
Education & Training Panel – 29 May 2008

Visitor Reports

Executive summary and recommendations

Introduction

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

Education provider	Programme name	Delivery mode
University of Nottingham	Masters of Nutrition (MNutr)	Full time
University of Nottingham	Masters of Nutrition (MNutr)	Full time accelerated
University of Central Lancashire	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Full time
University of Central Lancashire	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Part time
University of Leeds	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)	Full time
The University of Northampton	BSc (Hons) Podiatry	Full time

Decision

The Council/Committee is asked to agree the following:

accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, including the conditions recommended by the Visitors

or

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

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

Visitors' reports(6)

Date of paper

19 May 2008

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2008-05-19	a	EDU	PPR	COVER SHEET Approve visitors report (no representations) - ETC - SEPT 07	Publication DD: None	Public RD: None

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme name	Master of Nutrition
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietetics
Date of visit	20 and 21 February 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 '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 Thursday 24 April 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 Thursday 29 May 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 Thursday 24 April 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 Tuesday 10 June 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 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. The visit also considered a different programme, the Master of Nutrition, full time accelerated. A separate visitors' report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mrs Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Mrs Sylvia Butson (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mrs Tracey Samuel-Smith
HPC observer	Ms Elisa Simeoni
Proposed student numbers	36 Qualifying Year (first year)
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Dr Derek Chambers (University of Nottingham)
Secretary	Ms Nuala Carr (University of Nottingham) and Dr Fiona McCullough (University of Nottingham)

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"/>
School of Biosciences resource documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment rules and regulations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review complete module descriptions or practice placement handbooks prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit full information. However, they did table this information at the visit.

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"/>
Placement 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 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining seven 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 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, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: At the visit, the HPC Panel received a copy of the Master of Nutrition entry in the prospectus. This document and previously received advertising material states that the programme 'leads to eligibility for HPC registration as a Dietitian'. The visitors felt that to provide applicants with full and clear information before taking up a place on the programme, this must be amended to state that the programme leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both applicant and the education provider the information they require to make, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the Master of Nutrition prospectus entry to clearly state there are two programmes leading to the award of Master of Nutrition - the Master of Nutrition full time and Master of Nutrition full time accelerated.

Reason: The prospectus does not clearly state there are two programmes leading to the award of Master of Nutrition. The visitors felt that to provide applicants with full and clear information about which programme is more suitable for them, the entry in the prospectus must be amended.

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 redraft and resubmit the advertising material, including the Master of Nutrition prospectus entry, to include information about the English language entry requirements.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it became clear that through the education providers interview process any English language difficulties would be identified and, if the applicant was offered a place on the programme, appropriate measures would be put in place. However, there is currently no information in the advertising material which informs applicants of the English language entry requirements. The visitors felt that in order to provide applicants with full and clear information prior to taking up a place on a programme, the advertising material must be updated.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising material, including the Master of Nutrition prospectus entry, to state that the CRB check is enhanced.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team, it became apparent the education provider undertakes enhanced CRB checks on applicants however this is not communicated in the advertising material. The visitors felt that to provide applicants with full and clear information prior to taking up a place on a programme, the advertising material must be updated.

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 protocol to reflect the level and timings of student involvement throughout the course of the programme.

Reason: The HPC Panel was provided with a copy of the student consent form prior to the visit and during the programme team meeting they learnt that students were provided with this form at the start of the programme. The visitors were concerned that students were liable to forget the implications of signing this form. The visitors felt that to ensure students were aware of the extent and when they are expected to get involved in the programme; the student consent protocol must be redrafted.

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 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 and placement providers, it became apparent 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, the visitors could find no reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the documentation and in order to direct students to the standards HPC expects of them once they have joined the profession, the visitors felt the standards must be referenced.

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

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

Condition: The 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 and placement providers, it became apparent 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, the visitors could find no reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the documentation and in order to direct students to the standards HPC expects of them once they have joined the profession, the visitors felt the standards must be referenced.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme assessment regulations to clearly state that students who are awarded an aegrotat award are not eligible for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: The assessment regulations received prior to the visit do not state that students who are awarded an aegrotat degree are not eligible to apply for registration. The visitors felt that to ensure the assessment regulations clearly specify eligibility for admission, amended documentation must be submitted.

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 a review of the programme documentation to reflect the latest terminology and include the most recent literature produced by the profession.

Reason: The visitors felt that the programme reflects the curriculum guidance of the profession and therefore meets this standard. However, the visitors thought that the 2002 British Dietetic Association leaflet provided in the student information pack and the terminology used in the programme specification, could be updated.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors commended the education provider on the creation and use of Vitamin Village.

Reason: During the tour of facilities the HPC Panel were shown Vitamin Village. This is an online tool for use by students during the First Year of the programme. It has been designed by the education provider to compliment the student's knowledge and understanding of vitamins; ranging from the foods in which they are found to the effects of vitamin deficiency. The visitors were impressed by the innovative approach to student learning and the desire of the creators to continue development.

Commendation: The visitors commended the education provider on the range of modules available to students as part of the optional elements of the programme.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it was identified that the optional modules, which occur in Part 2 and 3, do not need to be undertaken within the School of Biosciences. The programme team highlighted that while most students were undertaking optional modules within the School, some students had opted to take modules in marketing and languages. The visitors felt that the design of the programme which allows students to undertake optional modules from other parts of the university, while not affecting the attainment of the standards of proficiency, was an area of best practice.

Mrs Alison Nicholls
Mrs Sylvia Butson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme name	Master of Nutrition
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietetics
Date of visit	20 and 21 February 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	8
Commendations.....	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 '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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until Thursday 24 April 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 Thursday 29 May 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 Thursday 24 April 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 Tuesday 10 June 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. The visit also considered a different programme, Master in Nutrition full time. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mrs Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Mrs Sylvia Butson (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mrs Tracey Samuel-Smith
HPC observer	Ms Elisa Simeoni
Proposed student numbers	6
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2008
Chair	Dr Derek Chambers (University of Nottingham)
Secretary	Ms Nuala Carr (University of Nottingham) and Dr Fiona McCullough (University of Nottingham)

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"/>
School of Biosciences resource documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment rules and regulations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review complete module descriptions or practice placement handbooks prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit full information. However, they did table this information at the visit.

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports specifically for the Master of Nutrition full time accelerated programme prior to the visit 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"/>
Placement 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 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining seven 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 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, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the Master of Nutrition entry in the prospectus to clearly state there are two programmes leading to the award of Master of Nutrition - the Master of Nutrition full time and Master of Nutrition full time accelerated.

Reason: The prospectus does not clearly state there are two programmes leading to the award of Master of Nutrition. The visitors felt that to provide applicants with full and clear information about which programme is more suitable for them, the entry in the prospectus must be amended.

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 redraft and resubmit the advertising material, including the Master of Nutrition prospectus entry, to include information about the English language entry requirements.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it became clear that through the education provider's interview process any English language difficulties would be identified and, if the applicant was offered a place on the programme, appropriate measures would be put in place. However, there is currently no information in the advertising material which informs applicants of the English language entry requirements. The visitors felt in order to provide applicants with full and clear information prior to taking up a place on a programme, the advertising material must be updated.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the advertising material, including the Master of Nutrition prospectus entry, to state that the CRB check is enhanced.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team, it became apparent the education provider undertakes enhanced CRB checks on applicants however this is not communicated in the advertising material. The visitors felt that to provide applicants with full and clear information prior to taking up a place on a programme, the advertising material must be updated.

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 protocol to reflect the level and timings of student involvement throughout the course of the programme.

Reason: The HPC Panel was provided with a copy of the student consent form prior to the visit and during the programme team meeting they learnt that students were provided with this form at the start of the programme. The visitors were concerned that students were liable to forget the implications of signing this form. The visitors felt that to ensure students were aware of the extent and when they are expected to get involved in the programme; the student consent protocol must be redrafted.

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 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 and placement providers, it became apparent 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, the visitors could find no reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the documentation and in order to direct students to the standards HPC expects of them once they have joined the profession, the visitors felt the standards must be referenced.

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

Condition: The 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 and placement providers, it became apparent 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, the visitors could find no reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the documentation and in order to direct students to the standards HPC expects of them once they have joined the profession, the visitors felt the standards must be referenced.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme assessment regulations to clearly state that students who are awarded an aegrotat award are not eligible for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: The assessment regulations received prior to the visit do not state that students who are awarded an aegrotat degree are not eligible to apply for registration. The visitors felt that to ensure the assessment regulations clearly specify eligibility for admission, amended documentation must be submitted.

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 a review of the programme documentation to reflect the latest terminology and include the most recent literature produced by the profession.

Reason: The visitors felt that the programme reflects the curriculum guidance of the profession and therefore meets this standard. However, the visitors thought that the 2002 British Dietetic Association leaflet provided in the student information pack and the terminology used in the programme specification, could be updated.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors commended the education provider on the range of modules available to students as part of the optional elements of the programme.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it was identified that the optional modules, which occur in Part 3 (direct entry), do not need to be undertaken within the School of Biosciences. The programme team highlighted that while most students were undertaking optional modules within the School, some students had opted to take modules in marketing and languages. The visitors felt that the design of the programme which allows students to undertake optional modules from other parts of the university, while not affecting the attainment of the standards of proficiency, was an area of best practice.

Mrs Alison Nicholls
Mrs Sylvia Butson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy
Date of visit	21-22 February 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 '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 28 April 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 29 May 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 10 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy part time 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 part time 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 and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mr Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Professor Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	Osama Ammar
Proposed student numbers	52 (Full time equivalent across full time & part time programmes)
Initial approval	May 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Brenda Hodgkinson (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Lorna Burrow (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Gayle Brewer (University of Central Lancashire, Internal Panel Member) John Holloway (University of Central Lancashire, Internal Panel Member) Liz Hancock (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Elizabeth McMullin (Central Lancashire NHS, External Advisor) Nina Thompson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

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"/>
Department handbook	<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 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 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 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, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials to remove the references to “licence to practice” and “leading to registration”.

Reason: The visitors felt that the submitted documentation contained references which must be corrected to prevent applicants or students misunderstanding their route to registration. In particular, the documentation implies HPC issues a licence to practice rather than protects professional titles and that completion of the programme leads directly to registration.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the references regarding “HPC required qualifications” for overseas applicants.

Reason: Several of the documents provided by the programme team contained references to “HPC required qualifications” for overseas applicants. This implied that all qualifications listed were HPC approved, whereas HPC guidance states that on registration the applicant should reach IELTS standard or equivalent. It was felt that this phrasing could be misleading to applicants to the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure consistency of entry requirements across all documentation.

Reason: Across the programme documentation there was inconsistency in the stated professional entry standards required for admission on to the programme. The visitors felt that the documentation required updating to remove the potential for confusion to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit a policy for funding of clinical placements, where appropriate, which is drawn up in collaboration with clinical partners.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and senior management it became apparent that the programme was seeking alternate funding streams. The details of the additional funding streams was not made clear in the documentation submitted for approval. The visitors felt the proposed intakes of

independently financed students may carry wider implications to placement co-ordination. In particular independently financed students carry their funding stream to placement providers and in some case placement educators.

To prevent this situation from creating an additional incentive to supervising independently financed students, the visitors felt the programme team must provide their policy for placement funding after collaborating with practice colleagues to ensure the arrangements are satisfactory for all parties.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the placements available to the programme. In particular, further clarification is required on placements made available by and from students from the defence sector, independently funded students and changes in regional commissioning numbers.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it became apparent that, due to the changes to the way that students on this programme would be financed, the placement experiences students would have available will also change. In particular, defence sector students would be participating in the majority of placements in that sector, and other students may also be placed in defence sector placements. Additionally, the documentation did not articulate how placements would be made available to independently financed students or that there is flexibility with the existing placement areas to support the new student numbers. The visitors felt the documentation must be updated to reflect accurately the number and range of placement experiences students will have access to.

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 clearly articulate pass level criteria will ensure safe and effective practice.

Reason: The grade descriptors supplied by the programme team indicated that in some cases the specific criteria constituting a pass grade would not ensure that a student was safe and effective. The visitors felt that the grade descriptors would need to be amended to guarantee that students would meet the SOPs for their profession on completion of the programme.

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

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

Reason: The submitted documentation 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

- 3.3 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.**

Recommendation: The education provider should consider that, if it chooses to manage the part time programme with a separate course leader from the full time programme, that the HPC will require formal notification.

Reason: In discussion, the programme team indicated they may review and separate programme leadership between two individuals.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing their work plan and reassess the burden of work in relation to the complex nature of the additional part time route.

Reason: The visitors recognised that the programme team showed a strong commitment and awareness to the increasing work load involved in running a part time programme alongside a full time route. The visitors felt that the programme team would benefit from reassessing the implications that this additional programme would have on their time, to ensure they were properly resourced.

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

Recommendation: The visitors considered that students were very well prepared for placements. It was mentioned by the students that, to enhance their experience, the programme team may wish to consider introductory input for the following areas:

- paediatrics;
- learning difficulties;
- mental health;
- women's health; and
- dementia

prior to students undertaking their Year 2 placement.

Reason: The visitors recommended that to further enhance the integration of theory and practice in the programme that additional subject areas were addressed in the lead up to placements.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recognised the disproportionate distribution of marks in the first category on placement and support the changes to weighting of the credit value as an interim measure. The visitors recommend that the original weightings be reinstated once the clinical module assessment grades have been recalibrated.

Reason: The visitors recognised the methods that the programme team had implemented to address possible discrepancies in placement grades, and felt that the steps taken were an appropriate interim solution. However, the visitors felt the original credit weightings reflected the programme team's commitment to putting placements at the centre of the assessment process. Therefore the visitors wished to encourage the team to review the modules in the future and again redesign and allocate an appropriate credit weighting.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors wish to commend the programme team's innovative approach to curriculum development, particularly their use of service user engagement and National Health Service Institute.

Reason: The visitors considered the programme team's approach to enhancing the curriculum significantly benefited the programme and was innovative in its approach.

Commendation: The visitors commend the programme team's commitment to resources for student support, teaching and learning, and additionally the support provided to clinical placements.

Reason: The visitors recognised that the level of resources, and the support that students and clinical placement providers received from the programme team showed best practice. The visitors noted that the level of support and resources was uncommon from other physiotherapy programmes.

Commendation: The visitors commend the use of case studies on the programme for enhancing the link between theory and practice, and for facilitating interprofessional working.

Reason: The visitors were impressed with the design and format of the case studies provided on the programme to enhance student learning, and felt that the contribution that these made to further development of coordinated learning between different healthcare professionals demonstrated innovative work.

Karen Harrison
Anthony Power

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy
Date of visit	21-22 February 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 '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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 April 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 29 May 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 10 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 visit also considered a BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy full time 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 full time 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 and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mr Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Professor Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	Osama Ammar
Proposed student numbers	52 (Full time equivalent across full & part time programmes)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2008
Chair	Brenda Hodgkinson (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Lorna Burrow (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Gayle Brewer (University of Central Lancashire, Internal Panel Member) John Holloway (University of Central Lancashire, Internal Panel Member) Liz Hancock (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Elizabeth McMullin (Central Lancashire NHS, External Advisor) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

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"/>
Department handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years 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 BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy full time 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 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 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 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, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials to remove the references to “licence to practice” and “leading to registration”.

Reason: The visitors felt that the submitted documentation contained references which must be corrected to prevent applicants or students misunderstanding their route to registration. In particular, the documentation implies HPC issues a licence to practice rather than protects professional titles and that completion of the programme leads directly to registration.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the references regarding “HPC required qualifications” for overseas applicants.

Reason: Several of the documents provided by the programme team contained references to “HPC required qualifications” for overseas applicants. This implied that all qualifications listed were HPC approved, whereas HPC guidance states that on registration the applicant should reach IELTS standard or equivalent. It was felt that this phrasing could be misleading to applicants to the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure consistency of entry requirements across all documentation.

Reason: Across the programme documentation there was inconsistency in the stated professional entry standards required for admission on to the programme. The visitors felt that the documentation required updating to remove the potential for confusion to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit a policy for funding of clinical placements, where appropriate, which is drawn up in collaboration with clinical partners.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and senior management it became apparent that the programme was seeking alternate funding streams. The details of the additional funding streams was not made clear in the documentation submitted for approval. The visitors felt the proposed intakes of

independently financed students may carry wider implications to placement co-ordination. In particular independently financed students carry their funding stream to placement providers and in some case placement educators.

To prevent this situation from creating an additional incentive to supervising independently financed students, the visitors felt the programme team must provide their policy for placement funding after collaborating with practice colleagues to ensure the arrangements are satisfactory for all parties.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the placements available to the programme. In particular, further clarification is required on placements made available by and from students from the defence sector, independently funded students and changes in regional commissioning numbers.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team it became apparent that, due to the changes to the way that students on this programme would be financed, the placement experiences students would have available will also change. In particular, defence sector students would be participating in the majority of placements in that sector, and other students may also be placed in defence sector placements. Additionally, the documentation did not articulate how placements would be made available to independently financed students or that there is flexibility with the existing placement areas to support the new student numbers. The visitors felt the documentation must be updated to reflect accurately the number and range of placement experiences students will have access to.

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 clearly articulate pass level criteria will ensure safe and effective practice.

Reason: The grade descriptors supplied by the programme team indicated that in some cases the specific criteria constituting a pass grade would not ensure that a student was safe and effective. The visitors felt that the grade descriptors would need to be amended to guarantee that students would meet the SOPs for their profession on completion of the programme.

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

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

Reason: The submitted documentation 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

3.3 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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider that, if it chooses to manage the part time programme with a separate course leader from the full time programme, that the HPC will require formal notification.

Reason: In discussion, the programme team indicated they may review and separate programme leadership between two individuals.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing their work plan and reassess the burden of work in relation to the complex nature of the additional part time route.

Reason: The visitors recognised that the programme team showed a strong commitment and awareness to the increasing work load involved in running a part time programme alongside a full time route. The visitors felt that the programme team would benefit from reassessing the implications that this additional programme would have on their time, to ensure they were properly resourced.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should continue the work taking place to enhance weekend access to university support mechanisms for the part time route.

Reason: The visitors recognised the programme team's efforts in ensuring that part time students would gain full use of the facilities and support mechanisms of the education provider. The visitors wanted to support this continued development with this recommendation.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should continue the work taking place to enhance weekend access to university support mechanisms for the part time route.

Reason: The visitors recognised the programme team's efforts in ensuring that part time students would gain full use of the facilities and support mechanisms of the education provider. The visitors wanted to support this continued development with this recommendation.

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

Recommendation: The visitors considered that students were very well prepared for placements. It was mentioned by the students that, to enhance their experience, the programme team may wish to consider introductory input for the following areas:

- paediatrics;
- learning difficulties;
- mental health;
- women's health; and
- dementia

prior to students undertaking their Year 2 placement.

Reason: The visitors recommended that to further enhance the integration of theory and practice in the programme that additional subject areas were addressed in the lead up to placements.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recognised the disproportionate distribution of marks in the first category on placement and support the changes to weighting of the credit value as an interim measure. The visitors recommend that the original weightings be reinstated once the clinical module assessment grades have been recalibrated.

Reason: The visitors recognised the methods that the programme team had implemented to address possible discrepancies in placement grades, and felt that the steps taken were an appropriate interim solution. However, the visitors felt the original credit weightings reflected the programme team's commitment to putting placements at the centre of the assessment process. Therefore the visitors wished to encourage the team to review the modules in the future and again redesign and allocate an appropriate credit weighting.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors wish to commend the programme team's innovative approach to curriculum development, particularly their use of service user engagement and National Health Service Institute.

Reason: The visitors considered the programme team's approach to enhancing the curriculum significantly benefited the programme and was innovative in its approach.

Commendation: The visitors commend the use of case studies on the programme for enhancing the link between theory and practice, and for facilitating interprofessional working.

Reason: The visitors were impressed with the design and format of the case studies provided on the programme to enhance student learning, and felt that the contribution that these made to further development of coordinated learning between different healthcare professionals demonstrated innovative work.

Karen Harrison
Anthony Power

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiography
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	4 - 5 March 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' 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 25 April 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 29 May 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 28 April 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 29 May 2008.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the University of Leeds 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 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	Madge Heath (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	55
Initial approval	May 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Dr Joan Maclean (University of Leeds)
Secretary	Deborah Schofield (University of Leeds)
Members of the joint panel	Lesley Daniels (University of Leeds, Internal Panel Member) Margaret Lascelles (University of Leeds, Internal Panel Member) John Newton (College of Radiographers) Dr Nick Thyer (University of Leeds, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
Proposal document for programme changes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supplementary evidence document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the student handbook prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, they did table it at the visit itself.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the major change did not affect specialist teaching accommodation, so there was no requirement to visit them.

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

2.1 The admission procedures must give both applicant and the education provider the information they require to make, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials to remove the references to “licence to practice” and “leading to registration”.

Reason: The visitors felt that the submitted documentation contained references which must be corrected to prevent applicants or students misunderstanding their route to registration. In particular, the documentation implies HPC issues a licence to practice rather than protects professional titles and that completion of the programme leads directly to registration.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both applicant and the education provider the information they require to make, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials to clearly articulate the role of the regulator in approving the programme of study.

Reason: In the advertising materials for the programme there was apparent confusion in the terminology of HPC approval of courses. The references to HPC validating rather than approving the award must be corrected to prevent applicants or students misunderstanding the role of the HPC.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the references to HPC approving placements.

Reason: In the documentation for the programme there was apparent confusion of the role of the HPC in relation to placements. The references to HPC approving placements for the programme must be corrected to clearly reflect the roles of the regulator and education provider in approving the programme of study in order to prevent students from misunderstanding the role of the HPC.

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

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

Reason: The submitted documentation 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

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to pursue staff development in the area of research within the radiography department.

Reason: In discussion, the programme team indicated that a number of staff members were involved in active research but that this currently may not be developing in radiography specific areas. The visitors recognised the programme teams' efforts in extending staff expertise to further enhance the professional development of the department. The visitors wanted to support this continued development with this recommendation.

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 recommend that the programme team update the reading lists for all modules across the programme to widen the use of current texts.

Reason: The visitors commented that the reading lists contained in some of the current module descriptors contained texts that were not the most recent editions and that these should be updated to reflect the range of texts used on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to develop IPL opportunities throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors recognised the efforts of the programme team in working towards the development of IPL. The visitors wanted to encourage the continued development of this area, particularly in the development of more awareness for all participants of the role of radiography in the overall management of patients/clients experiences.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors wish to commend the programme team for their student mentoring scheme and the strong support mechanisms in place for the students.

Reason: The visitors felt that the pastoral, clinical and academic support that is available to the students on the programme demonstrated best practice. In particular they noted that the benefits that the mentoring scheme offered to the students, both in receiving help and developing the ability to act as mentors, made a significant and innovative contribution to the students' experience.

Madge Heath
Linda Mutema

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Relevant entitlement(s)	Local Analgesia and Prescription only medicines
Date of visit	11-12 March 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
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 Chiropodist / Podiatrist 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.

Inclusive within pre-registration programmes for chiropody / podiatry we currently approve local anaesthetics and prescription-only medicine entitlements.

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 13 May 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 29 May 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 2 June 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 3 July 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 were to consider re-validation of the programme and the professional body to consider 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	Paul Frowen (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) Jean Mooney (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
HPC observer	Kam Thandi (Partner Administrator)
Proposed student numbers	40
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Ms Delia Heneghan (The University of Northampton)
Secretary	Mr Matthew Watson (The University of Northampton)
Members of the joint panel	Mrs Chris Ager (The University of Northampton, Internal Panel Member) Mrs Rashmi Dravid (The University of Northampton, Internal Panel Member) Professor Kate Springett (Canterbury Christ Church University, External Panel Member) Mr Michael Wilding (Southwark Primary Care Trust, External Panel Member)

	<p>Dr Wilfred Foxe (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists, External Panel Member)</p> <p>Mr Jim Pickard (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists, External Panel Member)</p> <p>Mrs Elizabeth Zawisza (The University of Northampton, Internal Panel Member)</p> <p>Ms Vivien Houghton (The University of Northampton, Observer)</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"/>
Periodic subject review documentatin	<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 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 14 SETs/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 that 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, or take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme to articulate that clearly successful completion of programme leads to eligibility to apply for HPC registration to use the protected titles Chiropodist / Podiatrist.

Reason: In the submitted documentation there were references to state registration and implications that completion of the programme led directly to registration with the HPC. The visitors felt the programme team must update the documentation to prevent applicants and students misunderstanding the route to HPC registration.

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 redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly the IELTS score which is appropriate for entry to the programme.

Reason: In the submitted documentation there was an indication that applicants to the programme may be subject to English language entry criteria, but the documentation did not clearly indicate what the entry criteria were. In discussion, the programme team indicated the entry IELTS score is 6.0. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to articulate this entry requirement clearly.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly that the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks undertaken on students is at an enhanced level.

Reason: In the submitted documentation there were indications that applicants would be subject to CRB checks as part of the admissions procedures. However, the documentation did not indicate the checks would be conducted at an enhanced level. The visitors felt the documentation must be updated to state the enhanced level of the check so that applicants are aware.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly when occupational health checks will be performed on applicants / students.

Reason: The programme documentation indicated applicants would be subject to occupational health checks. However, the visitors required additional information to understand when the occupational health checks will be performed since this may impact on the students' ability to commence activities that involve patient contact. The visitors felt the documentation should be updated to state clearly at which points in the admissions process or programme students may be subject to occupational health checks.

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 programme documentation to articulate clearly that 'A' levels (or their equivalent) from the scientific disciplines would be required for entry to the programme unless the applicant was to undertake further preliminary study eg: via an access course.

Reason: The submitted programme documentation indicated applicants would need to hold A levels but did not specify their relevance to the scientific disciplines. In discussion with the programme team, it was apparent that if an applicant did not have wholly relevant A levels they may be able to undertake an access course. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to clearly articulate the above information.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly the mechanisms and processes in place for effective management of the programme.

Reason: The submitted programme documentation contained internal contradictions and was not a full reflection of the management structures in place for the programme. In discussion with the programme team it was apparent that the documentation lacked some of the details of the mechanisms and processes used to manage the programme. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to articulate clearly how the programme is managed. Once articulated, the effectiveness of the management structure can be adequately assessed. In particular, this redrafting requires the programme team to provide greater detail on the admissions process, placement approval and monitoring, curriculum development and the assessment process.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly the system used for the approval and monitoring of placements.

Reason: The submitted programme documentation did not sufficiently detail the process the education provider uses to approve and monitor practice placements. In discussion with the programme team it became apparent that relevant processes were in place to assure quality and parity of placement experience. The visitors felt the processes used should be indicated within the definitive document.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly the procedures related to failure of the placement elements of the programme. In particular, the visitors felt information was required to relate what action was required in the event of failure owed to student misconduct or concerns over safe practice.

Reason: The submitted documentation did not detail sufficiently the procedures for failure of a placement element of the programme to students or practice educator colleagues. In discussion, it was apparent the protocols for failure were in place as were protocols for failure in the event of student misconduct or concerns over safe practice. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to reflect accurately the protocols practice educators and students would be expected to follow.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly the lines of communication and responsibility whilst students are in the practice environment.

Reason: The submitted documentation did not identify clearly the lines of communication and responsibility whilst students are in placement. In discussion with practice educators, the programme team and students, it was apparent the various groups understood their roles and responsibilities. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to reflect clearly the lines of communication and responsibilities as worked within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly the training and profession update opportunities made available to practice educators.

Reason: The programme documentation did not provide information on the training that practice educators were expected to undertake before they were able to receive students. In discussion with the programme team it was clear that practice educators were required to be trained. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to indicate that practice educators must be trained, are trained, and indicate the regularity of training update.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly the over-arching assessment design.

Reason: The programme documentation did not articulate clearly how students are to be assessed throughout the programme, particularly with regard to the assessment of clinical practice. Additionally, from the discussions with the programme team, it was apparent that the programme team may make some further changes to the assessment process. The visitors felt that the programme documentation must be updated to reflect the nature of the assessment, to ensure that the assessment design and assessment procedures give assurance that a student can demonstrate fitness to practice

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the assessments related to local analgesia entitlement within the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and from the programme documentation, it was apparent that the assessment relating to local analgesia entitlement was separated into theory and practice components taking place respectively in years two and three of the programme. The visitors felt the assessment processes associated to the very specific skills related to the local analgesia entitlement must be revised to ensure that both the theory and practical components are linked clearly within the course documentation, and that both are appropriate to ensure graduates are capable of using the access and supply of local anaesthetic POMs entitlement safely and effectively

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly the implications on progression through the programme as a result of inadequate clinical based attendance.

Reason: The submitted programme documentation indicated that attendance was to be monitored but did not demonstrate what the impact on student progression may be if attendance at clinical sessions was below the stated threshold. The visitors felt the programme team must update the documentation to clearly indicate that poor clinical attendance may be a barrier to progression.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly that individuals who complete the programme and are awarded an aegrotat degree will not receive eligibility to apply for HPC registration.

Reason: The submitted documentation made clear the default award titles, but did not state definitively that an aegrotat award will not lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to include this caveat.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements 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 redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to articulate clearly that an external examiner to the programme must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: The submitted documentation did not provide a statement to indicate that external examiner appointments would be subject to the above stipulation of the regulatory body. The visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated to ensure that there is a process in place to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should begin to consider the long term impact of the School / Division of Podiatry's plans for development. In particular this consideration should take into account the impact of the plans to implement a Masters level framework and increase the delivery of a Continuing Professional Development framework on physical and staff resources.

Reason: The programme team were highly praised by students and the joint validation panel for their commitment to the student experience and student support. It was also noted that there were plans to increase the portfolio of course provision within the School. In order to be able to protect their current high level of student satisfaction the visitors felt the School of Podiatry should engage in determining what the impact of the expansion in course provision might have on the pre-registration programme, as soon as possible.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider building a stronger succession plan within the School / Division of Podiatry.

Reason: Again, it was noted that the programme team delivered a high level of support to students and did this using the considerable experience of a dedicated team. The visitors felt that in order to protect the student experience and ensure that the team was able to respond to a number of proposed and possible challenges in the future, that a stronger sense of succession planning would be beneficial.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider formalising the arrangements in place for practice placement educators to work alongside the programme team in delivery of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the high level of contact time the programme team provided to students and the potential that future pressures may reduce that amount of contact time. The visitors also noted that practice placement educators provided an as yet untapped, but enthusiastic and very capable source of additional support for students in terms of delivery of the clinical aspects of the programme, especially. Therefore the visitors wished to encourage the programme team to utilise this resource available to them to supplement delivery of the programme.

Paul Frowen
Jean Mooney