

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	14 – 15 September 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Recommendations.....	15

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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 November 2010 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 9 December 2010. 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 12 November 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 9 December 2010.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic) Marcus Bailey (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	10 January 2011
Chair	Bob Dolden (University of Greenwich)
Secretary	Emma Price (University of Greenwich)
Members of the joint panel	Stuart Allen (Internal Panel Member) Jane Stokes (Internal Panel Member) Annie Jenkin (External Panel Member) Bob Willis (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Submission document detailing programme structure, management and education provider information	<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 the programme is new and therefore there are currently no external examiner reports. The visitors did review an external examiners' report for the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme.

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 (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 43 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 14 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation and contains accurate information about the programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to there needing to be a “licence to practice as a paramedic” (Programme Handbook p41, Submission Document p21). This terminology is no longer used by the registered profession and therefore could be misleading for students.

There was an instance (Programme Handbook, p17) where it was stated that “in order to meet the regulatory body hours” students were required to achieve 100% attendance. The HPC does not set an attendance requirement for the programme.

There was an instance where it was implied that the HPC worked with the education provider to deliver the programme, “The university and Health Professions Council students have access to information to support them through all aspects of their programme. (Programme Handbook, p7)”. The HPC will register those students who successfully complete the programme and are successful in their application to the Register and not participate in the delivery of the programme.

There were several instances where references to the HPC and HPC standards were incorrect, “HPC – Health Professionals Council” (Student Paramedic Practice Assessment Document, p11), “HPC Code of Professional Conduct” (Programme Handbook, p18, p20, p38, p39). The HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics is the document to which the education provider is referring to and the HPC is the Health Professions Council.

There were also instances where the College of Paramedics was referred to as the British Paramedic Association (BPA), “BPA – British Paramedic Association – College of Paramedics” (Student Paramedic Practice Assessment Document, p11), “BPA” (Submission Document p25, Programme Handbook, p13). The British Paramedic Association is no longer known as this and the College of Paramedics should be used instead.

The visitors considered the documentation could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect information or out-of-date terminology.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence regarding the entry criteria and admissions processes for the driving standards required for this programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit stated that entry criteria for this programme included the need for the applicants' driving licence to "have no history of a drink driving offence" (Submission Document p16). Discussions with the programme team confirmed these entry requirements for the programme. The visitors articulated that, if this is the case, as part of the admissions process the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks should consider all driving offences (eg. drugs/ insurance/ speeding) that could affect this programme requirement. The visitors therefore require further evidence regarding the programme admissions criteria and CRB checks to ensure these requirements are being met and clearly communicated to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that they apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with all appropriate health requirements, and fully inform potential applicants of all health requirements.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about an occupational health screening that was required to be undertaken by the applicant before a final offer of a place on the programme is made. Discussions with the programme team confirmed the entry requirements for the programme included an occupational health screening. The visitors were aware that for drivers in this profession there is a need for certain medical standards to be met (group 2 medical standards). The visitors require further evidence detailing how the education provider will ensure that this requirement is met through the admissions criteria.

The visitors articulated that before applying to the programme potential applicants would need to be made aware of all health requirements for the programme and the potential implications if their medical status should change whilst they are on the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence regarding the selection and entry criteria and health requirements to ensure potential applicants and students are fully aware of the requirements for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit revised programme documentation that clearly articulates further information about the library resources, Web CT and IT facilities for students.

Reason: Documentation submitted by the education provider prior to this visit provided some information regarding the library, the use of WebCT in the programme and also IT facilities (Submission Document, 4.0 - Programme

Management). During the visit further information was discussed regarding these specific areas of resource for the students. The library opening times and resources available along with the procedures for procuring new texts were discussed. The various uses of WebCT during the programme and modules was discussed. The availability of the IT facilities was also discussed. The visitors noted that this information was not available in the student handbook provided for students as an important resource. They noted this information was essential for the students to be able to maximise the resources in place to support their learning during the programme. Therefore the visitors require revised programme documentation that clearly articulates further information about the library resources, Web CT and IT facilities availability for students.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Condition: The education provider must submit revised programme documentation that clearly articulates the support and management of incidents that could occur that would span both the education providers and practice placement providers remit.

Reason: The documentation provided detailed information regarding support for students (Submission Document, 6.0 – Student Support). Discussions with students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme indicated there had been occasions during placements when distressing incidents had occurred (resulting in witness statements/coroner statements or visits to the coroner court) and the levels of support received by the students had varied. The students indicated they were not fully aware of any support available from the programme team and practice placement educators (such as writing statements, ensuring a legal department looks at statements or attending court). The levels of support offered varied from students being actively approached by practice placement educators and programme team to not being contacted by either the education provider or placement provider. Discussions indicated there was no standard process for the education provider to be notified of such incidences by the placement provider and there was no standard process for the placement provider to follow if such an incident should occur whilst a student is on placement with them.

The visitors were concerned that without appropriate support mechanisms in place incidents such as these could mean students could suffer from emotional distress unnecessarily. The visitors therefore require evidence that demonstrates how distressing incidents are dealt with by the education provider and practice placement provider to support affected students and how these support mechanisms are articulated for students.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must submit revised documentation that clearly articulates procedures for students to 'opt-out' of situations when they

participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching alongside information about consent protocols.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a consent form students need to complete when they commence study on the programme. The consent form detailed the consent protocols however did not include information about procedures in place for when students decide to 'opt-out' of situations in practical and clinical teaching where they participate as service users. Discussions with the students and with the programme team indicated there would be processes in place for when students decided to 'opt-out' whereby the situation was discussed by students and relevant members of staff and a resolution was reached to ensure there would be no impact on the students learning. The visitors judged this to be important information for students to know prior to reaching a situation where they may wish to withdraw from the taught content. Therefore the visitors require revised documentation (such as the student handbook or student consent form) that clearly articulates procedures for when students decide to 'opt-out' of situations in practical and clinical teaching alongside the consent protocols already submitted.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Condition: The education provider must submit revised documentation that clearly articulates, through the students' profession-related conduct process, further details around student self-declarations throughout the academic year.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit detailed the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) disclosure undertaken by applicants before an offer on the programme is made. Documentation also detailed the requirement for the applicant to have "no more than 3 points on their (driving) licence" as this would mean they would not be eligible to commence the programme (Submission Document p16). Discussions with students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme indicated they felt it was their responsibility to disclose to the programme team if there were any incidents that may have an impact on their profession-related conduct. Discussions with the programme team indicated the same procedures would be in place for this programme.

As well as the initial CRB check, annual self-declarations were made to add an additional check onto the students. Students were expected to disclose any incidents that may have an impact on their profession-related conduct as they occurred throughout the academic year not just at the one point of self-declaration in the year. The visitors agreed that the education provider should trust the students to disclose any pertinent information through the year however articulated the education provider should provide additional encouragement for them to do so in the form of information that details consequences of not disclosing and providing explicit details of how, in what circumstances and to whom, information should be disclosed. Given the admissions criteria regarding the driving elements of the programme, students need to be made aware they must alert the programme team to any change in their driving status whilst they are on the programme. Therefore the visitors require revised documentation on the process (such as details in the student handbook) that clearly articulates the

information required through student self-declarations throughout the academic year.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirmation the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change prior to final programme approval by HPC.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors for the programme. The programme consists of existing and modified modules (from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme) and new modules. These module descriptors seen were not finalised and while the visitors were satisfied that these module descriptors ensure those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register if any changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors need to review them to ensure changes will not affect the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programmes module descriptors if any changes have been made or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further details of the plans in place for auditing the placements to be used by the programme before any students are assigned to them.

Reason: Documentation submitted detailed that the practice placements are audited by the education provider to ensure the “learning environments are safe and conducive to the students learning experience” (Submission Document p31). At the visit the education provider provided an audit that had been completed for one of the placements and indicated they had plans in place to audit all placements prior to them receiving students. The visitors require the evidence that all placements will be audited to ensure they are safe learning environments. Therefore the visitors require details of the plans in place for auditing all placements to be used by the programme before any students are assigned to them.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further details of the plans in place for the practice placement educators.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the Practice Placement Educator (PPEd) is the person who will take overall responsibility for the student experience on placement. Discussions at the visit indicated the PPEd's will be required to undertake a higher education mentorship programme to prepare them for the task of working with students. The education provider gave estimated numbers of PPEd's who are doing this qualification and stated they would be completed before the start of the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the plans that PPEd's would undertake a higher education mentorship programme however need final plans to confirm this and be sure there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at each practice placement setting. The visitors therefore require specific details of the plans in place for the PPEd's, including numbers of PPEd's undertaking the mentorship programmes, timeframes for completion of the mentorship programme and final confirmed locations of the PPEd's once qualified along with an indication of the student to PPEd ratio per placement.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must submit revised documentation that clearly indicates the structured tripartite meetings that will take place between relevant parties during placement.

Reason: The documentation submitted included the Student Paramedic Practice Assessment Document (PAD). This gives information about the placement for the student and also contains the forms used as assessment whilst on placement. Discussions with the students and programme team indicated in addition to the meetings which need to be recorded in the PAD there are also structured meetings that the student, link lecturer and PPEd attend throughout the placement to discuss the PAD, to ensure the learning outcomes are being met and to highlight and discuss any areas which may be proving problematic for the student. Details of these meetings were not included in the documentation provided for students about their placements. These tripartite meetings were judged by the visitors to be important in ensuring the students learning outcomes are achievable and in allowing feedback to be given to the student regarding their progress. The visitors therefore require revised documentation that clearly articulates information about these tripartite meetings at placement for the students.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must submit revised programme documentation that clearly articulates communication and lines of responsibility in place between practice placement educators, the programme team and students. This should include the types of incidents that occur on placement which can trigger a response from the education provider to allow the students emotional needs to be assessed.

Reason: The documentation provided detailed information regarding support for students (Submission Document, 6.0 – Student Support). Discussions with students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme indicated there had been occasions during placements when distressing incidents had occurred (resulting in witness statements/coroner statements or visits to the coroner court) and the levels of support received by the students had varied. Discussions indicated there was no standard process by which the education provider is automatically notified of an incident and then can take appropriate action with the student. The incidents were dealt with on a case by case basis and this resulted in some students not being adequately supported through traumatic experiences. The visitors were concerned that incidents such as these are commonplace among these kinds of programmes and without the appropriate support mechanisms in place students could suffer from emotional distress unnecessarily. The visitors agreed that certain incidents should trigger a standard response by the education provider to allow all students to be approached to assess their emotional need and these should be clearly communicated to the programme team, the student and the practice placement educators (such as defining incident types or providing guidelines for dealing with incidents). The communications and lines of responsibility through the practice placement to the education provider for responding to distressing incidents should be clearly articulated for the programme team, practice placement educators and students (such as in the programme handbook, placement handbook or training for practice placement educators).

The visitors therefore require revised documentation that that clearly articulates communication and lines of responsibility in place between practice placement educators, the programme team and students including the types of incidents that can trigger a response from the education provider.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirmation the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change prior to final programme approval by HPC.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors for the programme. The programme consists of existing and modified modules (from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme) and new modules. These module descriptors seen were not finalised and while the visitors were satisfied that these module descriptors ensure those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register, if any changes are to be made to the descriptors, the visitors need to review them to ensure changes will not affect the learning outcomes and therefore the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programmes module descriptors if any changes have been made or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit revised documentation that clearly articulates the policies for failing, re-sitting examinations and progressing within the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit detailed the requirements for progression on the programme and did not specify module pre-requisites. In terms of the timings of examination re-sits allowed for both academic and for placement aspects of the programme the progression from module to module was unclear. It seemed students could be repeating modules whilst progressing to the next year of the programme. The visitors were concerned that this could mean that students would be on the next academic year without successfully completing all the required learning outcomes from the previous academic year. Discussions with the programme team indicated this would not be the case in that students would not progress from year to year without completing both the academic and practice aspects of the programme. The visitors considered this important information the students should be aware of when considering their progression. Therefore the visitors require revised documentation that clearly articulates the policies for failing, re-sitting examinations and progressing within the programme.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must submit a revised programme specification document that clearly articulates all exit awards for the programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted included a programme specification which detailed only one exit award as a certificate of higher education. Discussions at the visit indicated there were also BSc and DipHE awards that

could be used as exit awards. The visitors require a revised programme specification document that articulates all exit awards available from the programme to ensure that the programme will be the only programme which contains any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in the named award.

Recommendations

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to review the opportunities for including inter-professional learning within the programme.

Reason: The documentation and discussions about the programme indicated there were limited opportunities for inter-professional learning within the programme. The programme team indicated they were keen in developing the interprofessional learning aspects of the programme wherever possible, unfortunately at present this was not viable due to the programmes constraints within the school and available resources. The programme team, students and visitors all agreed that interprofessional learning enhances students' development and ability to work in multi-disciplinary environments. The visitors acknowledge the difficulties in implementing inter-professional learning and want to encourage the programme team to keep under review the possibilities for interprofessional learning with the programme for the future.

Marcus Bailey
Gordon Pollard

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bath
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	21 - 22 September 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	15

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approves 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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keeps 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 11 November 2010 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 9 December 2010. 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 20 January 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 16 February 2010.

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 as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. 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 professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Laura Golding (Clinical Psychologist) Stephen Davies (Clinical Psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	14
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Nick Gould (University of Bath)
Secretary	Lesley Anderson (University of Bath)
Members of the joint panel	Andrew Cuthbertson (British Psychological Society) Malcolm Adams (British Psychological Society) Alana Tooze (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the descriptions of modules prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it.

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 (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with Psychology PhD students and students from the MSc Health Psychology 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 38 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 19 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the web based programme documentation and any advertising material to ensure that the criteria used for selecting students at interview will be available to applicants.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation submitted by the education provider that there was no reference to or mention of the specific criteria which will be used by the programme team to select candidates at interview. The visitors articulated that this could mean applicants may not have all of the information they require to make an informed decision about applying to the programme. During discussions with the programme team it was clarified that the intention was to make the criteria available to applicants via the education provider's website well in advance of being invited to interview. The visitors therefore require evidence of what will be provided to applicants via the website, or by other means, which articulates the criteria for selection at interview. This is to provide clarity for those applying to the programme and to ensure that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and any advertising material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors considered this out of date terminology to be inaccurate and potentially misleading to applicants and students and therefore required the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout. This is to provide clarity for those on or applying to the programme and to ensure that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme can meet every standard of proficiency for practitioner psychologists.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the curriculum will describe learning outcomes that will ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet every standard of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as module descriptors, to articulate how the curriculum will be structured to deliver learning outcomes that will allow students to meet every standard of proficiency for practitioner psychologists. This is to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will be eligible to apply to the Register and that this standard can be met.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The education provider must articulate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine if the programme's teaching and learning strategy is reflective of relevant curriculum guidance. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as a teaching and learning strategy and module descriptors, to articulate how the learning outcomes reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance. This is to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will be eligible to apply to the Register and that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that the elements of professional practice are fully integrated with the theoretical basis of the programme's teaching and learning strategy.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the programme's teaching and learning strategy will ensure that the key aspects of theory and professional practice will be integrated within the curriculum. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as a teaching and learning strategy and module descriptors, to articulate how learning

outcomes will provide students with the necessary balance of theory and practice. This is to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will be able to work safely as a clinical psychologist and that this standard can be met.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must articulate how the curriculum will react to changes in the professional environment to ensure that it remains relevant to current practice.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the programme's teaching and learning practices will allow for changes in the philosophy, core values, skill and knowledge in clinical psychology. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as module descriptors, to articulate how the curriculum reflects relevant curriculum guidance and will be able react to changes in the profession. This is to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will be able to work safely as a clinical psychologist with a good understanding of the professional environment into which they may enter.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the curriculum includes sufficient information about, and or references to, the HPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine if there were any explicit references to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics or if the HPC's Guidance on conduct and ethics for students appears in module reading lists. The visitors articulated that students should be aware of the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics on them as students and on them as professionals in the future. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation includes sufficient information about and or references to the HPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics. This is to demonstrate that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and that the programme can meet this standard.

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum supports and encourages students to develop skills in autonomous and reflective thinking.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the teaching and learning strategy supports and encourages students to develop the skills of autonomous and reflective thinking. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as module descriptors, to articulate how the curriculum will support students in developing these skills to ensure that the programme can meet this standard.

4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the curriculum encourages students to use evidence based practice through student-centred and independent learning teaching strategies.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the teaching and learning strategy supports and encourages students to utilise evidence based practice. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as module descriptors and/or teaching and learning strategy, to articulate how the curriculum will support students to develop and utilise these skills. This is to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will be able to practice will be able to practice safely and effectively as a clinical psychologist.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the range of teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not

determine if the teaching approaches used were appropriate to meet the learning outcomes, both in terms of theoretical knowledge and the practical skills needed in professional practice. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as module descriptors and/or teaching and learning strategy, to articulate how the curriculum will be structured to deliver learning outcomes that will allow students to meet every standard of proficiency for practitioner psychologists. This is to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will be eligible to apply to the register and that this standard can be met.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The education provider must articulate how the learning outcomes of the programme ensure that standard of proficiency (SOP) 1b is met.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to the visit, particularly in the SETs mapping document, that there was to be no interprofessional learning while on the programme. The visitors also noted that there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be assessed. This was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery and assessment was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the programme will enable students to learn about working in partnerships with other professionals; contribute effectively to work undertaken as part of a multi-professional team; or communicate effectively with service users. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as module descriptors and/or teaching and learning strategy, to articulate how the curriculum will be structured to deliver learning outcomes. This is to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme can meet all of the relevant SOPs for their part of the Register.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes are assessed to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will meet every standard of proficiency for practitioner psychologists.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be assessed. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery and assessment was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how provision will be made to adequately assess the necessary learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as an assessment strategy and module descriptors, to articulate how learning outcomes will be assessed to ensure that students to meet every standard of proficiency for practitioner psychologists. This is to

ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will be eligible to apply to the register and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate how the programme's assessment strategy provides a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine if the assessment of programme's learning outcomes will be at the doctoral level and if the assessment strategy can demonstrate compliance with relevant external frameworks. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as an assessment strategy and module descriptors, to articulate how learning outcomes will be assessed at the appropriate level and reflect the requirements of use the word relevant here to external reference frameworks such as QAA subject benchmark statements. This is to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme have met the relevant learning outcomes and subsequently all of the SOPs for practitioner psychologists.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate how the assessment strategy ensures that aspects of professional practice are integral to the successful completion of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the programme's assessment strategy will ensure that the key aspects of professional practice are a necessary requirement for the successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as an assessment strategy and module descriptors, to articulate how learning outcomes will be assessed. This is to ensure that successful students can meet both the professional and academic requirements required of a clinical psychologist and that this standard can be met.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must articulate how the learning outcomes are assessed to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme will meet every standard of proficiency for practitioner psychologists.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be assessed. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery and assessment was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the learning outcomes of the programme are assessed. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as an assessment strategy and module descriptors, to articulate how the programme's learning outcomes will be assessed and why the assessment methodology has been chosen. This is to ensure that students will be subject to appropriate assessment and that those who successfully complete the programme will be able to practise safely and effectively.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the assessment strategy ensures that students who successfully complete the programme are fit to practise.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the assessment of the programme's learning outcomes ensures that those students who successfully complete the programme are fit to practice. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as an assessment strategy and module descriptors, to articulate how the students' performance will be assessed and that this assessment will be objective and ensure that they are fit to practice. This is to ensure that students will be subject to appropriate assessment and that those who successfully complete the programme will be able to practise safely and effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must re-visit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how students are to be assessed to ensure that they can continue through the programme as intended.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation provided prior to, and at, the visit there was no detailed description of the curriculum or how the

teaching and learning was to be delivered. This omission was clarified during discussions with the programme team when it was highlighted that the work to articulate the detail of the curriculum delivery was to be undertaken prior to final validation by the education provider. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how the assessment regulations would be articulated to students so that they can understand what is required of them at each stage of the programme. The visitors articulated that if the regulations were not sufficiently clear it could lead to students perceiving they had been treated differently in different situations. In turn this perception may lead to decisions made about their academic performance open to successful academic appeal and to students successfully completing the programme with concerns about their ability to meet all of the SOPs. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as an assessment strategy and module descriptors to demonstrate how students will be expected to progress through the programme at each stage and how this will be clearly communicated. This is to ensure that students will be subject to appropriate assessment and that those who successfully complete the programme will be able to practise safely and effectively.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that any exit awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone achieving an exit award other than the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology would not be eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for the MPhil exit award from the programme. This could lead to the assumption that the MPhil award may allow students to apply to the Register for HPC registration when it does not. Therefore, visitors need to see evidence that the policy is clearly articulated and that any award of the MPhil would not confer eligibility to apply to the Register on any student, to ensure that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that aegrotat awards will not be awarded to students on this programme. However in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for aegrotat awards. This could lead to the assumption that the education provider regulations supersede the programme specific regulations and that an aegrotat award may be conferred. Therefore visitors need to see evidence that this policy is clearly communicated within the

programme documentation, so that it is clear that aegrotat awards would not enable students to be eligible to apply to the Register.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements after discussions with the programme team. However this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme must state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the documentation, specifically in the programme regulations, to ensure that this standard can be met.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including more detailed programme management information in the student handbook particularly about the line management arrangement for students.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation that there was a detailed description of the programme management structure and the committees which sat above this. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However the visitors articulated that there was little or no mention of the mechanisms by which the students, as employees, would be managed while they were on the programme. It was also highlighted in the discussion with the practice placement educators that this line management structure was not clear. The visitors therefore suggest that detailed information about the line management of students is included in the student and/or clinical handbook. This could elevate any potential problems which may arise if students and practice placement providers are unclear as to whom they report to if issues with personal management occur.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing the monitoring mechanisms which will ensure that there are an appropriate number of appropriately registered educators to supervise in practice placement settings.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that there are mechanisms in place which will ensure that the practice placements settings will be suitable for students and provide environments conducive to meeting the relevant learning outcomes. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However the visitors suggest that the mechanism by which the programme team ensures that there are appropriate numbers of practice placement educators to supervise trainees should be kept under review. This would be to enable the team to strengthen the process used, and to ensure that all students on the programme get as consistent a practice placement experience as possible.

Stephen Davies
Laura Golding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	28 – 29 September 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 17 November 2010 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 9 December 2010. 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 12 November 2010. 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 9 December 2010.

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 - programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. 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 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 the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration). Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Sarah Johnson (Occupational Therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	38
Initial approval	November 1994
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	January 2011
Chairs	Jo Royle (Robert Gordon University) Susan Gibb (Robert Gordon University)
Secretaries	Lucy Jack (Robert Gordon University) Alison Smart (Robert Gordon University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The programme and admissions information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by the HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC being a professional body, accrediting a programme or requiring a certain number of practice hours for the programme. There was also a reference to HPC regulations superseding the university regulations and not allowing more than ‘...one retrieval opportunity in academic or practice education’. The HPC does not accredit programmes and does not set any requirements on a programme such as number of practice hours or the number of assessment re-takes that are permitted. In addition there were references to students on completion of the programme being able to apply for registration with the HPC rather than being ‘eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.’ The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the programme and admissions documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout. This will ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all relevant instances in programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was unclear what the English-language requirements were for entry to the programme. This was due to different International English Language Testing System (IELTS) levels being specified in different parts of the programme documentation (p22 of the student handbook). At the visit, discussions with the programme team clarified that this should be level 7. To ensure that there is no confusion for students, or potential applicants, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly and consistently states the English-language requirements for entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including references to the HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students in relevant reading lists.

Reason: The visitors were content that the education provider was including the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics along with the professional body code of ethics in the detailed module descriptor and referring to the document in the sessions regarding conduct. The visitors considered that including the HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students in relevant module reading lists would enhance the student learning and provide the students with the tools to understand what is required of them when they become practitioners.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including role emerging placements as part of the programme at all stages and not just for the final placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation, in discussions at the visit that role emerging placements were being utilised and were providing key learning experiences for the students. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this SET continues to be met. However, they suggest that as the experience provided by these placements appeared positive and beneficial to both student and practice placement, including the possibility of going to a role emerging placement could be introduced earlier in the programme and not limited to the final year.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider monitoring the grading of placements, including the negotiation aspect of awarding grades, to ensure there continues to be objective measurement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and discussions with students, practice placement providers and the programme team that the current system of assessing the experience and performance of students uses a mixture of assessment methods. Some placements are assessed and are subsequently graded, in which an element of negotiation between the student and the practice placement educator is included. As the assessment of placement experience is clearly linked to learning outcomes and the fitness to practice policy, the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However they recommend that the programme team continues to monitor this mix of assessment styles and consider moving toward a pass/fail method of assessment for all practice placements. In this way the programme team may

avoid the difficulties inherent in grading practice placements, may make marking of placement experience simpler and by removing the element of negotiation may make the assessment more objective.

Joanna Goodwin
Sarah Johnson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	28 – 29 September 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 17 November 2010 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 9 December 2010. 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 12 November 2010. 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 9 December 2010.

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 - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. 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 the following programmes – MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Claire Brewis (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	42
Initial approval	September 1994
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Jo Royle (The Robert Gordon University)
Secretary	Lucy Jack (The Robert Gordon University)

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

The HPC did not review external examiners reports prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it.

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 (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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The programme and admissions information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by the HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC being a professional body, accrediting a programme or requiring a certain number of practice hours for the programme. There was also a reference to HPC regulations superseding the university regulations and not allowing more than '...one retrieval opportunity in academic or practice education'. The HPC does not accredit programmes and does not set any requirements on a programme such as number of practice hours or the number of assessment re-takes that are permitted. In addition there were references to students on completion of the programme being able to apply for registration with the HPC rather than being 'eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.' The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the programme and admissions documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout. This will ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the procedures relating to selection and entry criteria, particularly the process enacted for checking applicants for criminal convictions, is clearly stated.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the education provider had in place clear admissions procedures and entry criteria in relation to the programme, including a clear process for checking applicants for previous criminal convictions. However, the processes as detailed within the documentation were judged by the visitors not to accurately represent the procedures as described, and were thus judged to be potentially confusing. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise their documentation to accurately reflect the processes as described by the programme team during the visit.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including references to the HPC Guidance on conduct, performance and ethics for students in relevant reading lists.

Reason: The visitors were content that the education provider was including the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics along with the professional body code of ethics in the detailed module descriptor and referring to the document in the sessions regarding conduct. The visitors considered that including the HPC Guidance on conduct, performance and ethics for students in relevant module reading lists would enhance the student learning and provide the students with the tools to understand what is required of them when they become practitioners.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how they present the assessment strategy for the programme in the detailed course descriptor, so that the objectivity of assessment is more evident.

Reason: Whilst the visitors were happy that the assessment strategy and design ensured that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register, they considered that the description provided by the programme team during their meeting was clear and this level of detail could enhance the detailed course descriptor and also the student handbook further.

Fleur Kitsell
Claire Brewis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	28 – 29 September 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 17 November 2010 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 9 December 2010. 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 12 November 2010. 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 9 December 2010.

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 - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. 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 the following programmes - Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Claire Brewis (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	24
Initial approval	1 January 2001
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Jo Royle (The Robert Gordon University)
Secretary	Lucy Jack (The Robert Gordon University)

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

The HPC did not review external examiners reports prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it.

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 (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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The programme and admissions information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by the HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC being a professional body, accrediting a programme or requiring a certain number of practice hours for the programme. There was also a reference to HPC regulations superseding the university regulations and not allowing more than '...one retrieval opportunity in academic or practice education'. The HPC does not accredit programmes and does not set any requirements on a programme such as number of practice hours or the number of assessment re-takes that are permitted. In addition there were references to students on completion of the programme being able to apply for registration with the HPC rather than being 'eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.' The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the programme and admissions documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout. This will ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the procedures relating to selection and entry criteria, particularly the process enacted for checking applicants for criminal convictions, is clearly stated.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the education provider had in place clear admissions procedures and entry criteria in relation to the programme, including a clear process for checking applicants for previous criminal convictions. However, the processes as detailed within the documentation were judged by the visitors not to accurately represent the procedures as described, and were thus judged to be potentially confusing. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise their documentation to accurately reflect the processes as described by the programme team during the visit.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including references to the HPC Guidance on conduct, performance and ethics for students in relevant reading lists.

Reason: The visitors were content that the education provider was including the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics along with the professional body code of ethics in the detailed module descriptor and referring to the document in the sessions regarding conduct. The visitors considered that including the HPC Guidance on conduct, performance and ethics for students in relevant module reading lists would enhance the student learning and provide the students with the tools to understand what is required of them when they become practitioners.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how they present the assessment strategy for the programme in the detailed course descriptor, so that the objectivity of assessment is more evident.

Reason: Whilst the visitors were happy that the assessment strategy and design ensured that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register, they considered that the description provided by the programme team during their meeting was clear and this level of detail could enhance the detailed course descriptor and also the student handbook further.

Fleur Kitsell
Claire Brewis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	28 – 29 September 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 17 November 2010 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 9 December 2010. 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 12 November 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 9 December 2010.

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 the following programmes - MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Claire Brewis (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	2
Proposed start date for the programme	January 2011
Chair	Jo Royle (The Robert Gordon University)
Secretary	Lucy Jack (The Robert Gordon University)

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

The HPC did not review external examiners reports prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it as the programme seeking approval 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 (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The programme and admissions information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by the HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC being a professional body, accrediting a programme or requiring a certain number of practice hours for the programme. There was also a reference to HPC regulations superseding the university regulations and not allowing more than '...one retrieval opportunity in academic or practice education'. The HPC does not accredit programmes and does not set any requirements on a programme such as number of practice hours or the number of assessment re-takes that are permitted. In addition there were references to students on completion of the programme being able to apply for registration with the HPC rather than being 'eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.' The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the programme and admissions documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout. This will ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the procedures relating to selection and entry criteria, particularly the process enacted for checking applicants for criminal convictions, is clearly stated.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the education provider had in place clear admissions procedures and entry criteria in relation to the programme, including a clear process for checking applicants for previous criminal convictions. However, the processes as detailed within the documentation were judged by the visitors not to accurately represent the procedures as described, and were thus judged to be potentially confusing. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise their documentation to accurately reflect the processes as described by the programme team during the visit.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including references to the HPC Guidance on conduct, performance and ethics for students in relevant reading lists.

Reason: The visitors were content that the education provider was including the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics along with the professional body code of ethics in the detailed module descriptor and referring to the document in the sessions regarding conduct. The visitors considered that including the HPC Guidance on conduct, performance and ethics for students in relevant module reading lists would enhance the student learning and provide the students with the tools to understand what is required of them when they become practitioners.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how they present the assessment strategy for the programme in the detailed course descriptor, so that the objectivity of assessment is more evident.

Reason: Whilst the visitors were happy that the assessment strategy and design ensured that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register, they considered that the description provided by the programme team during their meeting was clear and this level of detail could enhance the detailed course descriptor and also the student handbook further.

Fleur Kitsell
Claire Brewis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Therapeutic radiography
Date of visit	30 September 2010 – 1 October 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	11

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Radiographer' or 'Therapeutic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 17 November 2010 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 9 December 2010. 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 5 November 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 9 December 2010.

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 and validating body 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	Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer) Simon Walker (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	12
Proposed start date of programme approval	14 February 2011
Chair	David James (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Sarah Gutteridge (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Carolyn Bromfield (Internal Panel Member) Kate Brooks (Internal Panel Member) Wendy Woodland (Internal Panel Member) Geraldine Francis (External Panel Member) Hazel Colyer (Society and College of 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dissertation 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 (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with second year students from the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy programme who are already first degree holders 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 46 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 SETs.

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials to ensure that applicants can clearly access information about the application process and the funding arrangements available to students to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to apply or take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that potential applicants may not be able to clearly access information about the application process. The visitors need to see the programme documentation including advertising materials amended to clearly outline the application process, to highlight the fact that a clinical visit is required as part of the application process and that an interview will be required involving the programme team and practice placement representatives.

The visitors also noted that the programme documentation does not clearly highlight the funding arrangements (such as bursaries and loans) available to students and therefore require the programme documentation including advertising materials to be amended to make this information more accessible to potential applicants. The visitors require the education provider to inform potential applicants that the programme will involve the need for some students to travel to practice placements and stay away from the main site where the programme is delivered. The funding arrangements for this travel and accommodation must also be clearly highlighted to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials to ensure that it gives the applicant the information they need around criminal record checks to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and advertising materials it was clear that the education provider does not clearly and universally outline the admissions requirements in terms of criminal conviction checks. The visitors noted that some of this information was available within the documentation but was often difficult to find and felt that a potential applicant would find it difficult to access. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate these details within all programme documentation and advertising materials to allow applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials to ensure that it gives the applicant the information they need around health requirements to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and advertising materials it was clear that the education provider does not clearly and universally outline the admissions requirements in terms of health check compliance. The visitors noted that some of this information was available within the documentation but was often difficult to find and felt that a potential applicant would find it difficult to access. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate these details within all programme documentation and advertising materials to allow applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and other inclusion mechanisms are clearly explained and articulated to applicants and students.

Reason: From the documentation provided and from discussions with the programme team the visitors could not determine how the education provider informs applicants and trainees of the inclusion mechanisms that the education provider has in place, including AP(E)L. The visitors noted that they were provided with evidence of a procedure for AP(E)L, however they require further information to demonstrate how the education provider explains AP(E)L and widening-participation policies to applicants and students, including the policies and procedures for agreeing and awarding credits, an idea of how much experience and learning the education provider will accept and the associated costs. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly outline the staffing arrangements that are in place to demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with senior management and the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider is planning to run the proposed MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology programme as well as the current HPC approved BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy programme. The visitors also noted that the education provider intends to increase the total cohort size across their radiotherapy programmes and has not outlined plans for any extra staffing provision. The visitors require

evidence detailing the staffing arrangements in place to facilitate both an increase in total cohort size and also how the staffing provision will work across the different radiotherapy programmes.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a clear programme management structure and clearly highlight the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in this structure, as well as detailing their respective roles and responsibilities on other associated radiotherapy programmes delivered by the education provider.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and a review of the programme documentation the visitors were not clear about the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the proposed MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology programme. The visitors noted that the education provider is planning to run the proposed MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology programme as well as the current HPC approved BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy programme. Given the fact that the programme team will be involved in the delivery of both the approved BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and the proposed MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology programmes the visitors require clear evidence of the programme management structure that clearly highlights the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved across both programmes.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must further demonstrate how the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: From a review of the programme leader's CV the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors are yet to see evidence to suggest that the programme leader has had previous experience of leading a programme of study and previous experience of working in a higher education setting at a postgraduate level. The visitors also noted that the programme leader is yet to complete a master's level qualification. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From discussions with the senior management team the visitors noted that the education provider plans to run the proposed MSc Radiotherapy and

Oncology programme as well as the current HPC approved BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy programme. The visitors also noted that the education provider intends to increase the total cohort size across their radiotherapy programmes and has not outlined plans for any extra staffing provision. As the visitors are required to look at staffing within the overall context of the education that the education provider offers, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are in place to deliver an effective programme given the fact that two programmes will be running simultaneously. The visitors require further evidence to outline the staffing provision across the two programmes, including the time they are allocated to each programme and arrangements that are in place to deal with situations such as staff absences.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted evidence of a consent form. The visitors however did not see any evidence of guidelines to support this document and were unable to investigate how the consent procedure is implemented to mitigate any risk involved in trainees participating as service users. The visitors require further evidence to show the consent policy in place, how the education provider will collect consent and also how they will inform students about this policy and their right to confidentiality.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the range of learning and teaching approaches used is appropriate to the effective delivery of the radiation science curriculum.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the delivery of radiation science is delivered via self-directed study. The visitors noted that the expectation would be that the delivery of radiation science at master's level would have a taught element. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the range of learning and teaching approaches used is appropriate to the effective delivery of the radiation science curriculum, with specific reference to the radiation science aspects of SOP 3a.1.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment of students on practice placement.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students have to pass a practice placement on the first attempt to progress on the programme and that no re-sit is available. The visitors also noted that the assessment tool used by the practice placement educators to assess students whilst on placement does not allow any element of the assessment to be failed. The visitors were concerned that if a student failed an element of the practice placement they would be removed from the programme without the opportunity to develop this failed area. The visitors require further evidence, outlining how a failing student is supported on practice placement and how they are supported by the education provider during clinical visits to identify weak areas that need to be developed and, if appropriate, action plans formed. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider introducing a practice placements' induction earlier in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard were being met. However the visitors did note that the practice placement in year one does not take place until the end of the year. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers giving students an introduction to the placement setting earlier in the programme to allow students to gain a sense of what to expect from the practice placement element of the programme given the issues with attrition within the profession.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider keeping a record of the practice placement educators' HPC Registration numbers.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard were being met. The visitors did however feel that the education provider should consider keeping a record of the practice placement educators HPC Registration numbers as part of the practice placement audit process. The visitors suggest this would demonstrate best-practice and ensure that the education provider can continually monitor the registration status of the practice placement educators.

Kathryn Burgess
Simon Walker

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Birmingham Metropolitan College
Validating body / Awarding body	Aston University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Relevant entitlement(s)	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Date of visit	9 – 10 November 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Chiropodist' or '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.

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 14 December 2010 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 9 December 2010. 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 December 2010. 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 16 February 2011.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider issues raised by the previous year's annual monitoring process. The issues raised by annual monitoring affected the following standards - programme management and resources, and practice placements. 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 and awarding body did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist/Podiatrist) Phil Mandy (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	34 per cohort once a year
Initial approval	9 May 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	26 September 2011
Chair	Kim Pankhurst (Birmingham Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Siân Davies (Birmingham Metropolitan University)

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"/>
Internal annual monitoring reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Response to HPC Annual monitoring visitors' report	<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 (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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit revised programme documentation that has had instances of confusing and incorrect information removed.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted prior to the visit inconsistencies and confusing information. In particular there were instances of modules being called by differing titles through the documents (for example within the Student handbook on pages 6, 11 and 23 the same module is referred to as, “Functional Anatomy”, “Anatomy” and “Functional Anatomy of the Lower Limb”). There was also a misleading statement saying the programme leads to “registration with the Health Professions Council” (Programme Specification – ‘Educational aims of the programme’ and Student Handbook p11). This statement is inaccurate in that the qualification leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register rather than leading to registration. As an important resource for the programme, the visitors considered the documentation currently to be confusing for students and staff. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise documentation to remove incorrect information as noted and to clarify the module titles where needed.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must implement formal written protocols to obtain consent when students participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and through discussion with the programme team, consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in clinical and practical teaching. There was no formal information regarding consent protocols in place, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed. In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from students or could appropriately manage situations where students declined to participate in the practical and clinical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching (such as alternative learning arrangements).

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must submit revised documentation that includes information regarding their interim awards for this programme.

Reason: The documentation provided (the Programme Specification and Student Handbook) prior to the visit clearly stated the programme would not award interim awards to students exiting the programme before full completion of the approved programme award. Upon further discussions at the visit the education provider stated they did grant interim awards to students who chose to exit the programme before fully completing the approved programme in the form of a certificate or diploma of higher education that did not contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register. For clarity for students, staff and any external assessors, the visitors require this information to be updated in the relevant documents.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the requirement for at least one external examiner appointed to the programme to be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider additional improvements for the Research dissertation module.

Reason: Discussions at the visit indicated that the module handbook for the Research dissertation module needed to be updated as a matter of course. The visitors were happy with the module content, assessment and plan to update the handbook but would like to recommend some additional improvements for this module.

They recommend the education provider consider implementing a formal arrangement for supervising the student working on the research dissertation such as a signed agreement or contract to set out the roles and boundaries for the student and for the project supervisor. The visitors recommend the education provider also consider clearly identifying the required hours for the supervisor to give to the student so as to avoid instances where more time is given than is appropriate. During discussion at the visit it was stated that there was an informal arrangement in place whereby tutors who had not supervised a student undertaking a research dissertation were mentored by more experienced tutors. The visitors wish to recommend the education provider formalise this arrangement and expand it to include some additional training for all project supervisors.

The visitors felt these additions to the research dissertation module would enhance the learning and teaching experience for students and staff and provide a standard level of knowledge and experience across the board for all involved in the programme.

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider the way in which they communicate the importance of personal development to the students.

Reason: Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated they felt the students were well informed of the importance and use of a personal development plan. The students were familiar with the concepts of autonomous and reflective thinking as indicated by their engagement with the programme and their knowledge of the profession and of their own development but were not fully aware of the terminology of a personal development plan. Whilst the visitors were satisfied this standard was met, discussions with the programme team indicated that perhaps the terminology had not been properly communicated to students and that recent changes to the modules would address this and strengthen the understanding of personal development through the programmes duration. The visitors were happy with the changes proposed but would like to recommend the

education provider continually consider how they communicate the importance of the personal development plan to the students to be sure they are fully aware of the implications and purpose of having such an understanding of their own development through the programme and through their professional careers.

Phil Mandy
Paul Blakeman