hpc health professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Orthoptist
Date of visit	18 – 19 October 2011

Contents

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 'Orthoptist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 December 2011 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) 22 February 2012. 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 8 February 2012. 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 29 March 2012.

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 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	Alison Bruce (Orthoptist) Helen Griffiths (Orthoptist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	16
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2012
Chair	Rachel Russell (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Morven Gillies (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Rosie Auld (External Panel Member) Halbert Mills (Internal Panel Member) Edward Horn (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HPC did not review any external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there are currently no external examiners appointed to the programme 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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☐	☐	☒
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Optometry 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 42 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 SETs.

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

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

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

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 of the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect terminology in reference to the 'Health Professions Council for Orthoptics' (p72 programme approval submission document', p37 student handbook) and the HPC being '…responsible for the governance of the Orthoptic profession' (p2 student handbook). HPC is the regulator for 15 professions and as such is not referred to as the 'Health Professions Council for [Profession]' as this implies it is for one profession only. As a statutory regulator the HPC is responsible for the protection of the public through the protection of the title 'Orthoptist', the HPC is not responsible for the governance of the profession. The visitors also noted statements in the programme documentation such as '…1000 hours of practice education … thereby fulfilling the requirement of the professional/statutory body' (p17 clinical practice education handbook). The HPC sets no requirement on the number of hours of practice education that a student would need to complete in order to meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors considered these uses of terminology to be inaccurate and potentially misleading to applicants, and students, and therefore require 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.

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 provide further evidence of the information that will be provided to applicants prior to them applying or taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: From discussions at the visit and from the documents provided by the programme team, the visitors noted that no materials have yet been produced to inform potential applicants about the programme. The visitors were aware of the information included within the 'programme approval submission document' and student handbook but were unclear as to how this information would be communicated to potential students. In particular it was not clear how the scheme of placements including the requirement for students to fund any associated travel and accommodation would be communicated to applicants. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how applicants will be provided with the information they require to make an informed decision about taking up a place on

the programme. In this way they can be sure that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require and 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 ensure that the information regarding possible direct entry onto the programme at level 2 or 3 is not communicated to applicants until such time as these routes onto the programme are available.

Reason: As a result of discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that the programme does not currently allow students to enter the programme at level 2 or above. However, the visitors identified statements in the documentation provided which articulate how a student may be accepted onto the programme at level 2 or 3, depending on previous experience. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that these statements are designed for possible future use in allowing students on existing programmes to transfer to the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics. As this policy regarding direct entry to levels 2 and 3 of the programme is not to be used for the programme initially, this could potentially lead to an appeal and an unsuitable applicant gaining a place on the programme. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to ensure that the information regarding these possible entry routes are included only when these routes on the programme are available and have been through the HPC change notification process. This will ensure that a potential applicant will have all of the information they require to make an informed choice about applying to the programme and that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how the programme fits into the education providers' business plan and what commitment is being made to ensure that the programme is secure.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided by the programme team that the programme proposal had yet to be granted the required approval from the relevant education provider committees. In discussion with the senior team it was clarified that the programme proposal had been agreed at previous committees prior to an organisational restructure. As a result of this reorganisation the programme proposal now needs to be granted approval from a newly formed committee in order to progress and be included in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the programme's secure place in the business plan. This is to ensure that the resources to support the programme's development, including the recruitment of any necessary staff, are in place and available to the programme team. In this way the visitors can be sure that the programme is secure and that this standard can be 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 commit to increasing the number of appropriately qualified orthoptic staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided, both prior to the visit and during the visit, that there were roughly the equivalent of 1.8 full time orthoptic staff involved in the delivery of the programme. In discussion with the senior team and the programme team plans to increase the level of orthoptic specific involvement in the delivery of programme were highlighted. These plans included the potential recruitment of further orthoptic staff to the programme. However it was clear from the programme documentation, and in discussions at the visit, that these plans had yet to be agreed by the relevant committees at the education provider. Therefore, while plans to increase the number of orthoptic staff have been included in the development planning of the programme these plans have yet to be ratified and agreed. The visitors require reassurance that the number of staff on the programme team delivering the orthoptic programme is appropriate to deliver an effective programme. To provide this reassurance the visitors require evidence that the education provider will commit to increasing the number of orthoptic staff available to deliver this programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to effectively deliver this programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit any revised programme documentation if changes are made as a result of this internal validation event.

Reason: From the submission provided prior to the visit the visitors were clear that the student handbook and other programme documentation support the learning and teaching activities of the programme. However, in discussions throughout the visit it was clear amendments may be made to these documents as a result of the internal validation process. Visitors' decisions regarding whether or not the SETs are met must be made with the documentation that will be used in the operation of the programme. The visitors will need to review any changes that are made to the programme documentation in order to determine if the SETs are met. Therefore, the HPC visiting panel will need to see any amended or 'final' versions of the documentation to be sure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how this attendance is monitored.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there was no explicit reference to where and when attendance is mandatory for students on the programme. In discussion with the students it was highlighted that there is an

attendance policy and that students are aware of when attendance is mandatory. The visitors also discussed the attendance policy with the senior team who highlighted that a new education provider-wide policy was being instituted and would be in practice when the programme begins. However, the visitors were unsure how students starting the programme would be informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how students are made aware of what effect contravening this policy may have on their ability to progress through the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standard of proficiency (SOP);

3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice
  o be able to plan, operate and evaluate appropriate vision screening programmes

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the learning outcomes ensure students are able to meet SOP 3a.1 upon completion of the programme. In particular they were unclear as to where students were taught how to plan, operate and evaluate vision screening programmes. Through discussion with the programme team it was clarified that these skills would be covered within key modules on the programme. However, these elements of learning and teaching were not included in the standards of proficiency mapping for the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the module learning outcomes, students will be taught to about, and understand, how to plan, operate and evaluate relevant vision screening programmes. In this way the visitors can be sure that the students who successfully complete the programme can meet SOP 3a.1.

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.

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarification of how the scheme of placements will work in practice and how this scheme will allow students to meet relevant learning outcomes.

Reason: From discussions at the visit and from the programme documentation the visitors noted that the programme's scheme of placements is designed to provide students with sufficient placement experience to meet relevant learning outcomes. This scheme includes a series of long 'block' placements occurring over several weeks alongside a series of 'day' placements lasting for a single day. However the visitors could not determine how this scheme of placements is

designed to work in practice. The number of block placements that students are required to complete is referenced differently in different parts of the programme documentation and it is also unclear as to how the day placements will fit into the programme timetable. The visitors were also unclear as to how the placement swap scheme (p23 clinical practice education handbook) will affect the placement experience that students are exposed to. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the scheme of placements will work in practice to be sure that the duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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 provide further evidence of how practice placement educators are prepared to assess students and what action is to be taken in case of a student's failure to progress.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and the practice placement providers it was clear that practice placement educators were expected to undertake relevant professional body training prior to supervising students. It was also clarified that if the professional body's training was not available the education provider would offer similar practice placement educator training to that provided for other allied health professionals. However, the visitors were unclear about how these offerings would provide practice placement educators with the necessary programme specific training. In particular it was unclear as to how practice placement educators would be prepared to assess students using the programmes assessment procedures and how they were informed of what to do in the case of a student's failure to progress. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how practice placement educators are fully prepared to supervise students on this programme to be sure that this standard can be met.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Condition: The programme team must ensure that there is no requirement for students to record patient identifiers as part of their technique record book.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the programme team and with the practice placement educators that confidentiality of service users would be paramount on placements and that all relevant data protection policies and procedures would be followed. However the visitors noted in the techniques record book (appendix 10, clinical practice education handbook) that patient initial and numbers are asked for. If filled in, this could lead to service users

confidential details being accessible to those who do not have consent to see them. In turn this could lead to the data protection policies of the education provider and the practice placement provider being breeched. The visitors therefore require any requirement for the recording of service users' initials or patient numbers to be removed from the relevant documentation to protect the rights of service users and to ensure that this standard is met.

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 programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the assessment strategy of the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the following standard of proficiency;

3a.1   know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice
- be able to plan, operate and evaluate appropriate vision screening programmes

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the assessment strategy ensures students are able to meet SOP 3a.1 upon completion of the programme. In particular, they were unclear as to where students were assessed on their knowledge of how to plan, operate and evaluate vision screening programmes. Through discussion with the programme team it was clarified that these skills would be covered within key modules on the programme. However, as it was unclear in the assessment strategy where this knowledge would be assessed, the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates where, in the assessment strategy, the students will be assessed on their knowledge of how to plan, operate and evaluate vision screening programmes. In this way the visitors can be sure that the students who successfully complete the programme can meet SOP 3a.1 and that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure that any objective structured clinical examination (OSCE), within a placement setting in stage 4 of the programme, is rigorous and effective.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were clear that an OSCE examination at the end of the placement period in stage 4 is a key part of the assessment of a student's competency. However the visitors could not determine how these examinations were to be organised, managed and operated as the examinations are to take place within a student's final practice placement setting. The examinations are also designed to be supervised and marked by practice placement educators, not members of the programme team. The visitors were therefore unsure as to how the programme team ensured that these examinations are undertaken

appropriately and that the assessment of students' competencies is comparable across all placement sites. To ensure that this standard can be met the visitors require further evidence of how the OSCE examinations in stage 4 of the programme will be organised, managed and put into practice. In particular the visitors require further evidence of how the examinations will comply with external reference frameworks and be rigorous and effective across all placement sites.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure that any objective structured clinical examination, within a placement setting in stage 4 of the programme, measures the relevant learning outcomes.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were clear that an OSCE examination at the end of the placement period in stage is a key part of the assessment of a student's practical knowledge. However the visitors could not determine how these examinations were to be organised, managed and operated as the examinations are to take place within a student's final practice placement setting. The examinations are also designed to be supervised and marked by practice placement educators, not members of the programme team. The visitors were therefore unsure as to how the programme team ensured that these examinations are undertaken appropriately and that the assessment of students' competencies is comparable across all placement sites. To ensure that this standard can be met the visitors require further evidence of how the OSCE examinations in stage 4 of the programme will be organised, managed and put into practice. In particular the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensures that the examinations at each placement site will ensure that students can meet all of the relevant learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure that any objective structured clinical examination, within a placement setting in stage 4 of the programme, is objective and ensures fitness to practice.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were clear that an OSCE examination at the end of the placement period in stage is a key part of the assessment of a student's practical knowledge. However the visitors could not determine how these examinations were to be organised, managed and operated as the examinations are to take place within a student's final practice placement setting. The examinations are also designed to be supervised and marked by practice placement educators, not members of the programme team. The visitors were therefore unsure as to how the programme team ensured that these examinations are undertaken appropriately and that the assessment of students' competencies is comparable across all placement sites. To ensure that this standard can be met the visitors require further evidence of how the OSCE examinations in stage 4 of the programme will be organised, managed and put into practice. In particular the visitors require further evidence of how the

programme team ensures that the examinations at each placement site will ensure students' fitness to practice.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how the assessment marks on placement are derived and what effect each mark may have on a student's ability to progress through the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that students will be marked on their placement experience and these marks will be graded. The visitors noted in the documentation that this grading scheme was from A+, where almost all competencies are met highly satisfactorily, to F, where competencies were not met. However, within this scheme it was unclear as to how a student would achieve each grade. The visitors were also unclear as to how the grade on placement affected a student's progression through the programme and what effect this grading may have on their final degree award. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the grading scheme on placement works and how a student would achieve these grades. They also require further evidence of how these grades may affect a student's progression through the programme and what, if any, effect this may have on a student's final degree award. In this way the visitors can be sure that the requirements for student progression and achievement are clearly specified and that this standard can be met.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation to state that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. From conversations with the programme team the visitors were satisfied with the current arrangements to appoint an external examiner for the programme. However they require further evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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 should consider how best to inform the HPC of any changes to the entry requirements for those applicants with prior (experiential) learning.

Reason: As a result of discussions at the visit, the visitors identified that the programme does not have in place a policy to allow students to enter the programme at level 2 or above. Therefore they were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors noted statements in the programme documentation which articulates how a student may be accepted onto the programme at level 2 or 3, depending on previous experience. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that these statements are designed for possible future use to allowing students on existing programmes to transfer to the BSc (Hons) Orthoptics. If the policy to accept students onto the programme directly at stage 2 or stage 3 is implemented the visitors recommend that the education provider should notify the HPC as soon as possible through the major change process. This is due to the fact that the introduction of this policy may change how the programme continues to meet this standard.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider keeping the collaborative arrangements between themselves and the practice placement providers under review to ensure that the collaboration continues effectively.

Reason: The visitors noted in the 'programme approval submission document' the comprehensive and detailed plans the programme team have put in place to ensure that effective, regular collaboration between themselves and practice placement providers will happen. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the plans as articulated would seem to require a significant commitment of time for both the programme team and the practice placement providers and educators. The visitors therefore recommend that the collaborative arrangements outlined in the 'programme approval submission document' are monitored when put into practice. In this way the programme team can ensure that the time commitment to these arrangements is suitable and can be reviewed, if necessary. In this way the programme team can ensure that effective collaboration continues and that the time commitment required to make these arrangements work is feasible for all parties involved.

Helen Griffiths
Alison Bruce

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Sandwich)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	9 – 10 November 2011

Contents

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 'Biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 22 December 2011 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 22 February 2012. 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 23 December 2011. 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 22 February 2012.

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes and adding a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

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 and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied a secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science – full time and part time. A separate report exists for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Robert Williams (Biomedical scientist) Mary Macdonald (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	Maximum of 30 students split across full time, part time and sandwich routes
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2011
Secretary	Fahmeeda Rashid (Northumbria University at Newcastle)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

A number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any 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.

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, consistent and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted a number of instances where out of date or incorrect terminology is used. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that it is accurate, current and consistent. The visitors noted a reference within the Practice Placement Handbook to the programme '…seeking HPC approval of the degree in 2007'. The HPC visited the programme in 2007 and this statement is now out of date. The visitors also noted a reference within the same document to the requirement for applicants to the HPC Register needing to obtain a health reference from a GP. Applicants to the HPC Register are now required to sign a declaration about their health status. The visitors therefore require this documentation to be updated.

The visitors finally noted in discussions with the programme team it was stated that students transfer on to the applied route at the end of year two of the programme before the placement year. However, from a review of the Overview Document the visitors noted on page 26 that it states 'students on the Biomedical Science programme who undertake a 1-year placement in an approved training laboratory as part of a sandwich degree are offered a transfer to the Applied Biomedical Science (sandwich) programme for the final year if they have successfully completed the IBMS Portfolio and gained the Certificate of Competence. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure it is consistent and students are clear of the transfer point within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all students undertake an appropriate criminal convictions check.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the education provider has a Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) policy in place. However, from discussions with the students the visitors also noted that some students stated that they had not undertaken a criminal convictions check. Through discussions with the programme team it was highlighted that they often rely on the individual practice placement providers to facilitate the criminal convictions check. The programme team also stated that they can facilitate this check where a practice placement provider did not offer or require it. The visitors finally noted that in the Practice Placement Handbook it states that students must 'provide a satisfactory disclosure from the CRB before you will be allowed to undertake the placement and transfer to the Applied Biomedical Sciences

6

degree'. The visitors therefore require clarification and further evidence that demonstrates that the CRB policy is applied and that the admissions procedures ensure that all students undertake an appropriate criminal convictions check.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that the available resources in all placement settings are effectively used to support student learning.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However the visitors did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each placement setting effectively uses the resources available to support student learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence, including the audit tools, of how the programme team ensures that placements effectively use the available resources to support student leaning in all settings.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that the available resources in all placement settings effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However the visitors did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each placement setting effectively uses the resources available to support student learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that placements have sufficient resources in place at all placement settings.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the formal mechanisms in place which ensure that all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However, the visitors noted that the informal mechanisms, outlined through discussions at the visit, did not demonstrate a consistent approach to auditing practice placements. As this was the case the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider takes responsibility for ensuring that all practice placement learning is conducted in a safe and supportive environment. To be sure that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence of the formal mechanisms, including audit tools, that the education provider uses to ensure that placements provide safe and supportive environments.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the audit tool and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor all placements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However, the visitors did not have enough evidence from discussions at the visit and from the documentation provided, to demonstrate that a thorough and effective system is in place for the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the education providers auditing process along with any policies and procedures used to support the approval and monitoring of all placements settings.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all practice placement settings.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However, the visitors did not have enough evidence of the systems or processes the programme team use to ensure that all placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The visitors require further evidence, including the auditing tools, to demonstrate how they ensure that placement providers have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to supervise students and ensure they gain the experience they require.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). However, the visitors did not have enough evidence, from discussions at the visit and from the documentation provided, of the systems or processes in place to ensure that practice placement educators in all settings are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the systems or process to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators in all settings are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Mary Macdonald
Robert Williams

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	9 – 10 November 2011

Contents

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 'Biomedical scientist'must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 22 December 2011 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 22 February 2012. 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 23 December 2011. 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 22 February 2012.

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 and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied a secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Sandwich) – full time. A separate report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Robert Williams (Biomedical scientist) Mary Macdonald (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	Maximum of 30 students split across full time, part time and sandwich routes
First approved intake	1 September 2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Secretary	Fahmeeda Rashid (Northumbria University at Newcastle)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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.

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 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are 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.

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, consistent and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted a number of instances where out of date or incorrect terminology is used. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that it is accurate, current and consistent. The visitors noted a reference within the Practice Placement Handbook to the programme '…seeking HPC approval of the degree in 2007'. The HPC visited the programme in 2007 and this statement is now out of date. The visitors also noted a reference within the same document to the requirement for applicants to the HPC Register needing to obtain a health reference from a GP. Applicants to the HPC Register are now required to sign a declaration about their health status. The visitors therefore require this documentation to be updated.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all students undertake an appropriate criminal convictions check.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the education provider has a Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) policy in place. However, from discussions with the students the visitors also noted that some students stated that they had not undertaken a criminal convictions check. Through discussions with the programme team it was highlighted that they often rely on the individual practice placement providers to facilitate the criminal convictions check. The programme team also stated that they can facilitate this check where a practice placement provider did not offer or require it. The visitors finally noted that in the Practice Placement Handbook it states that students must 'provide a satisfactory disclosure from the CRB before you will be allowed to undertake the placement and transfer to the Applied Biomedical Sciences degree'. The visitors therefore require clarification and further evidence that demonstrates that the CRB policy is applied and that the admissions procedures ensure that all students undertake an appropriate criminal convictions check.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that the available resources in all placement settings are effectively used to support student learning.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However the visitors did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each placement setting effectively uses the resources available to support student learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence, including the audit tools, of how the programme team ensures that placements effectively use the available resources to support student leaning in all settings.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that the available resources in all placement settings effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However the visitors did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each placement setting effectively uses the resources available to support student learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that placements have sufficient resources in place at all placement settings.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the formal mechanisms in place which ensure that all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS).

The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However, the visitors noted that the informal mechanisms, outlined through discussions at the visit, did not demonstrate a consistent approach to auditing practice placements. As this was the case the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider takes responsibility for ensuring that all practice placement learning is conducted in a safe and supportive environment. To be sure that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence of the formal mechanisms, including audit tools, that the education provider uses to ensure that placements provide safe and supportive environments.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the audit tool and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor all placements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However, the visitors did not have enough evidence from discussions at the visit and from the documentation provided, to demonstrate that a thorough and effective system is in place for the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the education providers auditing process along with any policies and procedures used to support the approval and monitoring of all placements settings.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all practice placement settings.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). The visitors also noted that the programme team additionally use a number of informal mechanisms to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. These include looking at the placement environment during placement visits

throughout the year and ensuring that all placements sign a self-declaration to state that they continue to meet the CPA and IBMS standards.

However, the visitors did not have enough evidence of the systems or processes the programme team use to ensure that all placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The visitors require further evidence, including the auditing tools, to demonstrate how they ensure that placement providers have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to supervise students and ensure they gain the experience they require.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider only uses practice placements that are Clinical Pathology Accredited (CPA) and have been approved as training laboratories by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS). However, the visitors did not have enough evidence, from discussions at the visit and from the documentation provided, of the systems or processes in place to ensure that practice placement educators in all settings are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the systems or process to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators in all settings are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Mary Macdonald
Robert Williams

![hpc health professions council]

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Dietitian
Date of visit	29 – 30 November 2011

Contents

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 'Dietitian' 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 9 January 2012 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 22 February 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 February 2012. 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 10 May 2012.

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, 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.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	22 per cohort once a year
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Garfield Southall (University of Chester)
Secretary	Sue Sutton (University of Chester)
Members of the Joint Panel	Stephen Hughes (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
Overview of quality monitoring and enhancement of dietetics programmes and	☒	☐	☐
Programme quality monitoring – responses to external examiners reports and annual monitoring reports	☒	☐	☐
Student experience visits: a guide	☒	☐	☐
Equality and diversity policy	☒	☐	☐
Joint programme team minutes	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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.

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 programme team must revise the advertising materials for the programme to clearly articulate information about the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APL / AP(E)L) policies for the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the APL / AP(E)L policies for the programme. However, the visitors noted that the advertising materials did not include this information. Discussion with the programme team confirmed they did not include this information in advertising materials because if applicants used the APL /AP(E)L policies they would not be eligible for all, or some, of the NHS bursary and so be financially disadvantaged. The programme team stated that if anyone enquired about APL / AP(E)L they would be given the information. The visitors noted this reasoning, however considered information about APL / AP(E)L should be communicated clearly for all potential applicants in order for them to be able to make an informed decision about taking up or applying for a place on the programme.

The visitors therefore require the advertising materials (including the website, leaflets, prospectus) to be revised to include information about APL / AP(E)L and the financial impacts, to ensure applicants have all the information they need to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must implement formal protocols to obtain informed 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 through discussion with the students and the programme team there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent to participate as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. During discussion with the students it was clear informed consent was not obtained although the students felt they could opt-out from participating with no impact on their learning. Discussion with the programme team indicated they had no policies currently but did have a draft policy for the Human Nutrition module (XN5122). The visitors noted the programme uses a range of teaching methods including role plays, practising techniques with equipment for the profession and sharing personal information throughout the programme. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place there would be nothing to mitigate any risk involved in trainees participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participating within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained

or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to implement formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team review the advertising materials for the programme to ensure they provide potential applicants with as much relevant information as possible.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included the advertising materials. The visitors were satisfied that upon meeting the condition for SET 2.1 in this report, essential information will be available for potential applicants. However, there were some areas the visitors wish to suggest the programme team review, in order that the advertising materials provide potential applicants with as much relevant information as possible.

The visitors noted the advertising materials stated prospective candidates must demonstrate a sensible approach to eating and display a healthy interest in food. The visitors felt this statement may convey the incorrect message to applicants that persons may not be eligible for the programme if they have any kind of eating disorder. The visitors recommend the programme team remove this statement from the advertising materials for increased clarity.

The visitors additionally noted that the advertising materials referred to the Health Circular HC (88/9) and Home Office Circular No. 8/88. The visitors felt this wording could cause confusion for potential applicants to the programme when a statement informing them about an enhanced CRB check would be clearer. The visitors recommend the programme team amend this information in the advertising materials.

The visitors were also given information that is handed out at open days for the programme. The visitors felt this was valuable information about the admissions process and the programme and recommend the programme team make this information available to potential applicants by putting it online alongside the programme details.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team explore what can be done to manage the financial disadvantage associated with students who use the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APL / AP(E)L) policies.

Reason: During discussion the visitors heard that students on the programme using AP(E)L / APL policies could be financially disadvantaged by not being eligible for all, or some, of the NHS bursary students on this programme receive. The visitors are not aware of this being an issue for other dietetics programmes in the UK. The visitors recommend the programme team explore if there are

options that can be taken so students will not be disadvantaged in this way. The visitors suggest the programme team look to other allied health professional programmes within their own institution and then to other education provider dietetic programmes to find out how the programmes compare with managing this issue.

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 visitors recommend the programme team consider how they can use the planned Food Innovation building for this programme along with the postgraduate programme.

Reason: At the visit the visitors heard that the education provider had been approved for funding for the development of a new Food Innovation Building. The visitors heard that the building was to be used mainly with the postgraduate programmes. The visitors wanted to express their support for this new development and to encourage the programme team to look at how they can use the new building within the undergraduate provision too.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to monitor the Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) system to ensure it is effective.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated there had been some problems with the PAT system. At the visit the programme team indicated a new system had been implemented for PAT this academic year. The new system involved one person from the programme team being allocated as the personal academic tutor for that year group for one academic year. The following academic year the group transfers to a new tutor. The visitors were aware the system was implemented to address issues of staff availability however feel this system potentially could have its own issues. The visitors felt the transfer between tutors could lead to problems with continuity of pastoral and academic support for students, particularly if a student has a specific issue the tutor is working with. Additionally they were aware that this would lead to an increase in workload for the person who is the tutor for the year. The visitors were aware the programme team has recently implemented this change and suggest they continue to monitor it closely to ensure they are aware of any problems and can appropriately respond to anything that arises from it.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team consider how they communicate and signpost their professional suitability procedure.

Reason: Documentation and discussion with the programme team indicated the programme has a professional suitability procedure for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. In discussion with the students and the practice placement providers it was clear they were uncertain of the details of this process, how the process could impact on completion of the programme or where to find information about it. Therefore the visitors recommend the programme team considers ways to communicate further and signpost information on the professional suitability procedure to students.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team monitor the online interprofessional learning activities that are linked to the Professional Perspectives module to ensure the dietetics profession is adequately addressed.

Reason: Through documentation and discussion at the visit, the visitors heard about the cross-faculty interprofessional learning the students on this programme are part of. Discussion with the students indicated the format of the interprofessional learning could be better used. The students indicated there should be a member of the programme team monitoring the discussion boards to ensure the profession was being adequately represented however they were uncertain as to whether or not this happened in practice. In light of the students' comments, the visitors recommend the programme team ensure they monitor the interprofessional learning to ensure the profession specific aspects are appropriately included and the interprofessional learning is effective in its purpose.

Susan Lennie
Alison Nicholls

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	22 – 23 November 2011

Contents

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 'Practitioner psychologist' or ' Clinical psychologist' 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 9 January 2012 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 22 February 2012. 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 31 March 2012. 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 12 June 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Kevin Woods (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HPC observer	David Christopher
Proposed student numbers	21 per cohort once a year
First approved intake	January 1992
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	October 2012
Chair	Sara Connolly (University of East Anglia)
Secretaries	Alison Rhodes (University of East Anglia) Hannah Coman (University of East Anglia)
Members of the joint panel	Nicola Spalding (Internal Panel Member) Isabel Hargreaves (External Panel Member) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society) Helen Dent (British Psychological Society) Matthias Schwannauer (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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
Joint HPC approval / BPS accreditation and UEA validation event appendices	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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.

Conditions

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme team are appropriately consulted with the outcomes and any resulting actions that come from the 'psychology review' that has been recently undertaken.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the education provider has recently undertaken a review of the psychology programmes being delivered. The aim of this review was to consider the programmes and make recommendations on the future of the programmes. In discussion with the senior team it was indicated the review was not at a point where the contents could be discussed although the review recommendations were in the process of being passed on to the vice chancellor. The senior team meeting reassured the visiting panel that the contents of the review were not going to have a negative impact on the programme. In light of both the uncertainties from the outcomes of the review and the reassurance from the senior team, the visitors considered there needed to be arrangements in place to ensure the programme team are appropriately consulted with any conclusions of the review and are involved with the implementation of any outcomes that may impact on the management of the programme. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the education provider will ensure the programme team are consulted with the conclusions from the review and are involved with the implementation of any outcomes.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate there are arrangements in place within the programme to be able to manage staff changes.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated there will be future changes to the staffing for this programme in particular the programme leader arrangements. During discussion with the programme team the visitors asked how staffing changes would be managed. Along with the other changes the visitors noted (the administrative changes and the psychology review outcomes) the visitors considered changes to the programme leadership could have a cumulative negative impact on the effectiveness of the delivery of the programme. The programme team responded with a description of the processes for recruiting new staff to fill spaces in the programme team. The visitors considered more formal arrangements in place to deal with staffing changes would be an appropriate way to ensure the quality of the programme is maintained through any staffing changes that may occur. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates there are arrangements in place to manage any changes that occur within the programme team.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate they are monitoring and effectively managing the new integrated administrative support system for this programme.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme had recently undergone a change to the administrative support. The programme has gone from having one named administrative support role to an integrated administrative support approach. The integrated administrative support unit provides support for a number of different programmes with no named point of contact. During discussion with the senior team it was highlighted they were aware of some problems which were attributed to being only four months into the new system. Further meetings with the trainees and placement providers indicated they had experienced multiple problems with this new system. The trainees identified problems with receiving expenses claims, with receiving communications about coursework feedback and with cancelled teaching slots not being communicated to them. The placement providers identified problems with not being able to talk to someone when they needed to, with confusing messages about the practice educator training days and with incorrect emails informing them they had been confirmed as external speakers for the programme. The programme team highlighted their concerns regarding the administrative support. The programme team were concerned if the current problems relating to the new system were not rectified there would be later problems with maintaining the relationships with the placement providers and with the trainees.

The visitors are aware this system is new and as such there may be a period of readjustment with the administrative management of the programme. The visitors consider the administrative support given to the programme is key to the successful delivery of the programme. The visitors also considered the students' professional development to be supported through the services provided including the monitoring of their attendance, the coherent relationships with the placement providers and in helping identifying where the programme team may need to help any students. In light of the important role the administrative services play in the delivery of the programme and the fact this is a very new development the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the new system is being monitored. The visitors also require evidence that the monitoring of this system will lead to appropriate actions if necessary to counteract any negative impacts this system will have on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the assessment requirements for the programme in relation to failing a placement and progression through the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about assessment and progression through the programme. In discussion with the trainees it was clear they were uncertain as to how their progression through the programme would be affected by failing the oral presentation element of the placement evaluation. The trainees repeated what is included in the handbook, that oral presentations could be repeated if necessary (Programme Handbook, p53), however also indicated this could only occur for two placement oral presentations. If any further placement presentations were failed the trainees thought they could not progress through the programme and this would constitute outright failure of the programme. The programme handbook had a statement that was unclear whether it referred to the number of oral presentations which could be repeated or the number of times an oral presentation could be repeated, "No more than one additional presentation will be allowed" (Programme Handbook, p53).

In discussion with the programme team the assessment regulations were clarified as follows; if a trainee fails more than one placement at first attempt this constitutes an outright fail of the programme. A pass of placement is made up of the passing of the oral presentation as well as a pass from the supervisor at the placement. A trainee can retake an oral presentation. There is no limit to the number of oral presentations that can be retaken however each oral presentation can only be retaken once. If an oral presentation is failed at the second attempt the exam board and external examiner will be required to assess whether the trainee can progress.

The visitors understood the procedures however found this to be confusing if it is not articulated clearly enough, which was confirmed with the trainees who did not fully understand the procedures. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to ensure it clearly articulates the requirements for the assessment at placement in terms of how many times a trainee can retake an oral presentation, how many oral presentations can be retaken, how the overall placement pass is attained and how this links through to the trainees' progression through the programme.

Recommendations

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider forming a strategy for how the programme team will consistently implement equality and diversity to widen access for the profession.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted evidence of an equality and diversity policy and evidence of the education provider implementing and monitoring this policy. The visitors did however note that the programme team's ideas for widening awareness of their programme did not have a formal implementation plan for the programme. The visitors suggest the programme team consider formulating an equality and diversity strategy at a programme level to ensure that the work that is currently being undertaken around equality and diversity is conducted in a consistent, transparent and measured way.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider how they communicate the processes for feedback to the trainees.

Reason: Programme documentation provided prior to the visit detailed the programme committees and representatives on these committees. During discussion with the trainees the visitors heard about the range of ways in which to feedback to the programme team and heard examples of how they had fed back into the programme team on issues of timetabling, assessments and support mechanisms. The visitors heard from the trainees that changes had occurred as a result of this feedback, however it was clear that not all years of the programme were aware of the changes having been made as a result of the feedback they had given. The programme team corroborated this discussion and additionally stated a new process had been put into place to give a written response on the trainees feedback so they would be aware of how changes were related to anything they had put forward to the programme team. The visitors considered this to be an excellent way of closing the feedback loops, however in light of the trainees comments suggest the programme team look at how they communicate this process to the trainees so all know what to expect from the feedback processes.

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

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider how the current placement approval and monitoring processes can be applied to new placement settings outside of the NHS.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit detailed the placement approval and monitoring processes for the programme. The visitors also heard that all of the placement settings currently are both NHS settings and non-NHS settings with longstanding connections to the programme and there are no new settings being sought. When considering the future for the programme and the profession the visitors felt it would be beneficial for the programme to consider how their existing processes for approval and monitoring of placements can be adapted for new non-traditional settings for placements to ensure the placement suitability for trainees in the future.

Sabiha Azmi
Kevin Woods

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	12 – 13 January 2012

Contents

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 21 February 2012 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 22 February 2012. 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 April 2012. 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 10 May 2012.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
HPC observer	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	20 September 2012
Chair	Stuart Ashended (University of Greenwich)
Secretary	Kim Oliver (University of Greenwich)
Members of the joint panel	Paul Dyer (Internal Panel Member) Jane Stokes (Internal Panel Member) Bob Willis (External Panel Member) Robert Fellows (College of Paramedics) Ewan Armitage (College of Paramedics)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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 external examiners' reports for the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme and the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme delivered by the education provider in partnership with South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAS).

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HPC met with students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme and the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme delivered by the education provider in partnership with SECAS, 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 45 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 12 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.

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 the programme award is stated throughout as BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London).

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider currently runs a HPC approved BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme in partnership with South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAS). In order to differentiate between the currently approved programme and the programme seeking approval to be run in partnership with London Ambulance Service (LAS), the education provider has amended the programme award title to BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London). The visitors are satisfied that the amended award title sufficiently differentiates between the two programmes, however noted that the current programme documentation and advertising materials do not consistently reflect the amended award title. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure that the award title is stated as BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London) throughout.

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 of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect terminology in reference to HPC.

On page 17 of the Programme Handbook it states that 'in order to meet the regulatory body hours you will be required to achieve 100% attendance'. The HPC does not set an attendance requirement for programmes. On page 18 of the same document reference is made to the 'HPC Code of Professional Conduct'. The HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics is the document to which the education provider is referring to. Finally, within the same document there was an instance where it was implied that the HPC worked with the education provider to deliver the programme. On page 7 of the Programme Handbook it states that 'the university and Health Professions Council students have access to information to support them through all aspects of their programme'. 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.

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.

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 clearly highlight the geographical spread of practice placements and highlight the potential distances that students may be required to travel when attending placements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and advertising materials the visitors were not able to clearly distinguish the geographical spread of practice placements. Through discussions with the programme team the visitor's noted that the education provider will utilise a range of practice placements across the London region but will always endeavour to place students within a reasonable distance to and from home. However, from discussions with students from the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science programme and the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme delivered by the education provider in partnership with SECAS, it was noted that some students stated that the travel time to and from placement could be significant. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials to clearly highlight the geographical spread of practice placements and highlight the potential distances that students may be required to travel when attending placements to ensure that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a finalised version of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Greenwich and the London Ambulance Service NHS Trust to demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that they were presented with an unsigned draft Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Greenwich and the London Ambulance Service NHS Trust. Through discussions with the senior management team the visitors noted that the education provider plans to finalise the Agreement once the programme has completed the HPC approval process. The visitors noted that on completion of the approval visit the education provider will be able to finalise the Memorandum of Agreement. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide a finalised version of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Greenwich and the London Ambulance Service NHS Trust to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that the available resources in all placement settings are effectively used to support student learning.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme incorporates a range of practice placements including those within local NHS services but also those specific to LAS. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied with the audit documentation presented for the Bromley Education Centre and satisfied that the education provider has a system in place to ensure that the available resources in practice placement settings outside of the LAS are effectively used. However, through discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers it was evident that Bromley Education Centre is not a practice placement, and that students go there instead for components of practical and clinical teaching on the programme. The visitors noted that as well as facilitating practical and clinical teaching at the Bromley Education Centre, LAS also facilitate a significant proportion of the practice placements on the programme. The visitors finally noted discussions with representatives from LAS where they stated that all LAS practice placement settings were audited internally by LAS employees. The visitors were not presented with an example of the LAS audit.

Although the visitors were satisfied with the auditing framework used for non LAS placements presented by the education provider, they were not presented with sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each LAS placement setting effectively uses the resources available. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that the available resources in all placement settings are effectively used to support student learning.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that the available resources in all placement settings effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme incorporates a range of practice placements including those within local NHS services but also those specific to LAS. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied with the audit documentation presented for the Bromley Education Centre and satisfied that the education provider has a system in place to ensure that the available resources in practice placement settings outside of the LAS effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. However, through discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers it was evident that Bromley Education Centre is not a practice placement, and that students go there instead for components of practical and clinical teaching on the programme. The visitors noted that as well as facilitating practical and clinical teaching at the Bromley Education Centre, LAS also facilitate a significant proportion of the practice placements on the programme. The visitors finally noted discussions with representatives from LAS where they stated that all LAS

practice placement settings were audited internally by LAS employees. The visitors were not presented with an example of the LAS audit.

Although the visitors were satisfied with the auditing framework used for non LAS placements presented by the education provider, they were not presented with sufficient evidence of how the programme team ensures that each LAS placement setting effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that all placements setting effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the correct Course Specification document for the module 'Foundations for Effective Practice' to demonstrate that the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for Paramedics.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that on page 36 of the Submission Document it states that the module 'Foundations for Effective Practice' has course code NURS 1255 and is 30 credits. However, the visitors noted that on page 42 of the same document the Course Specification states that 'Foundations for Effective Practice' has the course code NURS 1254 and is 15 credits. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide the correct Course Specification document for 'Foundations for Effective Practice' to demonstrate that the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for Paramedics.

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.

Condition: The education provider must update the programme documentation to clearly specify the range of practice placements that all students will undertake through the duration of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine the range of practice placement experiences that students will undertake through the duration of the programme. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that in different years of the programme students would go into placements in different types of clinical settings. The visitors felt that it was important that this range of practice placements was highlighted within the programme documentation and clearly defined to ensure that all students gain access to the required range of learning experiences in a variety of practice environments. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly define the range of practice placements that all students will undertake through the duration of the programme and update the programme documentation to clearly specify this information.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure all placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme incorporates a range of practice placements including those within local NHS services but also those specific to LAS. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied with the audit documentation presented for the Bromley Education Centre and satisfied that the education provider can use this framework to make a judgement on whether placements outside of LAS are of good quality and provide a safe and supportive environment. However, through discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers it was evident that Bromley Education Centre is not a practice placement, and that students go there instead for components of practical and clinical teaching on the programme. The visitors noted that as well as facilitating practical and clinical teaching at the Bromley Education Centre, LAS also facilitate a significant proportion of the practice placements on the programme. The visitors finally noted discussions with representatives from LAS where they stated that all LAS practice placement settings were audited internally by LAS employees. The visitors were not presented with an example of the LAS audit.

Although the visitors were satisfied with the auditing framework presented by the education provider used for non LAS placements they were not presented with evidence that demonstrates that the education provider can make a judgement on whether LAS practice placements are of good quality and provide a safe and supportive environment. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the systems in place that allow the education provider to make a judgement on whether LAS practice placements are of good quality and provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure an effective system is in place for approving and monitoring all practice placements.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme incorporates a range of practice placements including those within local NHS services but also those specific to LAS. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied with the audit documentation presented for the Bromley Education Centre and satisfied that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for approving and monitoring placements outside of the LAS. However, through discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers it was evident that Bromley Education Centre is not a practice placement, and that students go there instead for components of practical and clinical teaching on the programme. The visitors noted that as well as facilitating practical and clinical teaching at the Bromley Education Centre, LAS also facilitate a significant proportion of the practice placements on the programme. The visitors finally noted discussions with representatives from LAS where they stated that all LAS

practice placement settings were audited internally by LAS employees. The visitors were not presented with an example of the LAS audit.

Although the visitors were satisfied with the auditing framework presented by the education provider used for non LAS placements they were not presented with evidence that demonstrates that the education provider has an effective system in place for approving and monitoring practice placements offered by LAS. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider takes overall responsibility for the management of practice placements and has an effective system is in place for approving and monitoring all settings, including those provided by LAS.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence outlining the systems used to ensure that all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme incorporates a range of practice placements including those within local NHS services but also those specific to LAS. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied with the audit documentation presented for the Bromley Education Centre and satisfied that the education provider can use this framework to ensure that practice placement providers outside of LAS have equality and diversity policies in relation to students. However, through discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers it was evident that Bromley Education Centre is not a practice placement, and that students go there instead for components of practical and clinical teaching on the programme. The visitors noted that as well as facilitating practical and clinical teaching at the Bromley Education Centre, LAS also facilitate a significant proportion of the practice placements on the programme. The visitors finally noted discussions with representatives from LAS where they stated that all LAS practice placement settings were audited internally by LAS employees. The visitors were not presented with an example of the LAS audit.

Although the visitors were satisfied with the auditing framework presented by the education provider used for non LAS placements they were not presented with evidence that demonstrates that the education provider ensures that LAS practice placements have equality and diversity policies in relation to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the systems in place to ensure that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students.

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 evidence outlining the systems used to ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are in place at all practice placement settings.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme incorporates a range of practice placements including those within local NHS services but also those specific to LAS. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied with the audit documentation presented for the Bromley Education Centre and satisfied that the education provider can use this framework to ensure that practice placement providers outside of LAS have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. However, through discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers it was evident that Bromley Education Centre is not a practice placement, and that students go there instead for components of practical and clinical teaching on the programme. The visitors noted that as well as facilitating practical and clinical teaching at the Bromley Education Centre, LAS also facilitate a significant proportion of the practice placements on the programme. The visitors finally noted discussions with representatives from LAS where they stated that all LAS practice placement settings were audited internally by LAS employees. The visitors were not presented with an example of the LAS audit.

Although the visitors were satisfied with the auditing framework presented by the education provider used for non LAS placements they were not presented with evidence that demonstrates that the education provider ensures that LAS practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. The visitors were unable to determine how the education provider makes a judgement on how many students can be allocated to a placement and how they monitor the number of practice placement educators in each specific practice placement setting.

The visitors therefore require further evidence of the systems in place to ensure that all placement providers have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

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 provide further evidence of the mechanisms in place that ensure that practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements and aware of the specifics of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London) programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that students are required to attend a range of practice placements including those facilitated by LAS but also those within other clinical settings such as paediatrics, accident and emergency and theatre. Through discussions with students the visitors noted that when student went to non LAS placement they were often on placement with students from other healthcare professions. From discussions with the senior management team the

visitor's also noted that LAS work in partnership to deliver pre-registration programmes with a number of education providers across the region and that LAS practice placement educators may be required to supervise students from more than one education provider and who may be at different academic levels.

The visitors noted the importance of practice placement educators being fully prepared for placement and knowing the specifics of individual programmes, including details such as the lines of communication and responsibility, how to take forward concerns and complaints (and access to these policies) and how to keep updated with programme developments. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of the mechanisms in place that ensure that practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement and aware of the specifics of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London) programme.

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 provider must provide the correct Course Specification document for the module 'Foundations for Effective Practice' to demonstrate that the assessment strategy and design ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for Paramedics.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that on page 36 of the Submission Document it states that the module 'Foundations for Effective Practice' has course code NURS 1255 and is 30 credits. However, the visitors noted that on page 42 of the same document the Course Specification states that 'Foundations for Effective Practice' has the course code NURS 1254 and is 15 credits. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide the correct Course Specification document for 'Foundations for Effective Practice' to demonstrate that the assessment strategy and design ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for Paramedics.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the Student Consent Form to further emphasise that students have the right to opt out of practical and clinical teaching where participating as service users.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the education provider has a Student Consent Form that it uses to obtain consent where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, and are satisfied that this standard has been met. Through discussions the visitors noted good practice in that the programme team introduce this form as part of the programme induction and verbally discuss the fact that students may be able to opt out of certain practical and clinical teaching sessions should they, for example, have specific cultural or health requirements. However, to enhance this good practice the visitors would like to recommend that the education provider could consider adding this information to the Student Consent Form to formally emphasise that students have the right to opt out of practical and clinical teaching where participating as service users.

Marcus Bailey
Gordon Pollard

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	7 - 8 December 2011

Contents

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' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 February 2012 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 22 February 2012. 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 30 January 2012. 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 22 February 2012.

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Kathleen Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	50
First approved intake	September 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Jo Cahill (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretary	Julia Ratcliffe (University of Hertfordshire) Liz Mellor (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Mandy Asghar (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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

The visitors did not make any 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.

Conditions

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 programme team must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register or that other arrangements will be agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the registration status of an external examiner 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 this standard continues to be met.

Pamela Bagley
Kathleen Bosworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Dietitian
Date of visit	7 – 8 December 2011

Contents

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 'Dietitian' or 'Dietician' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 February 2012 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 22 February 2012. 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 31 January 2012. 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 22 February 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum, 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 part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science and Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science.

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Maureen Henderson (Dietitian) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once a year
First approved intake	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	David Gayfer (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretary	Liz Mellor (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Jane Wilson (British Dietetic Association)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
Additional information for HPC visit	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must implement formal protocols to obtain informed 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 through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. During discussion with the students it was clear informed consent was not obtained although the students felt they could opt-out from participating with no impact on their learning. The visitors noted the programme uses a range of teaching methods including role plays, practising techniques with equipment for the profession and sharing personal information. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place there would be nothing to mitigate any risk involved in trainees participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participating within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors have noted the other programmes being reviewed at this visit used consent procedures which could be adapted for this programme.
The visitors therefore require the programme team implement formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements for the practice placement setting and the academic setting.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting. Discussions with the trainees indicated they knew the procedures to follow when absences were necessary however did not know the minimum requirements for attendance at the practice placement setting or in the academic setting. Discussions with the programme team indicated there was an expected attendance of 100% for all components of the programme with allowances made for reasonable absences. From the evidence received the visitors were not satisfied the minimum requirements were being fully communicated to the trainees. The visitors also noted that if trainees were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the education provider

to monitor and step in to take action to ensure absence does not affect a trainee's learning and development. The visitors were concerned that this could affect the meeting of the learning outcomes and therefore the standards of proficiency.

The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to communicate to trainees the minimum attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure the programme documentation is consistent in clearly articulating for students the professional portfolio needs to be passed in order for them to be able to progress from one year to the next in the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted before the visit, the visitors noted a statement in the programme specification document that indicated students were expected to develop a professional portfolio through the programme, it stated "Failure to do so ….may affect progression" (Programme specification, Section 2 – Programme specific assessment regulations). The visitors additionally noted the Indicative Practice Placement pack had a statement that said "The production of a portfolio of your CPD is a requirement for progression across the programme. Failure to do so will be brought to the attention of the programme board of examiners" (p40). The programme team confirmed the professional portfolio was a requirement that needed to be passed in order for students to progress from one year to the next. The visitors were concerned the programme documentation was inconsistent in reference to the portfolio and that by stating it was a requirement for progression in one document but stating it "may affect progression" in another document, there was the potential for students to become confused as to their progression requirements. The visitors considered that if this was not made clear successful academic appeals could be lodged by students.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure the programme documentation is consistent in clearly articulating for students that the professional portfolio needs to be passed in order for them to be able to progress from one year to the next in the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted before the visit, the visitors noted the Indicative Practice Placement pack had some information which could be confusing for students. In the placement assessment forms for placements 4, 5 and 6 there were statements that said "Part 2 carries no marks but the student's performance must normally be satisfactory in order to pass the placement" (Indicative Placement Pack, p72, p109 and p189). In discussion with the programme team it was confirmed that both parts of the placements needed to be passed at the end of each year in order for students to progress from one year to the next. The visitors understood there may be exceptions to this which the programme team look at on a case by case basis however they were concerned the programme documentation implied that, although normally this was the case, this was not always so. The visitors considered that if the requirements for progression were not made clear, successful academic appeals could be lodged by students.
The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure the programme placement documentation clearly articulates all the requirements for student progression within the programme, whether they are marked or otherwise and where and when compensation is allowed.

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 programme team must amend the programme documentation to clearly articulate that none of the interim awards available provide eligibility to apply for HPC registration.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors noted the Programme Specification detailed 5 interim awards available from the programme. There was a statement after the last interim award listed that said "This award does not entitle the recipient to register with the HPC" (Programme specification – Section 1, D Programme Structures, Features, levels, Modules, and Credits). The visitors were concerned this information was confusing for students on the programme because none of the interim awards would provide eligibility to register with the HPC.
The visitors therefore require the programme team to amend the programme documentation to clearly articulate that none of the interim awards will give eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

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 programme team must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register or that other arrangements will be agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the registration status of an external examiner 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 this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team look at how they communicate their accreditation for prior credited learning (APCL) policies.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit included information about the APCL policies in place. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated students could use the APCL policies to transfer between the programmes sharing the modules in the first year of the programme. Students could transfer onto and from the BSc (Hons) Dietetics programme. In discussion with the students they were not aware of this option being available. In light of the students comments the visitors suggest the programme team look at how they communicate their accreditation for prior credited learning (APCL) policies.

Maureen Henderson
Gordon Burrow

hpc health professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	7 – 8 December 2011

Contents

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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 February 2012 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 22 February 2012. 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 1 February 2012. 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 22 February 2012.

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
	Margaret Foster (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	30
First approved intake	September 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chairs	David Gayfer (University of Hertfordshire)
	Jan Turner (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretaries	Liz Mellor (University of Hertfordshire)
	Paula Dilley (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Jo Cahill (Internal Panel Member)
	Bob Willis (College of Paramedics)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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 two conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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

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

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

Conditions

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register or that other arrangements will be agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the registration status of an external examiner 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 this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider highlighting at the beginning of each academic year that students need to declare any changes in their criminal records status.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students' have to go through a criminal convictions check at beginning of the programme. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However in further discussion with students it was made clear that they were aware of undergoing the check but less clear about declaring any changes to their status. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team investigate ways of re-enforcing the fact that students need to make the programme team aware of any changes to their criminal convictions status.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to facilitate student transfer between this programme and the BSc (Hons) Paramedic science programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that the first year of both the Foundation Degree and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programmes are the same for both cohorts. In discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that, dependent on academic achievement, students may wish to transfer between the programmes at the end of their first year of study. However it was clear that, due to the link between the academic programmes and the placement provider, facilitating transfers between the programmes would be problematic. This would be particularly so if large numbers of students transferred between programmes as the placement and academic provision in subsequent years has been allocated and planned for. Therefore there was no policy in place to allow students to transfer easily between programmes after the first year of study. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team continue to investigate how best to manage any transfers between the two programmes and how these transfers may be implemented in the future.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider highlighting at the beginning of each academic year that students have given their consent to participate in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students' consent is gained at the beginning of the programme for them to participate in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors

also noted in discussion with the students that any issues which may arise around clinical teaching are dealt with quickly and sensitively by the programme team. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However in further discussion with students it was made clear that several of them could not remember signing the consent form which is required as part of the admissions process. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team investigate ways of re-enforcing the fact that students have given their consent to participate in the programme in this way.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and 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.**

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to continue the work currently being undertaken to develop the student skills passport.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and the practice placement providers it was highlighted that the practice assessment document (PAD) is the main tool utilised by students and practice placement educators to identify what experience a student would need to have while on placement. The PAD was utilised in meetings at the beginning and end of placement while being completed throughout the placement period. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors noted in the documentation and in discussion with the programme team that a 'skills passport' was being developed to better inform a practice placement educator of the relative experience and skills a student possessed. The visitors therefore recommend that that the programme team consider how best to continue the development of the skills passport to enhance student and practice placement educator's preparation for placements.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider further monitoring of the assessment moderating mechanisms in place to best address the issues highlighted in the external examiners report.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation, and in discussion with the senior team, that there are comprehensive monitoring mechanisms in place to ensure that there are appropriate standards applied in the assessment of students. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However the visitors noted within the documentation submitted that the programme's external examiner had highlighted that half of one graduating cohort received first class degrees. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that a significant contributor to this set of results was that a new

8

university wide process had been implemented to calculate degree results. It was also clarified that the utilisation of objectively structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) may also have contributed to this unusual result. The programme team have since implemented a policy of videoing OSCE assessments to enable easier moderation of the marking. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider continues to monitor the situation and investigates how best to mitigate against any unusually high sets of results in the future.

<div align="right">
Margaret Foster
Gordon Pollard
</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme name	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	7 – 8 December 2011

Contents

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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 February 2012 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 22 February 2012. 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 1 February 2012. 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 22 February 2012.

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
	Margaret Foster (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	30
First approved intake	September 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chairs	David Gayfer (University of Hertfordshire)
	Jan Turner (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretaries	Liz Mellor (University of Hertfordshire)
	Paula Dilley (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Jo Cahill (Internal Panel Member)
	Bob Willis (College of Paramedics)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must clearly state in the documentation how many hours of practice placement experience students must undertake to meet the relevant learning outcomes required to complete the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted that students were expected to complete 960 hours in a practice placement setting. However, in discussion with the practice placement providers and with the programme team it was made clear that this requirement would be increased to 1364 hours. In this way the programme team felt they were better able to satisfy the professional body's requirements for practical experience while on a training programme. However, the visitors were aware that this change in practice hours was not reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the increased number of practice hours will be integrated into the programme and how this will be appropriate to support students' achievement of the relevant learning outcomes. In this way the visitors can be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements support the delivery of this programme and that this standard continues to be met.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register or that other arrangements will be agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the registration status of an external examiner 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 this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider highlighting at the beginning of each academic year that students need to declare any changes in their criminal records status.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students' have to go through a criminal convictions check at beginning of the programme. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However in further discussion with students it was made clear that they were aware of undergoing the check but less clear about declaring any changes to their status. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team investigate ways of re-enforcing the fact that students need to make the programme team aware of any changes to their criminal convictions status.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to facilitate student transfer between this programme and the BSc (Hons) Paramedic science programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that the first year of both the Foundation Degree and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programmes are the same for both cohorts. In discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that, dependent on academic achievement, students may wish to transfer between the programmes at the end of their first year of study. However it was clear that, due to the link between the academic programmes and the placement provider, facilitating transfers between the programmes would be problematic. This would be particularly so if large numbers of students transferred between programmes as the placement and academic provision in subsequent years has been allocated and planned for. Therefore there was no policy in place to allow students to transfer easily between programmes after the first year of study. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team continue to investigate how best to manage any transfers between the two programmes and how these transfers may be implemented in the future.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider highlighting at the beginning of each academic year that students have given their consent to participate in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students' consent is gained at the beginning of the programme for them to participate in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors

also noted in discussion with the students that any issues which may arise around clinical teaching are dealt with quickly and sensitively by the programme team. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However in further discussion with students it was made clear that several of them could not remember signing the consent form which is required as part of the admissions process. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team investigate ways of re-enforcing the fact that students have given their consent to participate in the programme in this way.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and 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.**

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to continue the work currently being undertaken to develop the student skills passport.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and the practice placement providers it was highlighted that the practice assessment document (PAD) is the main tool utilised by students and practice placement educators to identify what experience a student would need to have while on placement. The PAD was utilised in meetings at the beginning and end of placement while being completed throughout the placement period. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors noted in the documentation and in discussion with the programme team that a 'skills passport' was being developed to better inform a practice placement educator of the relative experience and skills a student possessed. The visitors therefore recommend that that the programme team consider how best to continue the development of the skills passport to enhance student and practice placement educator's preparation for placements.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider further monitoring of the assessment moderating mechanisms in place to best address the issues highlighted in the external examiners report.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation, and in discussion with the senior team, that there are comprehensive monitoring mechanisms in place to ensure that there are appropriate standards applied in the assessment of students. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However the visitors noted within the documentation submitted that the programme's external examiner had highlighted that half of one graduating cohort received first class degrees. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that a significant contributor to this set of results was that a new

university wide process had been implemented to calculate degree results. It was also clarified that the utilisation of objectively structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) may also have contributed to this unusual result. The programme team have since implemented a policy of videoing OSCE assessments to enable easier moderation of the marking. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider continues to monitor the situation and investigates how best to mitigate against any unusually high sets of results in the future.

<div align="right">

Margaret Foster
Gordon Pollard

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	13 – 14 December 2011

Contents

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 'Biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 February 2012 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) 22 February 2012. 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 March 2012. 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 29 March 2012.

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science 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 all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decision on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	David Houliston (Biomedical scientist) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Darren Mernagh (University of Portsmouth)
Secretary	Nicola Noyce (University of Portsmouth)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Scientists) Christine Murphy (Institute of Biomedical Scientists) David Eccleston (Institute of Biomedical Scientists)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒
Supplementary Documentation	☒	☐	☐

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, there have been no past external examiners' reports 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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must revise all programme documentation to ensure that references to students' potential employment are current and that they reflect the requirements for statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussions with the students that graduates for the programme are expected to graduate and work as healthcare science practitioners. In discussions with the programme team and the placement providers it was clear that this has been articulated to students in the expectation that this will be a professional role within the NHS by the time these students will graduate. However, the visitors noted that the students had a definite sense of the difference between the role of a healthcare science practitioner and a biomedical scientist and expressed their preference for aspects of the role of healthcare science practitioners. In particular they highlighted the aspect of being more involved in the patient journey; from giving a sample to potential diagnosis. The visitors considered that this could lead to students having unrealistic expectations of a professional role which has not currently been fully defined and utilised by NHS employers. The visitors also noted that students were aware of the requirements of registration with the HPC but were less clear over the use of the protected title biomedical scientist. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to reflect the current situation in regards to potential employment and the requirements for statutory regulation. In this way the visitors can be sure that students are aware of their potential future employment situation and are aware of the requirements for professional regulation when they graduate.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how the learning outcomes of the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme have been comprehensively included in this programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there had been no change in the way students meet the standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists on this programme when compared to the previous BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes. This was articulated in the standards of education and training mapping provided by the programme team (p.236). However, the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team had achieved this with the changes made to fit the additional requirements of Medical Education England (MEE) and the changes required by the education provider. The visitors therefore need evidence to further clarify how the programme team have comprehensively included the learning outcomes from the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes into this programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that that the programme ensures that those students who successfully complete it meet the standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists and will be eligible to apply to the Register.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that a safe and supportive environment is provided for students while they are on placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation, and in discussion with the programme team, that each placement setting utilised by the programme will have to satisfy the faculty placement office's (FPO) requirements before students can attend that placement. However, the visitors were unclear as to what the approval and monitoring processes involved and how they ensured that practice placement settings provided a safe and supportive environment. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the approval and monitoring processes employed by the FPO and more specifically how they ensure that practice placements provide a safe and supportive environment for students. In this way the visitors can be sure that this standard continues to be met.

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 evidence of the formal processes in place which ensure that practice placements are thoroughly and effectively approved and monitored.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that the placements for the programme will have to satisfy the faculty placement office's (FPO) requirements before students can attend that placement setting. However, the visitors were unclear as to what the approval and monitoring processes involved and what specific requirements practice placement settings had to satisfy in order to be approved by the FPO. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the approval and monitoring processes employed by the FPO and more specifically what requirements placements had to meet in order to be approved. In this way the visitors can be sure that the programme's system of approving and monitoring practice placements is thorough and effective.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The education provider must provider further evidence of how the practice placement educator training will prepare practice placement educators to supervise students from this programme.

Reason: In the documentation, provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the programme team offer annual 'train the trainer' training for practice placement educators. However, in discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers it was clear that the current training was focused on the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes. Training regarding this programme had been provided but, due to time constraints, only to certain lead

members of placement staff had undertaken it. These members of staff were then disseminating this down to practice placement educators. However, the visitors were unclear as to how well prepared practice placement educator staff were to supervise students on this programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the training that will be undertaken by practice placement educators to ensure they understand the requirements for supervising students on this programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that placement educators have undertaken appropriate training and can fulfil the supervisory role required by this programme to ensure that students can meet the learning outcomes associated with their placement experience.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The education provider must provider further evidence of the plans in place for future formal collaboration between practice placement educators and the programme team.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided by the programme team at the visit, and in discussion with the practice placement providers, that there has been regular and effective collaboration between the placement providers and the programme team. This has been occurring through, but not limited to, the 'Biomedical Science Hospital Placement Working Group' while the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes have been running. However, the visitors were unclear as to how this provision would continue with the creation of the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science programme and the phasing out of the applied biomedical science programmes. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how this formal collaboration will continue in the future. In this way the visitors can be sure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the practice placement providers and the programme team and that this standard continues to be met.

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 programme team must provide further evidence of how the assessment of the learning outcomes of the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme has been mirrored in the assessment strategy of this programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there had been no change in the assessment strategy employed to ensure that students meet the standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists on this programme when compared to the previous BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes. This was articulated in the standards of education and training mapping provided by the programme team (p.243). However, the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team had achieved this with the changes made to fit the additional requirements of Medical Education England (MEE) and the changes required by the education provider. The visitors therefore need evidence to further clarify how the programme team have employed the same, or similar, assessment strategy from the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes in this programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that that the

programme ensures that those students who successfully complete it meet the standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists and will be eligible to apply to the Register.

Peter Rudy
David Houliston

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time and part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	13-14 December 2011

Contents

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 'Biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 February 2012 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 22 February 2012. 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 March 2012. 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 29 March 2012.

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, 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 part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science 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 all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decision on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	David Houliston (Biomedical scientist) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	20
First approved intake	October 2008
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Darren Mernagh (University of Portsmouth)
Secretary	Nicola Noyce (University of Portsmouth)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Scientists) Christine Murphy (Institute of Biomedical Scientists) David Eccleston (Institute of Biomedical Scientists)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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 did not make any 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.

Conditions

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 provide further evidence of how the changes made to the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes affect how students can meet the standards of proficiency for Biomedical scientists.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that changes had been made to how the programmes are delivered. These changes have been made as the result of a re-alignment of the curriculum to better meet new education provider requirement for modules to be 20 credits where possible. These changes have also been influenced by the commencement of the BSc (Hons) Healthcare science programme with which these programmes share some teaching. However, the visitors could not determine how these changes had affected the learning outcomes of these programmes and subsequently how students are able to meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how these changes have affected where teaching is delivered within the programmes and how students can still meet all of the learning outcomes. In this way the visitors can be sure that students who successfully complete the programmes can meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register and that this standard continues to be met.

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 provide further evidence of how any changes to BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes' assessment strategy affects how students who successfully complete the programmes meet all of the relevant standards of proficiency.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit, and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that changes had been made to how the programmes are delivered. These changes have been made as the result of a re-alignment of the curriculum to better meet new education provider requirement for modules to be 20 credits where possible. These changes have also been influenced by the commencement of the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science programme with which these programmes share some teaching. However, the visitors could not determine how these changes had affected the assessment strategy of these programmes. In particular the visitors could not determine what impact these changes had had on how the programme team ensures that successful students meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how these changes have affected where assessment is undertaken and how successful completion of this assessment ensures that students meet all of the learning outcomes. In this way the visitors can be sure that students who successfully complete the programmes meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register and that this standard continues to be met.

Peter Ruddy
David Houliston