

## Visitors' report

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | Teesside University                           |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Full time                                     |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Radiographer                                  |
| <b>Relevant modality</b>             | Diagnostic radiography                        |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 6 – 8 May 2009                                |

## Contents

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents.....             | 1  |
| Executive summary.....    | 2  |
| Introduction .....        | 3  |
| Visit details .....       | 3  |
| Sources of evidence.....  | 5  |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 6  |
| Conditions .....          | 7  |
| Recommendations .....     | 10 |
| 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 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 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 (Committee) on 29 July 2009. 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 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

## Introduction

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

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

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer)<br>Stephen Boynes (Radiographer)  |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Paula Lescott<br>Tracey Samuel-Smith   |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 16   |
| Initial approval  | 1 September 2004   |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | 4 January 2010   |
| Chair   | Angela Morgan (Teesside University)<br>Paul Taylor (Teesside University Diagnostic Radiography chair)            |
| Secretary   | John Holmes (Teesside University)  |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Katherine Sanderson (Internal panel member)<br>Paul Stephenson (External panel member)<br>Mary Baker (College of |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Radiographers)<br>Helen Jones (College of<br>Radiographers) |
|--|---|

## 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 programme review  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme 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<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 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 commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the advertising materials for the programme follow the guidelines provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors’ felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to ‘eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC’.

In addition to this, any references throughout the documentation to HPC ‘accrediting’ the programme should be amended as HPC ‘approves’ programmes. Finally, the references to state registration require amending as this term is no longer in use and should not be incorporated into HPC approved programme documentation.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the English language requirements are clearly articulated within the admission procedures.

**Reason:** From the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the English language requirement for the programme. During the visit, the visitors received a print out from the education provider website entitled ‘English Language Courses and Requirements’. This print out stated that for Health programmes, the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level required was 6.0 – 7.0. The visitors were therefore unsure of the English language requirement for entry to the programme and would like to receive documentation which clarifies this.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the health requirements for admission to the programme are clearly articulated within the programme documentation.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and documentation received during the visit, the visitors' learnt that applicants are informed about any health requirements when they are invited to attend an interview. The visitors felt that this was too late in the admission procedures and that applicants should be made aware of any health requirements before they submit their application to the programme. The visitors would therefore like to receive programme documentation which clearly articulates the health requirements for entry to the programme.

**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 ensure the protocols used to gain student consent are clearly articulated.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the students, the visitors learnt that they are asked to sign a consent form during their induction week. The students stated that they were not asked at any other point during the programme to provide their consent before participating as a patient or client. The feedback from students was that they felt obliged to participate in this type of activity. The visitors discussed this with the programme team who confirmed that students are asked to complete a consent form during the induction week but that any student can withdraw their consent at any time during the course of the programme. The visitors felt that this was not sufficiently communicated to students and would therefore like to receive documentation which clearly articulates the protocol used to gain student consent, which includes information about opting out at a later date.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the attendance policy for the theory element of the programme is clearly identified to students.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the placement attendance policy, including any mandatory attendance, was clearly communicated to students and was monitored. While the visitors received confirmation from the documentation and students that the theory element was monitored, they were unsure which stages of the theory element were mandatory and how this was communicated to students. The visitors would therefore like to receive documentation which clearly identifies the attendance policy to students.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms which ensure that a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring the negotiated summer placements is undertaken.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that students undertake a negotiated summer placement between years 2 and 3. This could be in the students' base hospital but could be, if the student organised it, in a different country. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider's standard educational audit does not apply to these negotiated summer placements. The visitors were therefore unsure of the systems used to approve these placements before use and monitor them on an ongoing basis, if it was necessary. The visitors would therefore like to receive further documentation which details the mechanisms used.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider including reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within their programme documentation.

**Reason:** The visitors' are satisfied that students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement, including information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct. However, the visitors could find no reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the documentation and would like to recommend this as an enhancement to the programme.

## Commendations

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

**Commendation:** The visitors' would like to commend the education provider on their commitment to maintaining service user involvement with the programme.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the programme team and service users, the visitors learnt that the education provider has employed a Projects Officer who has specific responsibility for ensuring continued service user involvement in the programme. The visitors felt that this was highly unusual and should be commended as best practice.

Shaaron Pratt  
Stephen Boynes

## Visitors' report

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | Teesside University                              |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Full time  |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Radiographer                                     |
| <b>Relevant modality</b>             | Diagnostic radiography                           |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 6 – 8 May 2009                                   |

## Contents

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents.....             | 1  |
| Executive summary.....    | 2  |
| Introduction .....        | 3  |
| Visit details .....       | 3  |
| Sources of evidence.....  | 5  |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 6  |
| Conditions .....          | 7  |
| Recommendations .....     | 10 |
| 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 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2009 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 (Committee) on 29 July 2009. 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 13 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

## Introduction

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

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

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer)<br>Stephen Boynes (Radiographer)  |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Paula Lescott<br>Tracey Samuel-Smith   |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 16   |
| Initial approval  | 1 September 2004   |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | 4 January 2010   |
| Chair   | Angela Morgan (Teesside University)<br>Paul Taylor (Teesside University Diagnostic Radiography chair)            |
| Secretary   | John Holmes (Teesside University)  |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Katherine Sanderson (Internal panel member)<br>Paul Stephenson (External panel member)<br>Mary Baker (College of |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Radiographers)<br>Helen Jones (College of<br>Radiographers) |
|--|---|

## 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 programme review  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme 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<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 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 commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the advertising materials for the programme follow the guidelines provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors’ felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to ‘eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC’.

In addition to this, any references throughout the documentation to HPC ‘accrediting’ the programme should be amended as HPC ‘approves’ programmes. Finally, the references to state registration require amending as this term is no longer in use and should not be incorporated into HPC approved programme documentation.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the English language requirements are clearly articulated within the admission procedures.

**Reason:** From the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the English language requirement for the programme. During the visit, the visitors received a print out from the education provider website entitled ‘English Language Courses and Requirements’. This print out stated that for Health programmes, the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level required was 6.0 – 7.0. The visitors were therefore unsure of the English language requirement for entry to the programme and would like to receive documentation which clarifies this.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the health requirements for admission to the programme are clearly articulated within the programme documentation.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and documentation received during the visit, the visitors' learnt that applicants are informed about any health requirements when they are invited to attend an interview. The visitors felt that this was too late in the admission procedures and that applicants should be made aware of any health requirements before they submit their application to the programme. The visitors would therefore like to receive programme documentation which clearly articulates the health requirements for entry to the programme.

**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 ensure the protocols used to gain student consent are clearly articulated.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the students, the visitors learnt that they are asked to sign a consent form during their induction week. The students stated that they were not asked at any other point during the programme to provide their consent before participating as a patient or client. The feedback from students was that they felt obliged to participate in this type of activity. The visitors discussed this with the programme team who confirmed that students are asked to complete a consent form during the induction week but that any student can withdraw their consent at any time during the course of the programme. The visitors felt that this was not sufficiently communicated to students and would therefore like to receive documentation which clearly articulates the protocol used to gain student consent, which includes information about opting out at a later date.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the attendance policy for the theory element of the programme is clearly identified to students.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the placement attendance policy, including any mandatory attendance, was clearly communicated to students and was monitored. While the visitors received confirmation from the documentation and students that the theory element was monitored, they were unsure which stages of the theory element were mandatory and how this was communicated to students. The visitors would therefore like to receive documentation which clearly identifies the attendance policy to students.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms which ensure that a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring the negotiated summer placements is undertaken.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that students undertake a negotiated summer placement between years 2 and 3. This could be in the students' base hospital but could be, if the student organised it, in a different country. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider's standard educational audit does not apply to these negotiated summer placements. The visitors were therefore unsure of the systems used to approve these placements before use and monitor them on an ongoing basis, if it was necessary. The visitors would therefore like to receive further documentation which details the mechanisms used.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider including reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within their programme documentation.

**Reason:** The visitors' are satisfied that students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement, including information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct. However, the visitors could find no reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the documentation and would like to recommend this as an enhancement to the programme.

## Commendations

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

**Commendation:** The visitors' would like to commend the education provider on their commitment to maintaining service user involvement with the programme.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the programme team and service users, the visitors learnt that the education provider has employed a Projects Officer who has specific responsibility for ensuring continued service user involvement in the programme. The visitors felt that this was highly unusual and should be commended as best practice.

Shaaron Pratt  
Stephen Boynes



"Porch, Judith"  
<J.Porch@tees.ac.uk>  
25/06/2009 09:38

To "Paula.Lescott@hpc-uk.org" <Paula.Lescott@hpc-uk.org>  
cc  
bcc  
Subject RE: HPC Approval visit - University of Teesside - May 2009 -  
Visitors' reports

For Follow Up: Normal Priority

Dear Paula

I hope you are well.

I confirm that the programme reports for BSc (Hons) / PGD/MSc Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) / PGD/MSc Occupational Therapy are accurate.

Amendments / Corrections to Diagnostic Radiography programmes -

- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography condition regarding negotiated summer placement between years 2 and 3 is correct and will be actioned.

- MSc Diagnostic Radiography - the negotiated placement takes place at the very end of the programme (not between years 2 and 3). This point needs amending but will be actioned.

- PgD Diagnostic Radiography - the students do not have a negotiated placement so this condition needs removing.

Best wishes  
Judith

Judith Porch  
Assistant Dean Quality Enhancement and Student Experience  
School of Health and Social Care  
Teesside University  
Middlesbrough  
TS1 3BA  
Telephone: 01642 384901  
E-mail: j.porch@tees.ac.uk

School website:

<http://www.tees.ac.uk/schools/SOH/>

The information contained in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the use of the addressee and others authorised to receive it.

If you are not the intended recipient, please note that any circulation or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by telephone or email.

-----Original Message-----

From: Paula.Lescott@hpc-uk.org [mailto:Paula.Lescott@hpc-uk.org]

Sent: 02 June 2009 16:52

To: Porch, Judith

Subject: RE: HPC Approval visit - University of Teesside - May 2009 -  
Visitors' reports

Dear Judith

RE: HPC visitors' reports - University of Teesside - Multi professional  
visit reports

On behalf of the HPC and the HPC visitors, I would like to thank you for your hospitality and hard work at the approvals event held on 6-8 May 2009.

Apologies for having to leave the visit suddenly. I hope it didn't cause too many disruptions with the change of personnel.

I have attached copies of the HPC visitors' reports for the occupational therapy, physiotherapy and diagnostic radiography programmes.

Under the Health Professions Order 2001, the education provider has 28 days in which to make a representation on the HPC Visitors' reports (this is independent of submitting evidence for meeting conditions). Currently this response date is 1 July and the reports will go to the August Education and Training Committee. Just to let you know that if the programme teams wish the reports to go to the next Committee in July they could let us know any responses by 24 June if this helps.

The final HPC visitors' reports are a public document and as such if you choose to respond to the reports and wish any comments to be made public we will publish your comments along with the visitors' reports on the HPC website following approval by the Education & Training Committee. You will need to make a written request if you would like your comments published.

Please note that the continuing approval / approval of the programmes cannot be confirmed until all conditions have been met and the Education & Training Committee has sent written confirmation.

We need to set the conditions deadlines within the 28 day response period. This will then determine the Education and Training Committee that the final recommendations from the visitors will go to. We need to allow at least six weeks between your response to the conditions and the final outcome at the Education & Training Committee.

(See attached file: 20090520bEDURPTTeesside BSc DR May 2009.doc)(See attached file: 20090520bEDURPTTeesside MSc.doc)(See attached file: 20090520bEDURPTTeesside PGDip.doc)

(See attached file: 20081209aEDURPTVisitors' report - Teesside BSc Physio.doc)(See attached file: 20081209aEDURPTVisitors' report - Teesside MSc Physio.doc)(See attached file: 20081209aEDURPTVisitors' report - Teesside PgDip Physio.doc)

(See attached file: 20090602dEDURPTVisitors' report - Teesside - BSc (Hons) OT - FT.doc)(See attached file: 20090602dEDURPTVisitors' report - Teesside - MSc OT - FT.doc)

(See attached file: 20090602dEDURPTVisitors' report - Teesside - Pg Dip OT - FT.doc)

If you have any queries please contact me.

Many thanks again.

Paula

Paula Lescott  
Education Officer  
Health Professions Council  
Park House  
184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU [www.hpc-uk.org](http://www.hpc-uk.org)

tel +44 (0)20 7840 9721  
fax +44 (0)20 7820 9684

mob 07798 631403  
email paula.lescott@hpc-uk.org

To sign up to the HPC newsletter, please email [newsletter@hpc-uk.org](mailto:newsletter@hpc-uk.org)

Please consider the environment before printing this email

HPC E-mail Disclaimer:

The material transmitted in this email is intended only for the person or legal entity to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and privileged information. It may not be used or disclosed except for the purpose for which it has been sent. If you are not the addressee or have received this email in error please notify the sender and do not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on the material in this email.

---

This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by Star Internet. The service is powered by MessageLabs.

---

This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by Star. The service is powered by MessageLabs.

---