

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Keele University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of visit	25-26 April 2017

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' or 'diagnostic 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 approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 May 2017. At the Committee meeting on 6 July 2017, 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 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered the endorsement 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. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Prisha Shah (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Steven Shardlow (Keele University)
Secretary	Claire Evans (Keele University)
Members of the joint panel	Louise Coleman (Society and College of Radiographers) Richard Price (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 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 as there is currently no external examiner 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 School of Health and Rehabilitation at the education provider, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it as it is not approved.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant 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 six SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally 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 revise the information they give to applicants, to ensure that they have the information they need regarding who will be responsible for paying the fees for the programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the admissions policy, open day slides, programme specification and programme website, which provided information about the programme for potential applicants. In the programme specification, open day slides and on the website it is clear that students have to pay for this programme themselves and this was confirmed at the visit. However on page 1 of the admissions policy it states that “NHS funded places on the Radiography programme at Keele University are commissioned by the West Midlands Strategic Health Authority”. The visitors noted that the inconsistent information regarding funding for the programme could be misleading to potential applicants. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures that the materials available to potential applicants gives these applicants the information they require, in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide clarity on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirements for this programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the UG Radiography Admissions Policy. This policy states that “an applicant whose first language is not English will have to demonstrate competence by holding an internationally recognised English language qualification”. The visitors were satisfied with this statement. However, the visitors noted in the documentation that a level 7 in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) must ‘usually’ be achieved before being admitted onto the programme. During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors asked what circumstances students will not ‘usually’ need to achieve a level 7. The programme team told the visitors that students will have to achieve a level 7 in the IELTS before admission onto the programme. The visitors therefore note that the terminology used in the admissions documentation could be misleading as it suggests that students may not have to achieve a level 7 in some circumstances. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider clarifies what the IELTS requirements are for this programme, so that applicants know what is required of them during the admissions process.

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 clearly articulate where standard of proficiency (SOP) 2.6, regarding the current legislation governing the use of ionising and non-ionising radiation will be taught as part of the curriculum.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the Course Specific Regulations and Module Proposal Documentation. From a review of the documentation the visitors were unable to locate, where in the curriculum SOP 2.6, the ability to “practise in accordance with the current legislation governing the use of ionising and non-ionising radiation for medical and other purposes’ is addressed in the curriculum. The visitors noted that as part of the competencies needed to be achieved by students on placements, students must be able to “practice in accordance with the relevant ionising radiation regulations”. The visitors could not however locate where in the curriculum students will be taught about the ionising radiation regulations such as the Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations (IR(ME)R) 2000 and its amendments (2006 and 2011), as part of the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how students will be taught about the ionising radiation regulations to enable them to meet the standards of proficiency for radiographers.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system to approve all placements.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the practice experience handbook, programme specification, student handbook, partnership/service level agreement and were shown the placement audit and monitoring database at the visit. From the initial documents submitted, the visitors could not see how the education provider approves placements prior to students going on them and how they are monitored. At the visit, the visitors were shown the placement audit and monitoring database and the visitors were satisfied that there was a process whereby placements were appropriately monitored, as there were effective feedback mechanisms from all stakeholders in place. However, the visitors were still unclear on how placements are approved before students go on them. In the placement audit form, the visitors could not locate any information regarding what policies and processes there were for approving placements and how these policies and processes are put into practice. The visitors were not satisfied that the placement audit tool was a sufficient process to approve placements prior to students going on that placement as it did not include any policies and processes for approving the placements. Therefore the visitors could not determine that there are effective policies and processes in place to approve placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval of placements to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place within practice placements.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the practice experience handbook, student handbook and programme specification. During the programme team meeting the visitors were told that placements are audited before students are placed, and the visitors were then shown an audit form for placements at the visit.

However, after scrutinising the evidence, the visitors could not see how the criteria against which placements will be audited will ensure that the practice placement settings will have equality and diversity policies that will be effectively implemented and monitored. The visitors noted that the audit tool did not include any information regarding where the placement provider equality and diversity policies will be recorded. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how the education provider would be able to make judgements about whether the placement providers has equality and diversity policies in place and how they ensure that these policies are appropriate. The visitors will therefore need to see further evidence of policies and procedures in place to demonstrate how they ensure that all placements ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to students are in place and appropriate.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the 'general regulations for university examinations and assessment' and the 'Keele code of practice on external examining'. There was no information in the 'general regulations for university examinations and assessment' which specifies that the external examiner will be from a relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. Furthermore, in the 'Keele code of practice on external examining' it states that external examiners must meet "applicable criteria set out by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies." However, the visitors could not be certain from this evidence that this would mean that the HCPC standard would be met as it is not defined in the assessment regulations as to whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations for this programme specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register.

Linda Mutema
Marin Benwell
Prisha Shah