt that this “drop-in” sessions was an enhancement to the School’s facilities for ensuring the welfare and well-being of the students during their time at University and a model for best practice.

Dr Helen Griffiths
Ms Christine Timms

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy
Date of visit	9 – 11 April 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until Thursday 10 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Tuesday 22 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major changes affected the following standards - programme admissions standards, programme management and resources standards, curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Orthoptics, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the education provider outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ms Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Ms Kathleen Bosworth (Physiotherapist) Dr Nicola Spalding (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Elisa Simeoni
Proposed student numbers	44
Initial approval	21 September 1999
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Ms Julie Walton (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Ms Janis Paine (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Professor Cynthia Pine (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member) Professor Gordon Tatlock (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Assessment handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Context document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining SET. Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a number of commendations. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the student consent form and the policy associated with it to clarify the information provided to students regarding participation and consent as a client or patient in all practice settings.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the education provider for the visit the policy that accompanied the consent form stated “normally students will be expected to consent...” Therefore although consent was always obtained, students could opt out if there was an issue with a particular situation for that student. Although the education provider explained that students were counselled as to the consequences of opting out the visitors were concerned that if a student took this option then the student may not be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for the programme.

Recommendations

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider inclusion of topics such as exercise prescription in order to develop students' ability to respond to changing employment opportunities, particularly outside of the National Health Service (NHS).

Reason: It is apparent from the documentation that there is currently no exercise prescription included in the curriculum. However the inclusion of this topic would be helpful for students to have a wider vision of the job market particularly outside of the NHS and encourage them to consider wider job opportunities.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending the assessment marking descriptors to provide more detail on the learning opportunities and assessment outcomes.

Reason: From review of the submitted documentation, the visitors felt that the assessment marking descriptors are currently restrictive with regard to the learning and assessment opportunities available to students. To better reflect the wide range of learning and assessment opportunities, the visitors felt the programme team should revisit the assessment marking descriptors.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the team on the introduction of the new 'hub and spoke' model for clinical education which results in greater flexibility in placement provision. The excellent systems operation of the model by clinical educators creates a range of new learning experiences for students

Reason: There is an excellent partnership between the clinical educators and the university staff which contributes to optimise students' placements. This was seen as innovative and best practice.

Commendation: The visitors wished to congratulate the School of Health Sciences on introducing monthly "drop-in" sessions for students within the School in support of the work of the Faculty Clinical Psychology Advisory Service to provide student counselling and support.

Reason: The visitors felt that this "drop-in" sessions was an enhancement to the School's facilities for ensuring the welfare and well-being of the students during their time at University and a model for best practice.

Ms Margaret Curr
Ms Kathleen Bosworth
Dr Nicola Spalding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiography
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	9 - 11 April 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until Thursday 10 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Tuesday 22 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major changes affected the following standards - programme admissions standards, programme management and resources standards, curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Orthoptics and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Dr Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Professor Angela Duxbury (Radiography) Mr Russell Hart (Radiography)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	50
Initial approval	4 January 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Ms Julie Walton (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Ms Janis Paine (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Professor Cynthia Pine (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member) Professor Gordon Tatlock (University of Liverpool/Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Assessment handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Context document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining SET. Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations on the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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 education provider must redraft and resubmit the student consent form and the policy associated with it to clarify the information provided to students regarding participation and consent as a client or patient in all practice settings.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the education provider for the visit the policy that accompanied the consent form stated “normally students will be expected to consent...” Therefore although consent was always obtained, students could opt out if there was an issue with a particular situation for that student. Although the education provider explained that students were counselled as to the consequences of opting out the visitors were concerned that if a student took this option then the student may not be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider could consider reviewing how student feedback on written coursework might be enhanced to maximise the benefits to the student.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with students that feedback on written coursework was often generic in nature and therefore was not always sufficient for the students needs. The visitors felt that there was an opportunity for the education provider to review the nature of the feedback given to enhance the student's knowledge and understanding of the subject material studied.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending the assessment marking descriptors to provide more detail on the learning opportunities and assessment outcomes.

Reason: From review of the submitted documentation, the visitors felt that the assessment marking descriptors are currently restrictive with regard to the learning and assessment opportunities available to students. To better reflect the wide range of learning and assessment opportunities, the visitors felt the programme team should revisit the assessment marking descriptors.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors wished to congratulate the School of Health Sciences on introducing monthly “drop-in” sessions for students within the School in support of the work of the Faculty Clinical Psychology Advisory Service to provide student counselling and support.

Reason: The visitors felt that this “drop-in” sessions was an enhancement to the School’s facilities for ensuring the welfare and well-being of the students during their time at University and a model for best practice.

Dr Martin Benwell
Professor Angela Duxbury
Mr Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time, Part time and Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	13 -14 May 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	14

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until Friday 25 July 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Friday 25 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on Monday 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ms Sarah Johnson (Occupational Therapist) Ms Susan Thompson (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Elisa Simeoni
HPC observer	Mr Osama Ammar
Proposed student numbers	90
Initial approval	September 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Ms Delia Heneghan, The University of Northampton
Secretary	Mr Matthew Watson
Members of the joint panel	Dr Mary Hanley (The University of Northampton, Internal Panel Member) Ms Julia Vernon (The University of Northampton, Internal Panel Member) Mr Paul McDermott (The University of Northampton, Internal Panel Member) Ms Fiona Douglas (University of the West of England, External Panel Member) Mrs Heather Reed

	<p>(Northamptonshire Healthcare NHS Trust, External Panel Member)</p> <p>Ms Mel Platts (University Hospitals Leicester NHS Trust)</p> <p>Ms Deborah Hearle (Cardiff University, External Panel Member)</p> <p>Mrs Jan Jensen (Canterbury Christ Church University, External Panel Member)</p> <p>Mr Ian Roberts (Graduate Member of the Panel)</p> <p>Ms Sally Feaver (College of Occupational Therapists)</p> <p>Ms Jo-Anne Supyk (College of Occupational Therapists)</p> <p>Ms Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists)</p>
--	---

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Common academic framework – Framework specification September 2007	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' report 2004/2005	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 40 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 23 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising materials for the programme, including the website entry, to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and a review of the education provider’s website, it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used for advertising must be amended. In particular, “state registration” and “licence to practise” are used as terms in the documentation and do not reflect the independence of the HPC or its performance of its regulatory function through protection of title. Moreover, the text used for advertising must be amended to clearly state that successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the Health Professions Council.

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

Condition: The programme team must review the programme documentation to clearly articulate that criminal records checks are part of the admissions criteria. Furthermore, it must be clearly stated in the documentation that the criminal records checks are enhanced.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that that criminal records were being performed in such a way to meet this standard, however, the documentation did not reflect this process. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to reflect the actual process undertaken and that the criminal records checks are performed at an enhanced level.

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

Condition: The programme team must review the programme documentation to clearly articulate that health checks are part of the admissions criteria.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that that health checks were being performed in such a way to meet this standard. However, the documentation did not reflect this process. Therefore, the visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to reflect the actual process undertaken.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to include the accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms policy.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that the programme team implements the accreditation of prior learning policy of the university. However, there were no references to this in the documentation submitted. Therefore the visitors felt that references to the accreditation of prior learning policy of the university must be articulated in the programme documentation.

2.3 The admission procedures must 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 will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide more information about the interview process.

Reason: In the documentation submitted, it is mentioned that students who meet the entry criteria are invited to take part in an assessed group task. The visitors felt that more evidence must be submitted about the group interview and that this information should be included in the programme documentation to make the process clear to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the prospective student cohort number as well as an indication of the funding arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation submitted, the commissioning numbers and validated numbers were not indicated. During the visit, the education provider provided some clarification but the visitors felt that a statement indicating the commissioned number of students and the validated number must be submitted.

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 education provider must provide information about the protocols used to obtain consent where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: In discussion, it was clear that there is a form used to obtain consent from students. However, the visitors did not have an opportunity to review the

protocols and therefore require additional documentary evidence to assist them in determining how this standard is met.

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 education provider must include the attendance policy in the programme specification.

Reason: In the documentation submitted, the attendance policy is included only in the Student handbook. The visitors felt that this policy must be also included in the programme specification as it is a crucial policy of the programme and must form part of the validated definitive document.

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 updated versions of all module descriptors in the programme.

Reason: In the original documentation received by the visitors the module descriptors were, in some cases, older versions. A significant number of additional module changes to learning outcomes and assessment were also tabled at the programme team meeting. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must be updated to include the latest module descriptors for the programme. The visitors will then be able to assess the amended learning outcomes and assessment methods to review how the standards of proficiency are delivered to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to clearly reflect that integration of theory and practice are central to the curriculum.

Reason: Although this was made clear by the presentation given during the meeting with the programme team, the visitors didn't feel that it was clearly articulated in the documentation. Therefore, they felt that a statement should be included in the validated definitive document to make explicit the integration of theory and practice.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to reflect the current implementation of their inter-professional learning strategy in the programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted shows that the programme includes inter-professional learning. However, there is little evidence of where the inter-professional learning is covered. In order to be able to determine accurately the impact of the inter-professional learning on the programme, the visitors felt that a clearer indication of how the strategy is implemented for the programme must be submitted.

5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment.

Condition: The programme team must submit the procedure that is in place to approve and monitor all placements outside Northamptonshire and overseas to show that practice placements settings provide a safe environment. This must include details of how students are allocated and how placements are monitored.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, some documentation was given to the visitors but there was insufficient time to be able to fully assimilate the information. However, the visitors felt that further evidence must be submitted to ensure that all practice placement settings will provide a safe environment.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit the procedure that is in place to approve and monitor all placements outside Northamptonshire and overseas to show that practice placements settings provide a safe environment. This must include details of how students are allocated and how placements are monitored.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, some documentation was given to the visitors but there was insufficient time to be able to fully assimilate the information. However, the visitors felt that further evidence must be submitted to ensure that all practice placement settings will provide for 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 must submit the procedure that is in place to approve and monitor all placements outside Northamptonshire and overseas to show that practice placements settings provide a safe environment. This must include details of how students are allocated and how placements are monitored.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, some documentation was given to the visitors but there was insufficient time to be able to fully assimilate the information. However, the visitors felt that further evidence must be submitted to ensure that the education provider has effective mechanisms in place to approve and monitor all placements.

5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Condition: The education provider must review the handbook for practice educators to include the learning outcomes to be achieved during practice placements.

Reason: During the meeting with the practice educators, it appeared that the information about the learning outcomes to be achieved given by the education provider to practice educators and students was not sufficient. A significant number of additional module changes to learning outcomes and assessment were also tabled at the programme team meeting. Therefore the visitors felt that the learning outcomes to be achieved during practice placements must be updated included in the handbook for practice educators.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to make clear to practice placements educators the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in case of failure.

Reason: During the meeting with the placement providers, the visitors asked the practice educators whether they knew about the implication and any action to be taken in the case of failure. It was evident that the placement providers were not fully aware of all the assessments procedures. Therefore the visitors felt that further information should be included in the handbook for practice educators.

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that there is a process in place to ensure that non-NHS placement providers and non-Local Authorities placements providers have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to students.

Reason: While it was felt that NHS and Local Authorities placements providers have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in place, the visitors did not feel that the education provider has a process in place to ensure that non-

NHS and non-Local Authorities placements providers have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy. Therefore, overseas placement providers, non-NHS placement providers and non-Local Authorities placement providers would need to provide this information to the education provider.

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

Condition: The education provider must include more information about the assessment strategy in the programme documentation.

Reason: During the visit, the programme team clarified some of the regulations like the resit policy. However, the visitors felt that further information must be submitted and included in the programme documentation, in particular about compensation and condonement regulations, in order they make sure that individuals who successfully complete the programme are fit to practise.

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

Condition: The education provider must include more information about placement assessments tools in the programme documentation.

Reason: In the original documentation received by the visitors, little evidence was provided about placements assessment tools. Therefore, the visitors felt that placement assessment tools must be fully explained in the programme documentation to make sure that this standard is fully met.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include updated versions of all module descriptors in the programme.

Reason: In the original documentation received by the visitors the module descriptors were, in some cases, older versions. A significant number of additional module changes to learning outcomes and assessment were also tabled at the programme team meeting. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must be updated to include the latest module descriptors for the programme. The visitors will then be able to assess the amended learning outcomes and assessment methods to review how the standards of proficiency are delivered to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide mapping exercises against external reference frameworks.

Reason: A Health Profession Council's Standards of Proficiency cross-mapping document was included in the documentation. However, the visitors would like to see other mapping exercises against external reference frameworks, in particular the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. It was indicated that these mapping exercises had already been completed but not submitted for scrutiny and therefore would not create an additional burden on the programme team.

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 objective criteria used in the assessment.

Reason: The documentation submitted included a generic grade assessment criteria guideline for the education provider. However, there was no evidence of objective criteria used in the assessment. Therefore, the visitors felt that this evidence must be submitted in order to make sure that the standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence showing that effective mechanisms are in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessments.

Reason: In the submitted documentation, the external examiners' reports from the last three years were included. However, the visitors felt that more information about how the programme assessed must be submitted, in particular about the internal and external moderation process.

6.7.4 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Condition: The education provider must include the procedure for the right of appeal for students in the programme documentation.

Reason: The procedure for the right of appeal for students was not included in the submitted programme documentation. The visitors felt that this procedure must be made available to students and therefore felt that this document should be included at least in the Student handbook.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider indicating the members of staff who are HPC registered.

Reason: In the documentation submitted, it was not made clear which members of staff were currently HPC registered. The visitors felt that this should be indicated, especially in the Curriculum Vitae.

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

Condition: The education provider should review the programme documentation to amend references to 1000 hours of practice based education being an HPC requirement.

Reason: In the submitted documentation there were references to a certain number of hours in practice education being a requirement for the professional body. The visitors felt that the wording of the paragraph could be misleading and imply that this is a requirement from the Health Professions Council. Therefore the programme documentation should be amended to make this clear.

Ms Sarah Johnson
Ms Susan Thompson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time and Part Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical Science
Date of visit	7 and 8 May 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical Scientist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 June 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 9 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mr Robert Williams (Biomedical Scientist) Mr Robert Keeble (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Proposed student numbers	25
Proposed start date of programme approval	6 October 2008
Chair	Dr Stephen Arkle (University of Portsmouth)
Secretary	Mrs S Wallace (University of Portsmouth)
Members of the joint panel	Dr Anne Loweth (External Panel Member) Mr Paul Whiting (External Panel Member) Dr Carol Ekinsmyth (Internal Panel Member) Dr Jasper Graham-Jones (Internal Panel Member) Mr Alan Wainwright (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

A number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 1 SET.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are often suggested when it is felt that the standards of education and training have been met at the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit placement handbooks, the programme specification and unit descriptors to more accurately reflect the new BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme.

Reason: The current information available to students does not apply to the new HPC standards of proficiency published in November 2007. The documents also state that all standards of proficiency in the student portfolio do not need to be met upon graduation. It was explained that this is an option for those on the previously designed programme but all standards of proficiency need to be met in order for the student to be eligible for application of HPC registration. The visitors felt that the current information does not give the students the correct information they require when enrolling onto the programme.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both 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 education provider must submit a new student handbook for this programme.

Reason: The visitors felt that the current student handbook required substantial revision owing to the use of old terminology and it did not make clear enough that completion of the programme does not lead to HPC registration but the eligibility to apply for registration. It also did not provide a transparent outline of the selection procedures and criteria for placement in the second year. Since only 20 students will be chosen to complete this programme, a competitive selection process is in place. Both students and visitors felt that this was not made clear before enrolling onto the programme, thus giving potential false hope to those who may chose to take up a place on the programme.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the programme team for their clinical simulation laboratory.

Reason: The visitors felt this innovative facility enables professional biomedical science practice to be delivered and assessed on the university campus. This is unusual for biomedical science programmes.

Robert Williams
Robert Keeble

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational Therapy
Date of visit	8 – 10 April 2008

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational Therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 June 2008 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 July 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Podiatry. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational Therapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Proposed student numbers	60
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Chris Sturley (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Maryann White (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapy) Ruth Heames (College of Occupational Therapy) Patricia McClure (College of Occupational Therapy)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online access to relevant policies and documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 59 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme to remove references to state registration of Occupational Therapists.

Reason: Within the submitted documentation there are indications of state registration (page 84 of the student handbook). In order to present accurately the independence of the HPC in its role as a regulator, the visitors felt the programme documentation required review and amendment.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to provide clarity of the planned staff numbers and their proposed input into the programme.

Reason: From the submitted documentation and discussions with the programme team, students and senior team, it was apparent that the programme resources including staff have been subject to change. In discussions it was apparent that the relocation of the programme as well as overall reduction in staff numbers as a result of long term leave arrangements require additional clarification in the document. In order for the visitors to be able to understand how the number of staff is adequate to deliver the programme, it was felt the programme documentation must clarify which members of the programme team are currently delivering the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation to confirm the arrangements for the relocation of resources to Plymouth in time for the start of the academic year 2008-2009.

Reason: From the submitted documentation and discussions with the senior team, programme team and students, it was clear the programme was currently in a transitional phase of a relocation from Exeter to Plymouth. By the start of academic year 2008-2009 it was intended to be delivering the programme solely at the Plymouth site. In order to ensure resources are available to support student learning, the visitors felt documentation was required to describe the relocation process and to provide confirmation that resources will be in place in time for the start of the academic year.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the lines of communication and responsibility regarding placements.

Reason: From the discussion with students and practice communicators, it was apparent that the recent changes to the placement co-ordination / supervision model in relation the Practice Development Teams had not been effectively communicated. To ensure that practice educators and students fully understand what to do and who to contact when they require support, the visitors felt the documentation must be amended to provide clarity on the responsibilities of individuals.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider increasing the regularity of obtaining consent from students on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that a protocol for obtaining consent was in place at the start of the programme. However, the visitors recommended that consent should be obtained at the commencement of each year to ensure that students gave consent based on more current information.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the communication to all parties surrounding the role of the Practice Development Teams.

Reason: From discussion with the senior management team, programme team, placement providers and students, it was clear that there have been some changes to the placement co-ordination /supervision relatively recently. Whilst the visitors recognise the benefit and value of these changes to the programmes of study on which they impact, it was apparent that the various parties involved in the changes had differing levels of awareness. In order to improve understanding of the role of the Practice Development Teams, the visitors recommend that the communication strategy to this work is revisited.

Jennifer Caldwell
Anthony Power
Jacqueline Waterfield

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme name	Foundation Degree in Professional Development in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Date of visit	24-25 June 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 August to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 14 August 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval/approval (delete as appropriate) of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 25 September 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The visit also considered the following programme – Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	15
Proposed start date of programme approval	October 2008
Chair	Professor Mike Goodwin (Staffordshire University)
Secretary	Andrea Jones (Staffordshire University)
Members of the joint panel	Richard Benefer (Staffordshire University, Internal Panel Member) Dr Mark Forshaw (Staffordshire University, Internal Panel Member) Peter Jones (Staffordshire University, Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validation Support Document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the operating department practice and nursing programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was clear that the documentation did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, the HPC is not a professional body and should not be referred to as such in any materials related to an HPC approved programme. It should also be made clear throughout all of the documentation that completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply for HPC registration. In addition, there are a number of items referred to as HPC requirements in the documentation that it needs to be clarified are professional body recommendations, in particular references to the amount of time that mentors should supervise students on placements and the guidance regarding the 24-hour cycle of care. Finally, references to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics should be updated to the most recent version of this publication throughout the documentation. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion amongst students on the programme, the visitors felt the programme documentation must be amended.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that the programme has a secure place in the education provider’s business plan and is guaranteed to run.

Reason: During the senior team meeting it was apparent that the education provider was waiting for confirmation from the strategic health authority regarding commissioned numbers to the programme to ensure that the funding would be in place to run the programme. Once this confirmation has been received by the education provider, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that this is the case to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that one of the planned paramedic personnel is recruited to the programme team before the start of the first programme, and that the other paramedic role is recruited to at the earliest possible opportunity.

Reason: From the programme team meeting it was clear that the programme team was already in place with the exception of the paramedic staff. Whilst the

visitors recognised that the job descriptions had been written and that initial advertising for the roles had already begun, they felt that in order for this programme to run at least one of these roles must be in position by the start of the programme. The visitors would therefore need confirmation of the recruitment of one of these individuals and details of their expertise and knowledge to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that one of the planned paramedic personnel is recruited to the programme team before the start of the first programme, and that the other paramedic role is recruited to at the earliest possible opportunity.

Reason: From the programme team meeting it was clear that the programme team was already in place with the exception of the paramedic staff. Whilst the visitors recognised that the job descriptions had been written and that initial advertising for the roles had already begun, they felt that in order for this programme to run at least one of these roles must be in position by the start of the programme. The visitors would therefore need confirmation of the recruitment of one of these individuals and details of their expertise and knowledge to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation in order to provide evidence that the resources available for the learning and teaching of the students on this programme would be sufficient.

Reason: From the tour of the facilities and the planned equipment for purchase by the education provider the visitors could not determine whether the equipment resources would be sufficient for the number of students on this programme. Indeed, from the equipment list supplied and from the resources seen on the tour the visitors felt that these would not provide sufficient learning and teaching resources. The visitors therefore require details of the equipment that is currently available to this programme and an updated list of the type and quantity of equipment that the education provider is planning to purchase to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to provide evidence of a formalised agreement between the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS) for the education provider to access WMAS clinical skills facilities.

Reason: From the meetings with the programme team and the placement providers it was evident that there had been close co-operation and involvement in the development of this programme, and that WMAS had agreed that the programme team could utilise their clinical skills facilities. To ensure that these facilities are guaranteed to be accessible to the education provider as planned, the visitors require a formalisation of this agreement in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that the stock of subject texts will be sufficient to support the learning of the students on this programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team it was apparent that there were plans to purchase the books listed in the module descriptors as required reading. To ensure that this standard is being met the visitors require evidence regarding the quantity of the resources that are being purchased. The visitors also need to see the recommended reading lists for the programme and demonstration of the plans to purchase these resources, including the amount of each of the texts.

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 education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clarify the policy on preceptorship following completion of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted by the education provider it was clear that the information in the documentation was misleading regarding the programme policy on preceptorship after completing the programme. The documentation needs to be updated to clarify that a period of preceptorship was recommended as best practice after completion of the programme, and that preceptorship is not a requirement as is currently stated.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to provide evidence of the education provider taking full responsibility over placements on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the education provider planned to initially utilise Coventry University's placement audits for the first year of the programme before commencing their own audits. The visitors require evidence of a formal agreement between the two education providers and endorsement of

Staffordshire University's responsibility for placements for the period that the information in the Coventry University's audits is utilised.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to provide evidence that the placement audits that are planned to be utilised are tailored to paramedic placements.

Reason: In the programme documentation submitted by the education provider an audit was provided that would be adapted and utilised in the future to approve and monitor paramedic placements on the programme. The visitors require evidence that this audit has been adapted to be suitable for assessing paramedic placements to ensure that this standard is being met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that a wider range of paramedic texts is available to the students on the programme.

Reason: From the resources seen at the visit and the texts proposed for purchase by the education provider, the visitors felt that a wider range of paramedic texts could be made available to aid the research and learning of the students on the programme.

Paul Bates
Glyn Harding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme name	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Date of visit	24-25 June 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 August to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee on 18 August 2008. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 14 August 2008. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Education and Training Committee on the ongoing approval/approval (delete as appropriate) of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Education and Training Committee on 25 September 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The visit also considered the following programme – Foundation Degree in Professional Development in Paramedic Science. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Professor Mike Goodwin (Staffordshire University)
Secretary	Andrea Jones (Staffordshire University)
Members of the joint panel	Richard Benefer (Staffordshire University, Internal Panel Member) Dr Mark Forshaw (Staffordshire University, Internal Panel Member) Peter Jones (Staffordshire University, Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider.

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Validation Support Document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities;

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the operating department practice and nursing programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was clear that the documentation did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, the HPC is not a professional body and should not be referred to as such in any materials related to an HPC approved programme. It should also be made clear throughout all of the documentation that completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply for HPC registration. In addition, there are a number of items referred to as HPC requirements in the documentation that it needs to be clarified are professional body recommendations, in particular references to the amount of time that mentors should supervise students on placements and the guidance regarding the 24-hour cycle of care. Finally, references to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics should be updated to the most recent version of this publication throughout the documentation. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion amongst students on the programme, the visitors felt the programme documentation must be amended.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that the programme has a secure place in the education provider’s business plan and is guaranteed to run.

Reason: During the senior team meeting it was apparent that the education provider was waiting for confirmation from the strategic health authority regarding commissioned numbers to the programme to ensure that the funding would be in place to run the programme. Once this confirmation has been received by the education provider, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that this is the case to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that one of the planned paramedic personnel is recruited to the programme team before the start of the first programme, and that the other paramedic role is recruited to at the earliest possible opportunity.

Reason: From the programme team meeting it was clear that the programme team was already in place with the exception of the paramedic staff. Whilst the

visitors recognised that the job descriptions had been written and that initial advertising for the roles had already begun, they felt that in order for this programme to run at least one of these roles must be in position by the start of the programme. The visitors would therefore need confirmation of the recruitment of one of these individuals and details of their expertise and knowledge to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that one of the planned paramedic personnel is recruited to the programme team before the start of the first programme, and that the other paramedic role is recruited to at the earliest possible opportunity.

Reason: From the programme team meeting it was clear that the programme team was already in place with the exception of the paramedic staff. Whilst the visitors recognised that the job descriptions had been written and that initial advertising for the roles had already begun, they felt that in order for this programme to run at least one of these roles must be in position by the start of the programme. The visitors would therefore need confirmation of the recruitment of one of these individuals and details of their expertise and knowledge to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation in order to provide evidence that the resources available for the learning and teaching of the students on this programme would be sufficient.

Reason: From the tour of the facilities and the planned equipment for purchase by the education provider the visitors could not determine whether the equipment resources would be sufficient for the number of students on this programme. Indeed, from the equipment list supplied and from the resources seen on the tour the visitors felt that these would not provide sufficient learning and teaching resources. In addition, consideration needs to be made into the lack of additional access to facilities for the students on this programme. The visitors therefore require details of the equipment that is currently available to this programme and an updated list of the type and quantity of equipment that the education provider is planning to purchase to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that the stock of subject texts will be sufficient to support the learning of the students on this programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team it was apparent that there were plans to purchase the books listed in the module descriptors as required reading. To ensure that this standard is being met the visitors require evidence regarding the quantity of the resources that are being purchased. The visitors also need to see the recommended reading lists for the programme and demonstration of the plans to purchase these resources, including the amount of each of the texts.

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 education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clarify the policy on preceptorship following completion of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted by the education provider it was clear that the information in the documentation was misleading regarding the programme policy on preceptorship after completing the programme. The documentation needs to be updated to clarify that a period of preceptorship was recommended as best practice after completion of the programme, and that preceptorship is not a requirement as is currently stated.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to provide evidence of the education provider taking full responsibility over placements on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the education provider planned to initially utilise Coventry University's placement audits for the first year of the programme before commencing their own audits. The visitors require evidence of a formal agreement between the two education providers and endorsement of Staffordshire University's responsibility for placements for the period that the information in the Coventry University's audits is utilised.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to provide evidence that the placement audits that are planned to be utilised are tailored to paramedic placements.

Reason: In the programme documentation submitted by the education provider an audit was provided that would be adapted and utilised in the future to approve and monitor paramedic placements on the programme. The visitors require evidence that this audit has been adapted to be suitable for assessing paramedic placements to ensure that this standard is being met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that a wider range of paramedic texts is available to the students on the programme.

Reason: From the resources seen at the visit and the texts proposed for purchase by the programme team, the visitors felt that a wider range of paramedic texts could be made available to aid the research and learning of the students on the programme.

Paul Bates
Glyn Harding