hpc health professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Keele University
Programme name	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Date of visit	17 June 2009

Contents

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve are supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, radiographers and physiotherapists) and programmes in local anaesthetics and prescription-only medicine (for chiropodists / podiatrists).

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2009. At the Committee meeting on 25 August 2009, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider did not review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Robert Cartwright (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Rachel Greig
Proposed student numbers	16
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Maggie Bailey (Keele University)
Secretary	Val Samways (Keele University)
Members of the joint panel	Peter Grannell (Internal Panel Member) Kay Stevenson (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

The HPC did not review SOPs mapping document prior to the visit as a mapping document was not required by the visitors as the programme is a post-registration qualification.

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

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

The HPC did not meet with the student as the programme was new so there were no current or past students to meet.

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 8 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

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

Conditions

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate when and how the education provider takes responsibility for ensuring applicants undertake appropriate criminal conviction checks.

Reason: In the submitted documentation it was stated that as part of the programme admissions procedure applicants would have to provide a recent CRB clearance certificate. No definition of 'recent' was included within the documentation, however, during the meeting with the programme team it was clarified that their expectation of a recent CRB check was one made within one year. From the programme team meeting the visitors also learnt that it was the employer (normally a NHS Trust) who carried out the criminal conviction check and therefore only those applicants, who were not working within their own work environment, would be expected to provide a CRB certificate. The visitors were concerned that not all applicants to the programme would therefore be required to undertake a criminal conviction check in an appropriate time frame. The visitors therefore felt that the education provider must clarify how they take responsibility for ensuring all applicants to the programme undertake an appropriate criminal conviction check.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence that the programme documentation includes information about any health requirements.

Reason: The documentation submitted to the visitors prior to the visit did not contain information about health requirements of applicants. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that an appropriate system was in place when applying entry criteria in compliance with any health requirements however felt that this should be outlined in the admissions procedures. Therefore, an outline of pre-programme enrolment health requirements needs to be detailed in the programme admissions documentation to better inform students of any programme-related health requirements.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was not possible to determine the number of staff and associate lecturers contributing to the programme. After discussion with the programme team it was stated that many staff members who will lecture on the programme had not yet been appointed. The visitors were therefore unable to determine if this standard was met. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to assure them there is a

sufficient number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme and that these staff hold appropriate qualifications and experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that programme staff and associate lecturers have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was not possible to determine that all staff and associate lecturers contributing to the programme had relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. After discussion with the programme team it was stated that many staff members who will lecture on the programme had not yet been appointed. The visitors were therefore unable to determine if this standard was met. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to ensure that teaching on the programme is performed by those with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the protocols used to obtain consent to ensure the mechanism in place to gain consent is appropriate to all situations and there are clearly articulated opt-out pathways.

Reason: From the documentation provided by the education provider during the visit it was clear that a policy for obtaining student consent was in place. However, as part of the policy students had to declare that they would be required to participate in practical skills sessions in order to fulfil the requirements of the course. The visitors felt that this wording did not make it clear that students could opt out of certain situations during a practical if they so wished. In order to ensure this standard is being met the visitors need evidence that a more coherent policy for obtaining student consent is in place and this is not confused with the policy that students must attend all practical sessions.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft the programme documentation, including the student handbook, to clearly state when attendance is mandatory and indicate what percentage of attendance must be achieved as a minimum requirement.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team the visitors were told they expected 100 per cent attendance from their students. However the documentation submitted prior to the visit did not state this. Additonally the visitors noted discrepancies between the module pro-forma and programme specification in relation to attendance and found the breakdown of mandatory taught days, placement hours and private study confusing. They were therefore unable to identify what is expected of students in terms of attendance, where it is

mandatory, and what are the minimum attendance requirements of the programme. The visitors would therefore like to receive updated programme documentation to more clearly state what is expected of the students in terms of expected attendance and mandatory hours.

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

Condition: The education provider must remove all reference to the HPC when describing the Outline Curriculum document.

Reason: Throughout the documentation submitted by the education provider there is reference to a publication called Outline Curriculum for Training Programmes to prepare Allied Health Professionals as Supplementary Prescribers (HPC, 2004). The HPC does not set learning outcomes instead we use our standards to ensure that upon completion of an education programme individuals are safe and effective to practice. Therefore to reflect the philosophy of the curriculum guidance the mention of the Outline Curriculum document should be attributed to the correct body.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation received at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that there is a thorough and effective system in place for approving new placements. From the Initial Placement Information Review and Audit (IPIRA) document and process, the visitors learnt that the annual system of monitoring placements utilises different documentation and follows a different process. To ensure that this standard has been met, the visitors would like to receive documentation which clearly articulates the mechanisms used to monitor placements on an ongoing basis.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider indicating in the learning outcomes that the HPC standard of proficiency (SOP) for supplementary prescribing programmes is covered by successful completion of the programme.

Reason: In the programme documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors could not find any reference to the HPC standard of proficiency (SOP) for a supplementary prescribing programme. However because the learning outcomes had been mapped against the Outline Curriculum document they were satisfied that the SOP was being met as part of the learning outcomes of the programme. The visitors however felt that specific mention of the HPC SOP in the learning outcomes would highlight to individuals that it was covered by successful completion of the programme. The SOP reads as follows: *Registrants must know and be able to apply the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber in order to have their name annotated on the Register.*

Glyn Harding
Robert Cartwright