

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	23 – 24 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 12 June 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 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 did not review the programme, but the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the MSc Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social worker) Teresa Rogers (Social worker)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	50 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Barbara Dexter (Buckinghamshire New University)
Secretary	Vicki Main (Buckinghamshire New University)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Helen Keville (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three 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 provide further evidence that the APCL policy is clearly communicated to applicants to the programme through the admissions procedures.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation related to admissions prior to the visit, including the webpages containing information for potential applicants. They were unable to find reference to the inclusion mechanisms, such as Accredited Prior Certificated Learning (APCL), which are available for applicants to the programme. The programme team confirmed the process for APCL at the visit, and how it is used within the programme. The visitors were confident that the policy and procedures for agreeing and awarding credits are in place, but were unable to determine how potential applicants find out about it and the details of the process specific to this programme. The visitors also noted that when questioned, the students present at the visit were not aware of any inclusion mechanisms that were available. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate that applicants are given the full information required in order to make an informed choice as to whether to apply to the programme.

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

Condition: The resources to support student learning must be reviewed to ensure they accurately reflect the exit awards for the programme and what awards will lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the assessment regulations for the programme, including the appendix specific to social work programmes. This document outlines the exit awards for the programme, as confirmed at the visit. However, the Student handbook for the programme also has a section which outlines the exit awards for the programme (page 40). This section does not include the ordinary degree that will be offered where a student successfully completes 300 credits, as outlined in the assessment regulations. The visitors also noted that the exit awards are titled 'Social Studies' rather and do not refer to the protected title of Social Work, but could not find a clear statement that the exit awards will not confer eligibility for registration as a Social Worker with the HCPC. The information in the Student handbook could therefore be misleading to students. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review the information provided to support students to ensure that it clearly states the exit awards applicable to the programme, and which awards will confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

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

Condition: The programme documentation to support student learning at the University and in the practice setting must be reviewed to ensure it is clear, and accurately reflects the programme and the current setting of social work regulation.

Reason: The documentation provided as part of the submission included the Student handbook and Practice curriculum document, which support students through their learning on the programme. The Practice curriculum document is also provided to practice placement educators. The visitors received versions of the documentation which were incorrectly paginated, and appeared to be in the incorrect order in places, out of sync with the contents page. These documents may therefore prove difficult to navigate for students and placement educators. The visitors also noted instances of incorrect or misleading information. Both documents refer to a 'HCPC Code of Conduct' (for example, page 54 of the Practice curriculum or page 27 of the Student handbook). The use of incorrect terminology in relation to the HCPC's guidance could mislead students as to the HCPC's remit and guidance regarding social work students. Page 22 of the Practice curriculum and page 9 of the Student handbook also state: "In accordance with HCPC regulations, all students must undertake 70 days of assessed practice in the first academic year and 100 days in their final year of study." This is not an HCPC requirement. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure it accurately reflects the programme and the current setting of Social Work regulation.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify the programme-specific arrangements for aegrotat credits or awards not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were informed at the visit that aegrotat awards were not offered for this programme. On page 12 of the University Academic Framework and Assessment Regulations, it states, "Credits can be achieved by any of the following means:...aegrotat pass of untaken credits...", as detailed in the Programme Specification. However, from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement in the programme documentation or assessment regulations that aegrotat awards would not provide eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood the programme's arrangements for aegrotat awards or credits, and if offered, the requirement for them not to provide eligibility to register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to review the mechanisms in place to support and monitor active participation in guided independent study, to ensure consistency in the approach.

Reason: The visitors discussed the approach taken to guided independent study on the programme with the programme team and with students at the visit. Guided independent study forms a large proportion of the notional hours in the delivery of the curriculum, and the students highlighted that there was some inconsistency in the way different tutors approach the setting and monitoring of work for independent study. Where some lecturers will set defined reading material or activities on the virtual learning environment and follow the activity up at the following sessions, others take a less structured or directive approach. Given the importance of the guided independent study in ensuring that the curriculum is being delivered in this programme, the visitors therefore advise the programme team to revisit the way in which the programme team monitor and support this study, to ensure the parity and consistency of student experience and the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Michael Branicki
Teresa Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme name	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	23 – 24 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 12 June 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 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 did not review the programme, but the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BSc Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social worker) Teresa Rogers (Social worker)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	20 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Barbara Dexter (Buckinghamshire New University)
Secretary	Vicki Main (Buckinghamshire New University)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Helen Keville (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three 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 provide further evidence that the APCL policy is clearly communicated to applicants to the programme through the admissions procedures.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation related to admissions prior to the visit, including the webpages containing information for potential applicants. They were unable to find reference to the inclusion mechanisms, such as Accredited Prior Certificated Learning (APCL), which are available for applicants to the programme. The programme team confirmed the process for APCL at the visit, and how it is used within the programme. The visitors were confident that the policy and procedures for agreeing and awarding credits are in place, but were unable to determine how potential applicants find out about it and the details of the process specific to this programme. The visitors also noted that when questioned, the students present at the visit were not aware of any inclusion mechanisms that were available. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate that applicants are given the full information required in order to make an informed choice as to whether to apply to the programme.

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 that the information provided on fees for the programme is sufficient to enable applicants to make an informed choice as to whether to apply or take up an offer of a place for the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation related to admissions prior to the visit, including the webpages containing information for potential applicants. They noted that information on fees for Home and EU students was provided on the webpage in the form of a downloadable tuition fee grid. However, this grid has varied figures determined by 'fee bands'. The visitors could not find a key or further explanation as to what the fee band codes represented and were therefore unable to determine how applicants would work out the fee they will pay for the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence that applicants will be provided with the information they require on fees, prior to taking up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The resources to support student learning must be reviewed to ensure they accurately reflect the exit awards for the programme and what awards will lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the assessment regulations for the programme, including the appendix specific to social work programmes. This document outlines the exit awards for the programme, as confirmed at the visit. However, the Student handbook for the programme also has a section which outlines the exit awards for the programme (page 37). This section refers to the Postgraduate Diploma as the final award, rather than the MSc Social Work, which is not mentioned in this section. The visitors also noted that the exit awards are titled 'Social Studies' rather and do not refer to the protected title of Social Work, but could not find a clear statement that the exit awards will not confer eligibility for registration as a Social Worker with the HCPC. The information in the Student handbook could therefore be misleading to students. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review the information provided to support students to ensure that it clearly states the exit awards applicable to the programme, and which awards will confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

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

Condition: The programme documentation to support student learning at the University and in the practice setting must be reviewed to ensure it is clear, and accurately reflects the programme and the current setting of social work regulation.

Reason: The documentation provided as part of the submission included the Student handbook and Practice curriculum document, which support students through their learning on the programme. The Practice curriculum document is also provided to practice placement educators. The visitors received versions of the documentation which were incorrectly paginated, and appeared to be in the incorrect order in places, out of sync with the contents page. These documents may therefore prove difficult to navigate for students and placement educators. The visitors also noted instances of incorrect or misleading information. Both documents frequently refer to the PG Dip programme, rather than the MSc. They also frequently refer to a 'HCPC Code of Conduct and Ethics' for students (for example, page 8 of the Practice curriculum and page 16 of the Student handbook). The use of incorrect terminology in relation to the HCPC's guidance could mislead students as to the HCPC's remit and guidance regarding social work students. Page 18 of the Practice curriculum also states: "In accordance with HCPC regulations, all students must undertake 70 days of assessed practice in the first academic year and 100 days in their final year of study." This is not an HCPC requirement. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure it accurately reflects the programme and the current setting of Social Work regulation.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify the programme-specific arrangements for aegrotat credits or awards not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were informed at the visit that aegrotat awards were not offered for this programme. On page 12 of the University Academic Framework and Assessment Regulations, it states, "Credits can be achieved by any of the following means:...aegrotat pass of untaken credits...", as detailed in the Programme Specification. However, from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine

where there was a clear statement in the programme documentation or assessment regulations that aegrotat awards would not provide eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood the programme's arrangements for aegrotat awards or credits, and if offered, the requirement for them not to provide eligibility to register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to review the mechanisms in place to support and monitor active participation in guided independent study, to ensure consistency in the approach.

Reason: The visitors discussed the approach taken to guided independent study on the programme with the programme team and with students at the visit. Guided independent study forms a large proportion of the notional hours in the delivery of the curriculum, and the students highlighted that there was some inconsistency in the way different tutors approach the setting and monitoring of work for independent study. Where some lecturers will set defined reading material or activities on the virtual learning environment and follow the activity up at the following sessions, others take a less structured or directive approach. Given the importance of the guided independent study in ensuring that the curriculum is being delivered in this programme, the visitors therefore advise the programme team to revisit the way in which the programme team monitor and support this study, to ensure the parity and consistency of student experience and the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Michael Branicki
Teresa Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Date of visit	1 – 3 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'radiographer' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 21 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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) Physiotherapy – Full Time; BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Podiatry - Full Time; MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; BSc in Operating Department Practice - Full Time. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Russell Hart (Radiographer) Patricia Fillis (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	20 Full time once per year
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Tony Kilpatrick (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Debbie Donnet (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Ben McConville (Internal Panel Member) Barbara Wilford (Society and College of Radiographers) Sarah E Smith (Society and College of Radiographers)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the HCPC with updated documentation following any major changes as a result of the revalidation and reaccreditation process.

Reason: At the visit, there were a number of aspects of the programme where the professional body and internal panels have required changes to be made. These included for example, amendments to the module descriptors, programme structure and assessment processes. The visitors therefore require the finalised documentation to be submitted where changes have been made, to ensure that the SETs will continue to be met under any changes, and to ensure that the documentation continues to be clear, accurate and appropriate to support students through the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources to support student learning throughout the programme are clear and consistently reflective of the current setting for registration of radiographer.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For instance within the handbook, page seven (BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging Programme Handbook Jan 2014) there is reference to 'HPC'. All reference such as these must be updated to the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council'. The Programme Specification also states that, "Due to the requirements of the professional bodies there will be no aegrotat awards of ...BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging..." These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate.

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 submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that

HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Russell Hart
Patricia Fillis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	1 – 3 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 21 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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) Radiotherapy and Oncology – Full Time; BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Podiatry - Full Time; MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; BSc in Operating Department Practice - Full Time. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	75 per year
First approved intake	September 1996
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Elaine Smith (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Morven Gillies (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Russell (Internal Panel Member) Karen Morris (College of Occupational Therapists) Julie Taylor (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Janette Grey (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Jennifer Duthie (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review the practice placement handbook prior to the visit as the information is included in the Allied Health Sciences Practice Education Handbook documentation. A separate practice placement handbook specific to MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) was also tabled at the visit.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources to support student learning throughout the programme are clear and consistently reflective of the current setting for registration of occupational therapists.

Reason: In review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted a number of inaccurate references to the HCPC. For instance it refers to the HCPC's former name, 'HPC' on page 33 of the 'BSc Hons Occupational Therapy Programme Re-Approval Document 2014' and within the module descriptor's references for 'Community Based Practice in Occupational Therapy (Practice Education)'. The Programme Specification also states that 'Due to the requirements of the professional bodies there will be no aegrotat awards of BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy.' Also within the programme documentation there are a number of references to the 'HCPC Codes of conduct'. These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the HCPC with updated documentation following any major changes as a result of the revalidation and reaccreditation process.

Reason: At the visit, there were a number of aspects of the programme where the professional body and internal panels have required changes to be made. These included for example, amendments to the module descriptors, programme structure and assessment processes. It was also highlighted in discussion with the programme team, that the practice education documents tabled at the visit were subject to changes as they had not yet been reviewed by the Assessment sub-group and external examiners. The visitors therefore require the finalised documentation to be submitted where changes have been made, to ensure that the SETs will continue to be met under any changes, and to ensure that the documentation continues to be clear, accurate and appropriate to support students through the programme.

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 submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this

programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Margaret Hanson
Karen Harrison

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	1 – 3 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 21 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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) Radiotherapy and Oncology – Full Time; BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Podiatry - Full Time; MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; BSc in Operating Department Practice - Full Time. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	78 per year
First approved intake	August 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Elaine Smith (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Morven Gillies (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Russell (Internal Panel Member) Karen Morris (College of Occupational Therapists) Julie Taylor (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Janette Grey (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Jennifer Duthie (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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 ensure that the information provided to potential applicants clearly articulates all the entry requirements for the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted in relation to admissions, including the programme information in the prospectus and on the website. They were unable to see from this evidence, how prospective applicants are informed of all relevant entry requirements, particularly occupational health requirements and criminal convictions check procedures, and any costs to the students associated with these processes. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how and when applicants are informed of the full entry requirements for the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence in the programme admissions documentation that criminal convictions checks are applied in the admissions process.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'BSc Hons Physiotherapy Re-Approval Submission Document Jan 2014' as evidence against this SET. Section 2.3 states that all students entering year one of study are required to be a member of the Protecting Vulnerable Groups scheme. The student meets the cost of applying to the scheme. International and EU students have to complete a local police check prior to commencing the programme. Students then undertake a self-disclosure on a yearly basis whilst on the programme. However, the visitors could not find the requirement of criminal convictions checks in the entry requirements contained within Section six: Admissions in the programme specification, or in the admissions information provided to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the admissions procedures will apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence in the programme admissions documentation that occupational health requirements are applied in the admissions process.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'BSc Hons Physiotherapy Re-Approval Submission Document Jan 2014' as evidence against this SET. Section 2.3 states that students are advised to undertake vaccinations. It also emphasises the physical demands of the profession and states that all admission offers are made conditional to an applicant successfully undergoing screening in relation to Occupational Health. However, the visitors were unable to find further information on how and when the application of occupational health screening occurs. They also could not find any information on health entry requirements contained within Section six: Admissions in the

programme specification, or within the information provided to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the admissions procedures will apply specified selection and entry criteria to ensure compliance with any health requirements.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources to support student learning throughout the programme are clear and consistently reflective of the current setting for registration of physiotherapists.

Reason: In review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted a number of inaccurate references to the HCPC or the HCPC's standards. For instance within the module descriptors (in 'BSc Hons Physiotherapy Re-Approval Submission Document Jan 2014') it refers to 'HCPC Codes of conduct' and 'HPCP Code of performance, ethics and fitness to practice policy'. The Programme Specification also states that, "Due to the requirements of the professional bodies there will be no aegrotat awards of ...BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy..." These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the HCPC with updated documentation following any major changes as a result of the revalidation and reaccreditation process.

Reason: At the visit, there were a number of aspects of the programme where the professional body and internal panels have required changes to be made. These included for example, amendments to the module descriptors, programme structure and assessment processes. The visitors therefore require the finalised documentation to be submitted where changes have been made, to ensure that the SETs will continue to be met under any changes, and to ensure that the documentation continues to be clear, accurate and appropriate to support students through the programme.

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 submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be

appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Recommendations

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to continue to focus on and develop the students' ability to recognise and respond appropriately to situations where it is necessary to share information to safeguard service users or the wider public.

Reason: In discussion with the students at the visit, the visitors asked about the delivery of legal and ethical aspects of practice in the programme. Whistleblowing was discussed and many students present appeared unsure as to the formal processes to follow when met with concerning behaviour or practices whilst working in the placement setting. The new standards of proficiency (SOPs) for Physiotherapists include a requirement for them to be able to recognise and respond appropriately to situations where it is necessary to share information to safeguard service users or the wider public (SOP 7.3). The visitors were confident that this SOP will be met by students upon graduation from the programme, however, they considered that a greater focus on the current setting of ethical aspects of practice and associated formal processes, earlier in the programme, would be helpful for students in practice. The visitors therefore advise the programme team to continue to monitor the way in which the programme addresses current practice issues concerning safeguarding of service users and the wider public.

Margaret Hanson
Karen Harrison

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Date of visit	1 – 3 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'chiropractor' or 'podiatrist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 21 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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) Radiotherapy and Oncology – Full Time; BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full Time; BSc in Operating Department Practice - Full Time; MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy – Full Time. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	30 per year
First approved intake	January 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	John Houston (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	David Steed (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Geraint Bevan (Internal Panel Member) Alison Barlow (College of Podiatry) Allan Wood (College of Podiatry) Wilfred Foxe (College of Podiatry) Lloyd Howell (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three 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 information available to potential applicants around health screenings, immunisations and 'Disclosure Scotland' checks.

Reason: The SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit directed the visitors to the education provider's website admissions page for podiatry. The information available on the website did not state that applicants would be required to undergo a health screening prior to being offered a place on the programme. Nor did it state the extent of the health screening or compulsory immunisations. However, from a meeting with the programme team it was clear that this was a requirement for all applicants. The visitors were also unable to find any information for applicants on the requirement to undergo a criminal convictions check prior to starting the programme. The visitors consider this important information for potential applicants to the programme to enable them to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show that potential applicants will be informed of the requirement to undergo a criminal convictions check and health screening as well as the content of the health screening and any immunisations required.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for chiropodists / podiatrists.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies and incorrect terminology. For example there were references to the HCPCs former name (HPC) on page 37 of the 'Allied Health Sciences Practice Education Handbook' where it states that "The HPC will only consider cases of admission to their register on application from an eligible individual;...". In addition to this the website admissions page states that "This programme is accredited by the UK Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists and the UK Health & Care Professions Council (HCPC)." The HCPC does not accredit programmes, we approve them. The website pages also state that "This programme aims to produce competent graduate podiatrists eligible for registration with the Health & Care Professions Council (HCPC)." (Programme Description). This statement could suggest to students that registration is automatic upon successful completion of the programme and should be amended to clearly articulate that students will be 'eligible to apply for registration' instead of 'eligible to register'. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the HCPC with updated documentation following any major changes as a result of the revalidation and reaccreditation process.

Reason: At the visit, there were a number of aspects of the programme where the professional body and internal panels have required changes to be made. These included for example, amendments to the module descriptors, programme structure and assessment processes. The visitors therefore require the finalised documentation to be submitted where changes have been made, to ensure that the SETs will continue to be met under any changes, and to ensure that the documentation continues to be clear, accurate and appropriate to support students through the programme.

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 submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Penny Joyce
Catherine O'Halloran

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Date of visit	1 – 3 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'radiographer' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 21 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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) Physiotherapy – Full Time; BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Podiatry - Full Time; MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; BSc in Operating Department Practice - Full Time. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Russell Hart (Radiographer) Patricia Fillis (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	55 Full time once per year
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Tony Kilpatrick (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Debbie Donnet (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Ben McConville (Internal Panel Member) Barbara Wilford (Society and College of Radiographers) Sarah E Smith (Society and College of Radiographers)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the HCPC with updated documentation following any major changes as a result of the revalidation and reaccreditation process.

Reason: At the visit, there were a number of aspects of the programme where the professional body and internal panels have required changes to be made. These included for example, amendments to the module descriptors, programme structure and assessment processes. The visitors therefore require the finalised documentation to be submitted where changes have been made, to ensure that the SETs will continue to be met under any changes, and to ensure that the documentation continues to be clear, accurate and appropriate to support students through the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources to support student learning throughout the programme are clear and consistently reflective of the current setting for registration of radiographer.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For instance, page 14 (BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology Programme Re-approval Submission Document Jan 2014) there is reference to 'HPC'. All reference such as these must be updated to the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council'. The Programme Specification also states that, "Due to the requirements of the professional bodies there will be no aegrotat awards of ...BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and oncology..." These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate.

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 submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that

HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Russell Hart
Patricia Fillis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc in Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	1 – 3 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 21 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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) Radiotherapy and Oncology – Full Time; BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Podiatry - Full Time; MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy – Full Time. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	20 per year
First approved intake	September 2012
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	John Houston (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	David Steed (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Geraint Bevan (Internal Panel Member) Alison Barlow (College of Podiatry) Allan Wood (College of Podiatry) Wilfred Foxe (College of Podiatry) Lloyd Howell (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The visitors viewed external examiners reports from the DipHE Operating Department Practice 2011/12 as the programme transferred to BSc in Operating Department Practice which had its first intake in September 2012.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three 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 information available to potential applicants around health screenings and immunisations.

Reason: The SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit directed the visitors to the education providers website admissions page for ODP. The information available on the website stated that applicants would be required to undergo a health screening prior to being offered a place on the programme. However, the information provided did not state the extent of the health screening or compulsory immunisations. The visitors consider this important information for potential applicants to the programme to enable them to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show that potential applicants will be informed of the content of the health screening and any immunisations required.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for operating department practitioners.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies and incorrect terminology. For example page 82 of the 'BSc Operating Department Practice Programme Handbook' states that "...then the occupational health (OH) team will administer the required immunisations for a stated fee." However, after speaking with the programme team, it was made clear that students will not be required to pay for any immunisations. In addition to this the website admissions page references the HCPCs former name (HPC). In the programme description for further education students it states "...to be eligible to register with the Health Professions Council". This statement could also suggest to students that registration is automatic upon successful completion of the programme and should be amended to clearly articulate that students will be 'eligible to apply for registration' instead of 'eligible to register'. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the HCPC with updated documentation following any major changes as a result of the revalidation and reaccreditation process.

Reason: At the visit, there were a number of aspects of the programme where the professional body and internal panels have required changes to be made. These

included for example, amendments to the module descriptors, programme structure and assessment processes. The visitors therefore require the finalised documentation to be submitted where changes have been made, to ensure that the SETs will continue to be met under any changes, and to ensure that the documentation continues to be clear, accurate and appropriate to support students through the programme.

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 submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Penny Joyce
Catherine O'Halloran

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	1 – 3 April 2014

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 21 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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) Radiotherapy and Oncology – Full Time; BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Podiatry - Full Time; MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; BSc in Operating Department Practice - Full Time. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	20 per year
First approved intake	August 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Elaine Smith (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Morven Gillies (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Russell (Internal Panel Member) Karen Morris (College of Occupational Therapists) Julie Taylor (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Janette Grey (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Jennifer Duthie (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review the practice placement handbook prior to the visit as the information is included in the Allied Health Sciences Practice Education Handbook documentation. A separate practice placement handbook specific to MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) was also tabled at the visit.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources to support student learning throughout the programme are clear and consistently reflective of the current setting for registration of occupational therapists.

Reason: In review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted a number of inaccurate references to the HCPC. For instance it refers to the HCPC's former name, 'HPC' within the Programme Specification Pro-forma, section nine. Also within the programme documentation there are a number of references to the 'HCPC Codes of conduct'. The Programme Specification also states that, 'Due to the requirements of the professional bodies there will be no aegrotat awards of MSc Occupational Therapy...' These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the HCPC with updated documentation following any major changes as a result of the revalidation and reaccreditation process.

Reason: At the visit, there were a number of aspects of the programme where the professional body and internal panels have required changes to be made. These included for example, amendments to the module descriptors, programme structure and assessment processes. It was also highlighted in discussion with the programme team, that the practice education documents tabled at the visit were subject to changes as they had not yet been reviewed by the Assessment sub-group and external examiners. The visitors therefore require the finalised documentation to be submitted where changes have been made, to ensure that the SETs will continue to be met under any changes, and to ensure that the documentation continues to be clear, accurate and appropriate to support students through the programme.

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 submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the

requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Margaret Hanson
Karen Harrison

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	1 – 3 April 2014

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 21 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. 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 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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) Radiotherapy and Oncology – Full Time; BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy - Full Time; BSc (Hons) Podiatry - Full Time; MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full Time; BSc in Operating Department Practice - Full Time. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	44 per year
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Elaine Smith (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Morven Gillies (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Russell (Internal Panel Member) Karen Morris (College of Occupational Therapists) Julie Taylor (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Janette Grey (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Jennifer Duthie (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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

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 ensure that the information provided to potential applicants clearly articulates all the entry requirements for the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted in relation to admissions, including the programme information in the prospectus and on the website. They were unable to see from this evidence, how prospective applicants are informed of all relevant entry requirements, particularly occupational health requirements and criminal convictions check procedures, and any costs to the students associated with these processes. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how and when applicants are informed of the full entry requirements for the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence in the programme admissions documentation that criminal convictions checks are applied in the admissions process.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-Reg) Programme Re-Approval Submission Document Jan 2014' as evidence against this SET. Section 2.3 states that all students are required to be a member of The Disclosure Scotland: Protecting Vulnerable Groups scheme. The student meets the cost of applying to the scheme. International and EU students have to complete a local police check prior to commencing the programme. Students then undertake a self-disclosure on a yearly basis whilst on the programme. However, the visitors could not find the requirement of criminal convictions checks in the entry requirements contained within Section six: Admissions in the programme specification, or in the admissions information provided to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the admissions procedures will apply selection and entry criteria including criminal convictions checks.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence in the programme admissions documentation that occupational health requirements are applied in the admissions process.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-Reg) Programme Re-Approval Submission Document Jan 2014' as evidence against this SET. Section 2.3 states that students are advised to undertake vaccinations. It also emphasises the physical demands of the profession and states that students are selected, "...based on the graduates' educational qualifications, academic references, personal statements, medical fitness, [adhering to the Disability Discrimination Act] and interview performance." However, the visitors were unable to find further information on how and when the application of occupational health screening occurs. They also could not find

any information on health entry requirements contained within Section six: Admissions in the programme specification, or within the information provided to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the admissions procedures will apply specified selection and entry criteria to ensure compliance with any health requirements.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure that inclusion mechanisms, such as recognition or accreditation of prior learning, are clearly articulated in the programme admissions documentation.

Reason: The visitors were directed to Section 2.3 of the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-Registration) Programme Re-Approval Submission Document Jan 2014 as evidence against this SET. The SETs mapping also provided a link to the education provider's admissions policy, however the visitors were unable to find information within this specific to the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-Registration) programme. They were unable to find a clear statement within Section 2.3 of the submission document regarding inclusion mechanisms, whether (and how) they are used for entry to this programme and any restrictions on the amount or type of credits that can be recognised under the Recognition of Prior Learning policy. They also could not find any information on the programme's recognition of prior learning entry requirements contained within Section six: Admissions in the programme specification. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the admissions procedures will apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms. In this way they can ensure that this SET is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources to support student learning throughout the programme are clear and consistently reflective of the current setting for registration of physiotherapists.

Reason: In review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted a number of inaccurate references to the HCPC. For instance the programme handbook refers to the HCPC's former name, 'HPC' (page 25). The Programme Specification Pro-forma also states that, "Due to the requirements of the professional bodies there will be no aegrotat awards of... MSc Physiotherapy..." These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the HCPC with updated documentation following any major changes as a result of the revalidation and reaccreditation process.

Reason: At the visit, there were a number of aspects of the programme where the professional body and internal panels have required changes to be made. These included for example, amendments to the module descriptors, programme structure and assessment processes. The visitors therefore require the finalised documentation to be submitted where changes have been made, to ensure that the SETs will continue to be met under any changes, and to ensure that the documentation continues to be clear, accurate and appropriate to support students through the programme.

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 submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Recommendations

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to continue to focus on and develop the students' ability to recognise and respond appropriately to situations where it is necessary to share information to safeguard service users or the wider public.

Reason: In discussion with the students at the visit, the visitors asked about the delivery of legal and ethical aspects of practice in the programme. Whistleblowing was discussed and many students present appeared unsure as to the formal processes to follow when met with concerning behaviour or practices whilst working in the placement setting. The new standards of proficiency (SOPs) for Physiotherapists include a requirement for them to be able to recognise and respond appropriately to situations where it is necessary to share information to safeguard service users or the wider public (SOP 7.3). The visitors were confident that this SOP will be met by students upon graduation from the programme, however, they considered that a greater focus on the current setting of ethical aspects of practice and associated formal processes, earlier in the programme, would be helpful for students in practice. The visitors therefore advise the programme team to continue to monitor the way in which the programme addresses current practice issues concerning safeguarding of service users and the wider public.

Margaret Hanson
Karen Harrison

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Goldsmiths College University of London
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	8 - 9 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 13 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. 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 16 May 2014. 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 5 June 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 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 did not review the programme, but the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the MA in Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social worker) Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	35 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	John Ginman (Goldsmiths College University of London)
Secretary	Rachel Davies (Goldsmiths College University of London)
Members of the joint panel	Vijay Patel (The College of Social Work) Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the HCPC and its guidance and standards for the statutory regulation for social workers.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided prior to the visit, and found instances of inaccurate references to the HCPC and its documentation to support students and registrants. For instance, the documentation regularly refers to 'accreditation' from the HCPC, including within the programme specification. The HCPC, as the statutory regulator for social workers in England, 'approves' education and training programmes to lead to eligibility to register as social workers, rather than operating a system of endorsement or accreditation. The programme handbook also refers to a 'HCPC Code of Conduct and Ethics' for students (for example, page 217), and Appendix 5 is a 'HCPC Professional Conduct and Ethics agreement', based on the HCPC's 'Guidance on conduct and ethics for students', which students are asked to sign. The use of terminology such as standards, agreement or code of conduct, in relation to this guidance, could mislead students as to the HCPC's remit and guidance regarding social work students. The HCPC's 'Standards of conduct, performance and ethics' and 'Standards of Proficiency - Social workers in England' that will apply to students who successfully complete the programme and register with the HCPC, should be referenced correctly throughout the documentation. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references to the HCPC, including references to its guidance and standards and how they are applicable to students or registrants, are clearly and accurately laid out.

Recommendations

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.**

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to monitor supervision in the practice setting going forward, to ensure that appropriate supervision is taking place as outlined in the practice learning agreement, and is recorded appropriately.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the practice placement documentation, and discussed preparation for placements and expectations of supervision with students and placement educators at the visit. The visitors were confident that the new documents to support practice educators in supervising students, along with workshops, would meet this standard going forward. However, in discussion with students, the visitors heard that some placement educators have not always ensured that supervision takes place in the correct environment, at the specified frequency, and is recorded appropriately. The programme team and placement educators highlighted that the new documentation to support placement learning clearly specifies the requirements for supervision, and details how the frequency and content of these sessions is monitored throughout the placement. The placement educators demonstrated that they fully understood the requirements of supervision in practice, as outlined in the practice documentation. The visitors were therefore content that this standard will be met going forward, but advise the programme team to keep placement supervision under review to ensure that it takes place as specified in the practice placement documentation.

Michael Branicki
Deborah Kouzarides

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Goldsmiths College University of London
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	8 - 9 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 13 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. 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 16 May 2014. 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 5 June 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 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 did not review the programme, but the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BA in Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social worker) Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	35 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	John Ginman (Goldsmiths College University of London)
Secretary	Rachel Davies (Goldsmiths College University of London)
Members of the joint panel	Vijay Patel (The College of Social Work) Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the HCPC and its guidance and standards for the statutory regulation for social workers.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided prior to the visit, and found instances of inaccurate references to the HCPC and its documentation to support students and registrants. For instance, the documentation regularly refers to 'accreditation' from the HCPC, including within the programme specification. The HCPC, as the statutory regulator for social workers in England, 'approves' education and training programmes to lead to eligibility to register as social workers, rather than operating a system of endorsement or accreditation. The programme handbook also refers to a 'HCPC Code of Conduct and Ethics' for students (for example, page 109), and Appendix 5 is a 'HCPC Professional Conduct and Ethics agreement', based on the HCPC's 'Guidance on conduct and ethics for students', which students are asked to sign. The use of terminology such as standards, agreement or code of conduct, in relation to this guidance, could mislead students as to the HCPC's remit and guidance regarding social work students. The HCPC's 'Standards of conduct, performance and ethics' and 'Standards of Proficiency - Social workers in England' that will apply to students who successfully complete the programme and register with the HCPC, should be referenced correctly throughout the documentation. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references to the HCPC, including references to its guidance and standards and how they are applicable to students or registrants, are clearly and accurately laid out.

Recommendations

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.**

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to monitor supervision in the practice setting going forward, to ensure that appropriate supervision is taking place as outlined in the practice learning agreement, and is recorded appropriately.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the practice placement documentation, and discussed preparation for placements and expectations of supervision with students and placement educators at the visit. The visitors were confident that the new documents to support practice educators in supervising students, along with workshops, would meet this standard going forward. However, in discussion with students, the visitors heard that some placement educators have not always ensured that supervision takes place in the correct environment, at the specified frequency, and is recorded appropriately. The programme team and placement educators highlighted that the new documentation to support placement learning clearly specifies the requirements for supervision, and details how the frequency and content of these sessions is monitored throughout the placement. The placement educators demonstrated that they fully understood the requirements of supervision in practice, as outlined in the practice documentation. The visitors were therefore content that this standard will be met going forward, but advise the programme team to keep placement supervision under review to ensure that it takes place as specified in the practice placement documentation.

Michael Branicki
Deborah Kouzarides

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Validating body / Awarding body	Teesside University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	19 - 20 March 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 23 April 2014 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 5 June 2014. 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 22 April 2014. 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 5 June 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social Work profession came onto the register in 2012 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	35 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Lesley Bryden (New College Durham)
Secretary	Ann Aydon (New College Durham)
Members of the joint panel	Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) Roseann Connoly (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 review the information available to potential applicants with particular reference to bursaries and fees.

Reason: In discussion with the students, it was highlighted that students on the programme are very aware of the changes in bursary arrangements for social work students in England. However, there was uncertainty on the number of bursaries available to New College Durham students and how these would be allocated. Students mentioned they had heard possibilities of allocation via means testing, attendance and grades however no progress on a formal decision had been communicated to them. The visitors also heard that current first year students were made aware, upon application, that the current course fees were £6000 per year, however when coming to register were informed that the fees has risen to £7500. Students expressed that the lower fee rate, amongst other areas, had partly informed their choice to study at New College Durham. In addition to this some students mentioned that the fee structure on the New College Durham admissions web page suggested that fees reduced in second year, then again in third year. However, they later understood that this was a statement of the fees paid by current students in their current year of study and was not applicable to new applicants. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and that it could currently be misleading. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are informed and kept up to date regarding the bursary and fee structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies and incorrect terminology. For example page 58 of the course handbook states that, "Before any student is permitted to go out on their first placement s/he will need to fulfil the HCPC Assessed Readiness for Direct Practise requirements showing that they meet the Professional Capability Framework at the Readiness for Direct Practice level." This is not a requirement of the HCPC and refers to guidelines set by The College of Social Work. It was also noted that the New College Durham web page contained statements which suggested that students would receive automatic registration with the HCPC on successful completion of the programme, for example, "The course will provide successful students with a professional qualification in social work, which will enable them to join the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)...". In a meeting with the students it was also expressed that students were of the understanding that successful completion of the programme provided automatic registration to the HCPC. It is important for students to understand that successfully

completing the programme will provide eligibility to apply to the HCPC register and not automatic registration. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that where students participate as service users in practical teaching, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent was sought for participation as a service user in practical and role play activities. The visitors were provided with a 'Consent and Confidentiality' form that students signed prior to starting the programme, however this did not clearly state any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved where students participate 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 provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching or role play.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information about the collaborative curriculum for the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided stated that interprofessional learning (IPL) was not applicable to the programme. However in conversation with the programme team the visitors heard conflicting statements on whether IPL was present in the programme. The visitors therefore require clarification on the inclusion of IPL, and if this is present require information about which parts of the curriculum are shared, and which are not, with the reasons behind this. This is to ensure that where IPL is present it does not prevent students from learning the skills and knowledge specific to social work.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation noting information about aegrotat awards, however the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that

aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the programme documentation it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. In this way the visitors can be sure that this information is available to students and that this standard is 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 revise the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy that the current external examiners meet the requirement of the HCPC. However, this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered, or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme are included in the assessment regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.

Deborah Kouzarides
Gary Hickman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	9 – 10 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 30 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 9 July 2014. 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 26 August 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Phil Warren (Biomedical scientist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	12 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Allison Jones (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Rachel Allen (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Philip Cheetham (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Dave Eccleston (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review a practice placement handbook prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. During discussion with the programme team it was highlighted they are currently developing a practice placement handbook.

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 17 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 40 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 review the advertising materials and programme documentation to make it clear that upon successful completion of the programme the individual will be eligible to apply for registration with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) as a biomedical scientist.

Reason: The visitors found inconsistent advice about registration with the HCPC in the advertising materials and programme documentation. For example, there were several references in the documentation to registration as a “Healthcare science practitioner”, but not specifically as a “biomedical scientist” with the HCPC. To an applicant, this may cause confusion. The visitors require the advertising materials and programme documentation to include further explanation of the importance of registration with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist and what this entails in order to be satisfied that this standard has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the information provided to potential applicants regarding the requirements for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English to ensure they are consistent.

Reason: The entry criteria for this programme require evidence for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English. Students who do not have English as a first language need to demonstrate “obtaining an IELTS [International English Level Testing System] score of 6 or above or equivalent.” (Programme specification, page 5). It was not clear if, or what score is required for each of the components of IELTS for entry to the programme. During the programme team meeting, the programme leader said, they will revisit the admission criteria to increase the required IELTS score to 7 with no elements below 6.5 and update this section. The visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation including advertising materials. The revised documentation must clearly state the English language requirements needed for entry to the programme, to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate criminal convictions checks are applied through the admissions procedures by the education provider and are clearly stated for applicants specifically to this programme.

Reason: The visitors could not see evidence in the programme documentation to show that students for this programme will be subjected to criminal convictions checks. However, the visitors noted in the documentation that at enrolment all MPharm students must undergo a DBS check and this will normally be completed during induction week (School Manual, page 9). During meetings with the senior team and the programme team it was noted that criminal convictions checks are carried by the education provider

before potential students are recruited on the programme. They also said they will update all documents to reflect requirements for this programme. The visitors require this information to be clearly stated in the programme documentation and admission procedures for applicants specifically to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide clear information about the health requirements including immunisation for applicants in the admissions documentation, and set out the process for dealing with any health issues.

Reason: The programme documentation sets out health requirements, however the visitors noted this information is pharmacy focused. The statement “It is a requirement for all MPharm applicants to complete a Fitness to Practice (FTP) Form at interview and if any issues are highlighted these are considered by the School’s Suitability Panel before any offer is made” (page 9, School Manual) makes it unclear whether this programme has any admissions health requirements that apply. There was also limited information on the process for dealing with any health issues for this programme specifically. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clarify the admissions information given to applicants and students, to ensure they are aware of any health requirements including immunisation that apply for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions and programme documentation to articulate clearly the scheme for the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) or other inclusion mechanisms that are in place for programme entry.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that, while the student handbook indicated applicants could apply to be exempted from the study of certain modules of the programme and be admitted through an accreditation procedure, there was no clear detailed information about the scheme. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that prior certificated credit or prior experiential credit may be used within the programme, and any evidence of prior learning and experience is assessed during admissions. However, the visitors were unable to determine that enough information was available to potential applicants about APEL. In order to meet this standard, information about APEL should be clearly articulated to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored through the admissions procedures.

Reason: The mapping document for the Standards of Education and Training (SETs) made reference to page 8 of the school manual documents in relation to this standard.

However, the visitors were unable to find this evidence. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there was an equality and diversity policy in place in relation to applicants and students, but were not clear how this policy works, or how it is implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the equality and diversity policies in place, together with an indication of how they are implemented and monitored in order to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: The SETs mapping document made no reference to documentation provided prior to the visit as evidence of the arrangements that are in place to ensure the continued security of the programme for future cohorts. At the visit, the visitors met with the senior team and learnt that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Discussions covered financial security of the programme and security for students if the programme was deemed no longer viable. However, because this was not documented, the visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that this standard has met.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme committees and management structure, indicating the roles and responsibilities of the programme team members and how the roles interlink.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors noted that the programme team also manage other programmes and therefore there are agreed management structures in place. The visitors were unable to determine the programme specific structures for effective management of this programme. In discussion with the students it was clear they understood the roles and responsibilities of various members of the programme team, and who the main points of contact were when they needed support. However, the visitors noted the programme management structure was not documented, and as such could not be assured that future students and staff of the programme would have a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the roles and lines of responsibility of the programme team and committee structures, to ensure that the programme continues to be effectively managed.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence regarding the systems in place for programme monitoring and evaluation including for placements.

Reason: The visitors discussed the monitoring and evaluation of several aspects of the programme including placements with the programme team. They discussed some of the monitoring and evaluation systems in place, but these systems were not always

clearly reflected in the programme documentation or were generic (school manual, page 11). The visitors were unclear about several aspects of the monitoring and evaluation systems in place, especially monitoring and evaluation of the practice aspects of the programme and those relating to feedback. There is limited information in this document about the procedures behind feedback mechanisms, or how feedback is considered by the programme team; the visitors were therefore unclear how this standard is met. The visitors were unclear exactly how feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated from the feedback are implemented, and how any resulting changes to the programme are communicated to practice educators, students and other stakeholders. The visitors require information which clearly articulates the processes for dealing with student, practice educator and other stakeholders' feedback and that demonstrates robust quality assurance procedures for practice placements are in place to be satisfied that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the selection criteria for the role of visiting lecturers and tutors on the programme, and how the education provider ensures that individuals recruited to these roles have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors were informed that visiting lecturers and tutors of the programme are recruited by the education provider from organisations in the regional partnerships. From a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that all individuals appointed have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge in their role. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that there are effective systems in place that allow the education provider to ensure that all individuals recruited have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge for this role.

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 provide evidence of the protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no recognised protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved with students participating as service users. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that students may be required to take blood samples from each other during practical sessions. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements 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 provide evidence of protocols for obtaining informed

consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching sessions.

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 the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did mention the minimum attendance requirements for this programme. However, the visitors noted that each module has different mandatory attendance requirements and monitoring mechanisms. During discussions with the programme team, it was highlighted that these individual module requirements are not clearly articulated in the programme documents. Therefore the programme team will need to clearly identify where students' attendance is mandatory and the procedures and mechanisms in place to monitor it effectively. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further detail of the formal procedures in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct and how it may be implemented throughout the programme.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation provided, and from discussions with the programme team, practice placement team and the students, the visitors were clear that there are mechanisms in place to deal with any student misconduct in the education setting. The visitors were unclear, however, how concerns about students' profession-related conduct whilst on placement are relayed to the programme team, or how any issues would be dealt with by the education provider. The visitors were also unclear how any non-academic conduct issues would be dealt with by the education provider, or whether the students are aware how any issues could impact on future HCPC registration. Therefore, the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms by which the education provider manage any concerns with students' profession-related conduct on placement to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for biomedical scientists.

Reason: The visitors noted the SOPs mapping document referenced SOPs to particular learning outcomes within the module descriptors. However, they also noted the SOPs mapping was incorrect and misleading and were subsequently unable to determine all SOPs were being covered by the modules and consequently assessed. The visitors

were unclear how this programme will ensure that students who complete the programme will be able to meet all the SOPs for biomedical scientists. The visitors suggest a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes will assist their review of this SET. The visitors require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for biomedical scientists.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the current regulatory and professional landscape of the HCPC and the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS).

Reason: The programme intends to deliver graduates that are eligible to apply to the HCPC Register as biomedical scientists. The visitors noted from the SETs mapping document, reading the documentation and from discussions with the students that the programme is heavily focused on Health Education England (HEE) modernising scientific careers healthcare scientists for the National Health Services (NHS). The visitors noted during the meetings with the students that they knew very little about the role of the HCPC and the importance of registering with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist. The programme specification makes reference to the IBMS, HCPC and HEE as subject benchmarking groups. However, the visitors could not determine how the curriculum reflects the current regulatory and professional landscape of the HCPC and the IBMS. In order to ensure the curriculum remains relevant to current practice, the visitors therefore require further evidence.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to refer to the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics and provide evidence to demonstrate students are made aware of their implications.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors could not identify where students are made aware of the implications of the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates how the programme team ensure that students understand the implications of these standards. In particular the visitors require further evidence about where in the programme students are made aware of the standards, if they are included in any teaching, and if there is opportunity for students to access the HCPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they ensure the delivery of the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

Reason: From the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensured the delivery of the programme supports

and develops autonomous and reflective thinking. Within the programme team meeting, it was highlighted they planned some of the teaching methods and assessment to encourage students to reflect on their learning and practice throughout the programme. However the visitors could not see any evidence of this in the documentation. The visitors therefore require further evidence to specifically demonstrate the delivery of the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the delivery of the programme encourages evidence based practice.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit it was clear the programme consisted of several competency based assessments with formal teaching and learning approaches in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on learning taught in the curriculum. The visitors were unable to find evidence of evidence based practice within the programme such as through student-centred and independent learning, teaching and assessment strategies. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the delivery of the programme encourages evidence based practice.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information about interprofessional learning in the programme.

Reason: From documentation submitted and discussion with the programme team it was clear that the education provider needed clarification about this standard. This standard refers to areas of the curriculum which are taught across different professions. If this occurs for this programme, the programme team must make sure the skills and knowledge specific to biomedical scientists are addressed. HCPC appreciate that it may not be possible for programmes to offer interprofessional learning, as a result it is not a requirement. In light of this clarification the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate whether interprofessional learning takes place on the programme and, if it does, how profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that practice placements are integral to the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided and during the programme team and practice placement provider meetings, the visitors were made aware that service level agreements with practice providers were informal and based on the nature of their good relationships with the placements providers. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find enough evidence from the documentation and discussions to determine how the

education provider will ensure partnership arrangements with placement providers are effective and consequently how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show that there are service level agreements with placement providers ensuring placements for students and providing evidence these placements are integral to the programme.

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 demonstrate how 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.

Reason: From the documentation provided and during the programme team and practice placement providers meetings, the visitors were made aware that service level agreements including placements arrangements for students with practice providers were informal and based on the nature of their good relationships with the placements providers. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook covering the placement arrangements and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find enough evidence from the documentations and discussions to determine how the practice placements arrangements will work and ensure partnership arrangements with placement providers are effective and consequently how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show that there are service level agreements with placement providers ensuring the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. This standard is linked to SET 5.1.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. To ensure this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to show that the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment for students. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided and during the programme team and practice placement providers meetings, the visitors were made aware that service level agreements with practice providers were informal and based on the nature of their good relationships with the placements providers. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find sufficient evidence from the documentations and discussions to determine how the education provider will ensure partnership arrangements with placement providers are effective and consequently how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show that the education provider has service level agreements with placement providers ensuring maintenance of a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. To ensure this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to show that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. To ensure this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to show that the education provider has systems in place to ensure that there are adequate numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. To ensure this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. To ensure this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training both initially and through subsequent refresher training. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook and a system to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. To ensure this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure to have regular and effective collaboration with the practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided and during the programme team and practice placement provider meetings, the visitors were made aware service level agreements with practice providers were informal and based on the nature of their good relationships with the placements providers. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a system to maintain regular and effective collaboration with placement providers. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find evidence from the documentations and discussions to determine how the education provider will ensure to have regular and effective collaboration with the practice placement providers and consequently how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show this standard is met. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for each placement.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider did not submit a practice placement handbook as part of the documentation. However, prior to the visit the programme team submitted other documentation for the programme including the SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made reference to the “Work Based Learning Booklet 2013/14” and “School Manual Academic Year 2013/14” about how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook which will be the primary source of information for students and practice educators. Therefore, in order to determine this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to show how the students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for each placement. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they will ensure that the learning, teaching and supervision on placements will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider did not submit practice placement handbook as part of the documentation. However, prior to the visit the programme team submitted other documentation for the programme including the SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made reference to the “Work Based Learning Booklet 2013/14” and “School Manual Academic Year 2013/14” about how this standard is met. The visitors were unable to find enough evidence from the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers to determine how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook which will be the primary source of information for students and practice educators. The visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the learning, teaching and supervision on placements will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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 education provider must ensure that the rights and needs of service users are respected throughout practice placement.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider did not submit practice placements handbook as part of the documentation. However, prior to the visit the programme team submitted other documentation for the programme including the SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made reference to the “Work Based Learning Booklet 2013/14” and “School Manual Academic Year 2013/14” about how this standard is met. However, the visitors could not find sufficient evidence from the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers to determine how this standard is met. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a placement handbook which will be the primary source of information for students and practice educators. The visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the rights and needs of service users are respected throughout practice placements. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment of the learning outcomes ensures that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for biomedical scientists.

Reason: The visitors noted the SOPs mapping document referenced SOPs to particular learning outcomes within the module descriptors. However, they also noted the SOPs mapping was incorrect and misleading and were subsequently unable to determine all SOPs were being covered by the modules and consequently assessed. The visitors were unclear how this programme will ensure that students who complete the programme will be able to meet all the SOPs for biomedical scientists. The visitors suggest a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning

outcomes will assist their review of this SET. The visitors require further evidence of how the assessment of the programme's learning outcomes ensures that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for biomedical scientists.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures all assessments provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks is measured.

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme including the SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made reference to the "Programme Specification" and "School Manual Academic Year 2013/14" about how this standard is met. The nature of the evidence provided was unclear. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find enough evidence from the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers to determine how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures all assessments provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks is measured. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 6.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme including the SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made reference to the "Programme Specification", "Module descriptors" and "School Manual Academic Year 2013/14" about how this standard is met. The nature of the evidence provided was unclear. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find enough evidence from the documentations and discussions with the programme team and placement providers to determine how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 6.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the measurement of student performance is objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: The SETs mapping document made no reference to documentation provided prior to the visit for evidence of the measurement of student performance being objective and ensuring fitness to practise. At the visit, the visitors met with the programme team and learnt that the programme has moderation processes and external examiners to ensure measurement of student performance is objective and ensure fitness to practise. However, the visitors felt this information needs to be clearly

articulated in the documentation and therefore it did not satisfy visitors that this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that there are measurements in place to ensure student performance is measured objectively to ensure fitness to practise.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they have effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: In line with the visitors' concerns relating to SET 5 and 6.5, they noted from documentation provided prior to the visit and discussion at the visit it was unclear how the education provider ensures there are effective moderation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the practice placement assessment of students. The visitors therefore require further evidence around assessment strategy and design including monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for practice placements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

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 HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that they have regulations or policies in place that ensure approved programmes are the only programmes which contain any reference to the protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Additionally, the visitors did not see the evidence in the documentation to inform students that the successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC as a biomedical scientist. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt the programme team will update the programme documents to reflect that the final award will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC as a biomedical scientist. However, the visitors require evidence that the final draft of programme documents are produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

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, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiner at the visit however were unable to determine if they were registered as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard when updating programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Robert Keeble
Phil Warren

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Chichester
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	19 – 20 March 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 April 2014 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 5 June 2014. 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 May 2014. 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 5 June 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession came onto the register in August 2012 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 professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Robert Goemans (Social worker) Kim Bown (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	50 Full time once per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
First approved intake	September 2014
Chair	Mark Mason (University of Chichester)
Secretary	Katie Ackerman (University of Chichester)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Keville (The College of Social Work) Vicky Lawson Brown (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 two 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

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: The SETs mapping documents submitted prior to the visit state that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC. However, the visitors could not see where this was articulated in the programme documentation, and were therefore not satisfied that this SET was met. This SET requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation is updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is 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, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The programme team should keep student access to journals under review to ensure that the learning resources for the programme continue to be appropriate to the curriculum, and readily available to students.

Reason: From discussion with the students it was revealed that they were satisfied with the resources associated with the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. However, some students spoke of difficulties of accessing key journals, as and when they needed it. Due to increase in demand on resources, with the introduction of the MA Social Work programme, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to keep student access to journals under review, to ensure that resources continue to be readily available to all students going forward.

Robert Goemans
Kim Bown

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	24 – 25 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 29 May 2014 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 5 June 2014. 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 June 2014. 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 26 August 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 considered the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. The education provider produced minutes for the event. A separate report produced by the professional body outline their decision on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Adam Longcroft (University of East Anglia)
Secretary	Antonia Shorten-Marsh (University of East Anglia)
Members of the joint panel	Michael Bowker (Internal Panel Member) Zoe Butterfint (Internal Panel Member) Carol Edwards (External Panel Member) Sandra Gibson (Internal Panel Member) Gordon Pollard (College of Paramedics) Samantha McCabe-Hogan (College of Paramedics)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit. This is a new programme; therefore there are no past external examiners' reports to review.

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

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

The HCPC met with a selection of students from various health programmes within the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences; which is where this programme is held.

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 seven SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The visitors require further detail about the Memorandum of Agreement and when it will be finalised.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated this programme is delivered through partnership arrangements which will be detailed within a memorandum of agreement in place for this programme. This will be held between the University of East Anglia and the East of England Ambulance Service Trust. At the visit, discussion indicated the parties involved with this programme are in the process of agreeing and finalising the Memorandum of Agreement to be in place before the programme commences. In order to determine this programme is effectively managed between the parties, the visitors require details of the indicative content of the Memorandum of Agreement including details of placement capacity and confirmation of when it will be finalised and agreed. The visitors also require assurance there are plans in place for if a partner wishes to withdraw from the partnership to ensure that students on the programme are not disadvantaged if this occurs.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further information about the recruitment to the post of programme director.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated staff recruitment to the programme was ongoing. Discussion at the visit confirmed staff recruitment for two programme team members was underway and that one of these posts would hold the role of programme director. In order to determine this standard is met the visitors require details of the recruitment to the post of programme director including timescales, the job description and associated roles and responsibilities.

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 submit further information around staff recruitment and resourcing for the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated staff recruitment to the programme was ongoing. Discussion at the visit confirmed staff recruitment for two programme team members was underway and is currently being advertised. It was indicated that staff resourcing would increase as student numbers on the programme increases. There was also reference to two unconfirmed 'paramedic' roles from the placement team within the school – the 'placement co-ordinator' and 'placement office' (Student handbook for Practice learning volume D, page 4). There was further discussion about the placement team posts. The visitors were unclear as to the role and responsibilities for these posts and where they would be based. In order to determine there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively the visitors require further evidence. The

visitors require information demonstrating the programme team staff recruitment time scales with job descriptions. The visitors also require further information around the placement team staff and the associated roles and responsibilities.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated module leaders have not yet been identified. During discussion at the visit it was highlighted recruitment for staff to the programme was ongoing and the final arrangements as to the module leaders and module contributors were ongoing. In order to be assured there is enough profession specific input to the programme to ensure subject areas will be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further information. The visitors require details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be.

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 demonstrating they have a system in place for the initial approval and monitoring of all placements.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit and discussion at the visit indicated the education provider conducts 'educational audits' and maintains them with database records for practice placement education. The visitors saw the system for existing placements which are not linked to the main practice placements for this programme. The visitors learnt the paramedic practice placement settings will be new to the school the programme is held in. The visitors require further evidence in order to be assured the paramedic practice placement settings have been audited and that the approval and monitoring system in place will be appropriate and ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further clarity on the roles of practice educators and mentors and further information evidencing future planning for staff numbers has been carried out.

Reason: During the visit a presentation was delivered outlining the scope of this programme for the East of England Ambulance Service Trust. The visitors learnt of the projections for student numbers with the workforce demand for future years. The visitors heard of the plans to ensure there will be enough practice educators / mentors in place for the programme however could not determine how the demand for practice educators / mentors would meet considering work scheduling and unexpected unavailability. The visitors also noted that the terms 'practice educator' and 'mentor' were often used interchangeably leading to confusion as to which roles would be required and when they would be needed. In order to determine that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting the

visitors require further clarity on the roles of practice educators and mentors and further information evidencing how future planning for practice educators has been carried out.

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 submit further information about the recruitment to the role of external examiner.

Reason: Discussion at the visit confirmed the external examiner has not yet been appointed however recruitment is underway. In order to determine adherence to this standard the visitors require details of the recruitment to the external examiner role. This includes timescales and confirmation they are appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, are from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team ensure requirements are clear when referring to required hours for theory and practice learning within the programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied that the resources to support student learning are effectively used and so are satisfied this standard is met. The visitors noted references to the HCPC and the College of Paramedics were made throughout the documentation. The visitors noted within the documentation provided when referring to the required number of practice and theory hours to be completed it was not always clear these requirements are set by the College of Paramedics not the HCPC (for example, page 5 of the Placement Learning Handbook). The HCPC does not prescribe requirements for the number of theory and practice hours to be completed. The visitors felt this could lead to confusion and so suggest the programme team ensure requirements are clear when referring to required hours for theory and practice learning within the programme documentation to ensure there are no confusions.

Paul Bates
Mark Nevins

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	24 – 25 April 2014

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 12 June 2014 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 5 June 2014. 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 June 2014. 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 26 August 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 also reviewed the programme. The education provider and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kim Bown (Social worker) David Childs (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Jo Jackson (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirsty Sceates (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Ian Paylor (External Panel Member) Bojana Petric (Internal Panel Member) Nigel South (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner reports as the programme is new.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the Nursing 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 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants are fully informed about the criminal conviction checks and health checks required as part of the admissions procedures.

Reason: The mapping documentation submitted prior to the visit demonstrated that applicants would be required to complete an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check and an Occupational Health check as part of the admissions process. Upon review of the advertising materials provided, the visitors could not see how potential applicants to the programme are made aware of the requirements for criminal conviction checks and occupational health checks. The visitors consider this information to be important in enabling potential applicants to make an informed decision regarding whether to apply to the programme. This includes the requirement for the checks, information about the level required and why this is needed, along with details about the process, and whether applicants will have to pay for their own DBS check. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the criminal conviction and occupational health checks required as part of the admissions process.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme would follow the university wide AP(E)L policy. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that applications through this route will be considered on an individual basis, and there is a thorough matching process between an applicants' prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what amount of credit could be considered through AP(E)L, and whether practice learning could be transferred or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider informs potential applicants of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, highlighting the lines of responsibility of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with staff CVs for members of the programme team. However, from the information provided, it was not clear which members of the programme team would be delivering specific areas of the programme.

At the visit, the visitors were informed that recruitment of staff for the programme was ongoing, in that some staff members are not yet in place, and whether some staff will be teaching on a full time or part time basis is yet to be finalised. The visitors therefore require further information regarding the structure for the day to day management of the programme, the lines of responsibility of the teaching team, and how this is conveyed to students to ensure that they can refer to this information, and have a clear understanding regarding which members of the team will deliver each area of the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the management of the programme will work in practice, and how students will be supported through the programme by members of the programme team.

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 that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were informed that recruitment of staff for the programme was ongoing, in that some staff members are not yet in place, and whether some staff will be teaching on a full time or part time basis is yet to be finalised. As such, the visitors were unable to determine that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, and therefore further evidence of the full teaching team, once recruitment is finalised, is required to ensure this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that all staff that will deliver the programme have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge in their role.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the staff members that are already in place to deliver the programme have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. However, in line with the conditions under SETs 3.2 and 3.5, as recruitment for the programme team is ongoing, and it was not clear which members of the programme team would be delivering specific subject areas of the programme, the visitors will require further evidence that additional staff recruited to deliver the programme have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge in their role within the delivery of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all programme documentation is updated so that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the HCPC's requirements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted references to the "HCP" (page 12, Practice Learning Handbook), rather than the HCPC. The visitors also noted a reference to the "Standards of professionalism and conduct" (page 4, Student Handbook) which should be the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance

and ethics. Finally, the visitors noted in the Practice Learning Handbook that “completion of the Social work degree, a professional programme, will subsequently lead to registration with the Health and social care professions programme (HCPC)” (page 11). Students who complete the programme will only be eligible to apply for registration, subject to a health and criminal conviction declaration. This, and any other instances, will require amending to demonstrate that upon completion of the programme, students will be “eligible to apply for registration” with the HCPC, the ‘Health and Care Professions Council’. The visitors therefore require that the documentation provided to students and applicants is updated to reflect the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC, and HCPC requirements.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the number of placement days that students will undertake is accurately and consistently reflected.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted reference to students completing an 80 day placement in year 2, and an 110 day placement in year 3 of the programme (Practice Learning Handbook, page 4). Other references in the documentation referred to one 70 day placement and one 100 day placement. The programme team clarified that the placement days would be 70 and 100 days, and the reference to 80 and 110 days was to account for any instances of sickness or other absence within the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review all documentation to ensure that the number of placement days is clearly and consistently communicated to students, and therefore ensure that the resources to support student learning will be effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain students’ consent when they are acting as service users in role play situations.

Reason: From the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that students would be asked to give their consent to take part in a video presentation. However, in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that there was not a formal process by which students would be able to give their consent when acting as service users in role plays, and other practical teachings. The visitors also could not see how students were told about the risk of emotional distress through participating in role plays, and any impact on their academic progression if they chose to opt out of participating. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how students on the programme will be able to give informed consent to participate in role play activities, when they are acting as service users.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that the external examiner appointed to the programme must be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: In discussion at the visit, the visitors learned that there will be only one external examiner recruited to the programme, in line with the wider University policy. The visitors also noted that the process to recruit an external examiner for the programme is ongoing. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the external examiner recruited would be from the appropriate part of the HCPC Register, they could not locate any information regarding the registration requirements of an external examiner for the programme within the documentation. The visitors therefore require evidence of where it clearly specifies the requirement 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.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation: When a permanent programme leader has been recruited to the programme, the education provider should inform the HCPC through the major change process.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were informed that recruitment for the role of programme leader is ongoing, and were provided with a CV for the interim programme leader. The visitors were satisfied with the current arrangements for the interim programme leader, and that they are adequately supported in their role and therefore this standard is met. However, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that when a permanent programme leader has been recruited to the programme, the HCPC should be notified through the major change process to ensure that there is a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme, that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on relevant part of the Register.

Kim Bown
David Childs