

**Health Professions Council
Approvals Panel – 6 July 2006**

PROGRAMME APPROVAL

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The Visitors have confirmed that the conditions relating to the following programmes approval have been met. The Visitors are now satisfied that the programme meets the Standards of Education & Training and wish to recommend approval. The attached Visitors' reports have been updated to reflect that the conditions have been met.

| Education Provider | Programme Name | Delivery mode |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Anglia Ruskin University | Supplementary Prescribing | PT |
| University of East Anglia | Diploma Higher Education in Paramedic Science | FT |
| Edge Hill University | Certificate in Non-medical prescribing | PT |
| University of Essex | Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professional | PT |
| University of Lincoln | BSc(Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences | FT |
| Queen Margaret University College, Edinburgh | Postgraduate Diploma Radiotherapy & Oncology MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology | FT |
| Sheffield Hallam University | Supplementary Prescribing | PT |
| University of Southampton | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy | PT |
| University of Southampton | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy | PT |

Decision

The Panel is asked to approve the above named programmes in line with the Visitors' recommendation that the programme now meets the Standards of Education and Training.

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

Visitors Reports (9)

Date of paper
26 June 2006

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2006-06-20 | a | EDU | PPR | Programmes for Approval - 4 July 2006 | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

**Health Professions Council
Department of Education and Policy**

Visitors report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Anglia Ruskin University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals |
| Date of event | 27.07.05 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Derek Adrian-Harris - Radiographer Jean Mooney - Chiropodist / Podiatrist |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Karen Scott |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Libby Martin Denis Wheller Hazel Taylor Sue Topper |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part 1.

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

| | yes | no | n/a |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme planning team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or previous as appropriate) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | yes | no |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

This is a new programme that has not been previously approved by HPC

| Requirement (please insert detail) | yes | no | n/a |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|
| | | | |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 10 AHPs (in addition to the existing cohort of 40) |
|---|--|

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition 1: The education provider must demonstrate how its programme of staff development ensures continuity of professional and research development.

Reason: This was not clear from the documentation provided

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

3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well being of students must be both adequate and accessible

3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place

Condition 2: Evidence of the student experience of the programme must be provided. To evidence this, minutes from student liaison meetings, student feedback forms and other relevant materials may be used.

Reason: As the panel was unable to meet with any students at the visit, it was thought that the HPC would need to attend a further visit to clarify issues and concerns surrounding the student experience. However, the HPC has determined since the visit that if sufficient evidence of the student experience (both good and bad with evidence of measures taken to address the bad), can be provided, a further visit may not be required.

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 3: APU must indicate, within its documentation, which elements of the taught and practice-based learning programmes are mandatory. APU must indicate its methods of monitoring student attendance throughout all elements of the programme. To do this, it must:

- describe how the University '80% attendance rule' is applied to the Supplementary Prescribing programme,
- delineate which elements of the taught programme can comprise the 20% non-attendance within the '80% rule', and
- identify the systems that allow the student to compensate for elements within the course that are lost as a result of the application of '80% attendance rule'.

Reason: This information was not clearly articulated in the documentation

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition 4: The education provider must describe how it will ensure that the additional Medical Supervisors needed to deliver the proposed AHP programme are identified, prepared, trained and supported to undertake their role as placement supervisor.

(This condition is repeated for SETs 5.7.5, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10, and 5.11 below)

Reason: At the time of the visit, it was clear that much of the responsibility for ensuring the health of the placement programme, in terms of monitoring and assessing staff, was left to the NHS trusts.

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

Condition 5: The education provider must demonstrate how it maintains a thorough and effective system for the approval and monitoring of placements.

Reason: At the time of the visit, it was clear that much of the responsibility for ensuring the health of the placement programme, in terms of monitoring and assessing staff (and students), was left to the NHS trusts.

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

Condition 6: APU must clearly articulate its method of identification of students who are at risk of failure and its required actions taken, and protocols used in those cases where students do not achieve a pass grade in any element of the placement assessment process.

Reason: There was no process identified in the course documentation to demonstrate how identification and monitoring of potential failure of placements would be undertaken

5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.3 must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.

5.11 Practice placement providers must ensure necessary information is available at the appropriate time for both the education provider and students.

Condition 4 (repeated): APU must describe how it will ensure that the additional Medical Supervisors needed to deliver the proposed AHP programme are identified, prepared, trained and supported to undertake their role as placement supervisor.

Reason: At the time of the visit, it was clear that much of the responsibility for ensuring the health of the placement programme, in terms of monitoring and assessing staff, was left to the NHS trusts.

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored

Condition 7: APU must provide evidence of how existing Trust and WDC anti-discrimination policies are implemented, how they are monitored by the APU and how it ensures that all placements have such policies.

Reason: This information was not clearly articulated in the documentation provided by the education provider.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition 8: APU must ensure that there is a process of frequent and ongoing clinical assessment to ensure that a student at risk of dangerous practice is identified at the earliest stage, and that remedial action is agreed, taken and tested against the learning outcomes of the programme, in order to ensure patient safety

Reason: This process was not identified in the documentation, nor was it clearly articulated by the programme team

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

Condition 9: APU must ensure that the student clinical Portfolio links to the Learning Outcomes of the programme. The Learning Log must include descriptors of the Learning Outcomes of the programme, so that the assessed Log demonstrates fitness to practice. The Learning Log and clinical portfolio should both show where the student has / has not demonstrated competence within the individual Learning Objectives

Reason: This was not evidenced by the documentation

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Condition 10: APU must ensure that there is a system of frequent, recorded, and ongoing continuous clinical assessment in order to highlight those areas of knowledge and skill within the student's clinical practice that are to the expected standard and/or less than the expected standard for a particular stage of the learning programme.

Reason: There was no criteria supplied for the portfolio component of the assessment

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.4 for a procedure for the right of appeal for students; and

Condition 11: The APU assessment regulations should include detail of the student's right to appeal the assessor's decision

Reason: No appeal mechanism was identified in the course documentation

6.7.5 for at least one external examiner to be appointed

Condition 12: The criteria for the appointment of the external examiner must be outlined in the course documentation

Reason: While an external examiner is appointed to the course, the documentation does not outline the recruitment process for the appointment of the examiner, nor does it demonstrate the selection criteria applied to ensure the appropriateness of the examiner.

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Recommendations

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

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

Recommendation: APU must include details of the delivery of the proposed Supplementary Prescribing programme for Allied Health Professionals. This information must include a timetable and flowchart of the proposed course to indicate the schedule of how the curriculum is taught, and how the learning objectives are achieved.

Reason: To provide prospective students, employers, placement providers and medical supervisors with the information they require to make an informed choice in their decision to link into the proposed programme.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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: APU should undertake a mapping exercise to demonstrate that the course product will be both fit for purpose and fit for practice. The mapping should be against the following:

- HPC SETs
- the learning objectives of the proposed APU AHP-SP programme
- the programme's general learning objectives for a Level 3 programme

Reason: In order to ensure that the drivers of the APU AHP-SP programme are fully integrated within the proposed programme and to assist the programme team in meeting all the requirements of future validation processes.

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

Recommendation: The Learning Outcomes of the proposed programme in Supplementary Prescribing should be re-worded to reflect the expectations of a Level 3 programme

Reason: While the stated learning objectives clearly reflect the requirements of the NHS, they do not appear to reflect the educational requirements of a level 3 programme.

Commendations:

The HPC visitors would like to commend the programme team for their enthusiasm and commitment to the implementation of the programme for AHPs, and for their collaborative approach with the WDC to meet the changing needs of practice.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: TBC

To be submitted to Approvals Committee on: July 2006

The Approvals Committee recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Date: 01 December 2005

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | University of East Anglia |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | DipHE Paramedic Science |
| Mode of Study | 2 years full time |
| Date of event | 30th June & 1 st July 2005 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | February 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | David Whitmore – Paramedic Jim Petter - Paramedic |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Sharon Woolf – Education Manager |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Prof Geoff Moore (Chair) Dr David Heylings (UEA) Mrs Catharine Wells (UEA) Mr Paul Bates (BPA) Mr Ian Todd (External) |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

| | yes | no | n/a |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme planning team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | yes | no |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | yes | no | n/a |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | |
| DipHE Paramedic Science | 12 - 15 |

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS – These are all referenced to the HPC Standards of Education and Training (SETs)

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

Condition: Provide details of which tutors will teach which units.

Reason: Full details of the units were given together with CVs of all staff involved with the programme, however the details of which staff would teach which units was not specified in the documentation.

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure;

Condition: That the exit award / support from both EAAS / UEA is clearly articulated to the student in the relevant paperwork in the event of an irretrievable driving course failure.

Reason: Whilst understood by both the panel and the programme team that an academic award of a Dip HE would be given in this case, with the candidate not being able to progress further with the East Anglia Ambulance Trust, this needs to be made more explicit in the course paperwork available to the students.

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: to provide details of the bespoke mentor training course.

Reason: The panel needs sight of the mentor course aims, philosophy and outcomes. The programme team verbally expanded upon what was implied in the submitted paperwork.

6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: To provide the name of an External Examiner who must be on the Paramedic Register.

Reason: External examiners have not yet been appointed. (BPA to offer assistance if required).

Deadline for *Conditions* to be met: 30 September 2005

To be submitted to Approvals Committee on:

RECOMENDATIONS

Set 2.2.2

Recommendation: That the course paperwork be amended to reflect to show that an enhanced CRB disclosure is required and for the programme team to consider introducing an annual self declaration of health & criminal convictions.

Reason: Whilst a system is in place for students to sign up to the course conditions (including CRB checks and health) many other HEIs have a system of annual self-declaration in place which HPC considers to be best practice.

COMMENDATIONS

- The paperwork was clearly laid out against SETs & SOPs. The programme team had gone to great lengths to produce clear, concise documents that covered the individual components of an academic programme. Each section was individually bound and there were two tables that referenced these documents against the HPC Standards of Education and Training and the HPC Standards of Proficiency. The quality of this documentation made the task of the panel much easier to perform.
- The inter-professional learning (IPL) model that the UEA propose to adopt for this programme has been well thought out and articulated both verbally and in the course documentation. Much thought has been given to where and how within the programme IPL will be used.
- The audit scheme for placements is very comprehensive and is to be commended as an area of best practice to be passed on to other HEIs and ambulance services.
- The approach to the driving course element of the programme is to be applauded, particularly as it incorporates the new Road Safety Act and the latest thoughts of the Driving Standards Agency in regard to “blue light” driver training. Once again is to be commended as an area of good practice to be passed on to other HEIs and ambulance services.

Decision of the HPC Visitors

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

David Whitmore

Jim Petter

Date: 4 July 2005

Health Professions Council

Visitors report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Edge Hill University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Certificate in Non-medical prescribing Modules: HEA 790 Non Medical Prescribing HEA 9074 Non Medical Prescribing |
| Date of event | 11 May 2006 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | James Pickard (Podiatry) Patricia Fillis (Radiography) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Karen Scott Mandy Hargood – observing |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Wendy Cooke – Chair Sue Roberts – Edge Hill Michelle Jones – Edge Hill Mike Bronsell - External University of Chester Alison Bardsley – Visitor NMC Edmund Harrison – Quality Officer Edge Hill Ruth Williams – Edge Hill Mair Ning – Edge Hill Gill Hall - Edge Hill Paul Warburton – Edge Hill Debbie Meah – Edge Hill David Jones – SHA Representative |

Scope of visit (*please tick*)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part 1.

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | n/a |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme planning team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators Note: Discussion took place with three providers, including a mentor. The effectiveness of placement teaching was confirmed through meeting with past and current students. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Note: These are new modules that have not been previously approved by the Health Professions Council

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/a |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | Three cohorts per year of 35 students |
|--|---------------------------------------|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

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

Condition 1: The course team must revise all documentation provided for potential applicants and students undertaking the modules (including the Programme Specification, Student Handbooks and Course Fact sheet) to clearly differentiate between level 3 and level 4 modes of study available within the taught element of the programme. This information must address the differences in the teaching and learning strategies and its assessment.

Reason: The programme enables students to be able to undertake level 3 or level 4 study to obtain the same award. The difference between the levels of study is not clear in the documentation provided to students prior to commencement and must be clearly articulated in order for students to be able to make an informed choice about the level of study they wish to undertake.

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

Condition 2: The HEI admissions procedure must make explicit within the programme specification and all pre-admissions material that the procedures ensure that all applicants have been subject to a CRB (enhanced disclosure) check.

Reason: The process to ensure that all entrants to the programme have been subject to a CRB (enhanced disclosure) check was not evident within the programme specification. Other documentation refers to CRB but does not indicate consistently that this is an essential aspect of the admissions process.

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements;

Condition 3: The HEI admissions procedure must make its procedure for ensuring that all applicants have been subject to a positive health check explicit in the documentation.

Reason: The process for ensuring that all entrants to the programme have demonstrated that they have been subject to a positive health check was not evident in the programme specification. The documentation does not indicate consistently that this is an essential aspect of the admissions process.

2.2.5 accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition 4: The programme documentation and application information must clearly articulate how the accreditation of prior and experiential learning is considered in the admissions process. The applicant must also be made aware of the timescale for the application to be made and at what point before joining their programme of study they will be informed of the level of credit exemption awarded to them.

Reason:

Potential students need clear guidance to inform them of how the University policy applies to this course. The documentation should be explicit to applicants that credit may not always be awarded.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

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

Condition 5: The programme must provide details of the number of staff teaching on the programme and their qualifications/specialist teaching areas.

Reason: The panel were provided with two staff CVs. This however was insufficient to demonstrate that the staffing levels and expertise of the programme team were appropriate to the background and numbers of the expected cohort.

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 6: The programme and module documentation provided must make explicit those elements of the programme and module, both academic and in practice, where attendance is mandatory.

Reason: The documentation did not specify those aspects of the programme where attendance is mandatory.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition 7: The programme documentation must make explicit the processes involved in the approval and monitoring of practice placements.

Reason: Through discussion with the course team and students it was clear that a rigorous process for approval and monitoring of practice placements in place. However, this was not articulated fully within the programme documentation reviewed.

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

Condition 8: The programme and module documentation must make explicit to academic staff, students and mentors, the processes in place to identify and support those students who may be a cause for concern either in the academic setting and clinical practice setting.

Reason: The documentation did not articulate the processes in place to identify and support a student who may be experiencing difficulty either in the academic or clinical practice element of the programme or module.

SET 6. Assessment standards

Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for:

6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition 9: The HEI must ensure that one external examiner of the programme is an AHP from the relevant part of the HPC register.

Reason: It is a requirement of the HPC that AHP students must be examined by an Allied Health Profession whose name is included within the relevant area of the HPC register. The documentation did state that an external examiner had been appointed but it was not explicit as to which area of the HPC register the examiner has been appointed from.

Deadline for *Conditions* to be met: 14 June 2006

To be submitted to Approvals Committee on: 4 July 2006

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Patricia Fillis
James Pickard**

Date: 16 May 2006

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Recommendations:

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

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

Recommendation 1: The course team consider producing a pre-course study guide that will enable students of all professional backgrounds to undertake a through clinical history and examination to a consistent standard.

Reason: In discussions with past and current students this aspect of pre-course study was raised by them and it was felt that they would have benefited from such a study guide before commencing the programme.

SET 5 Practice placement standards

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation 2: The course team should articulate to students and mentors the appropriate timings of placements and practice assessments so that they reflect the level of knowledge to successfully undertake the placement and associated assessments.

Reason: The documentation reviewed did not specify the timings of the practice placements and thus a student could potentially attempt a placement and associated assessment in advance of them studying the underpinning theory.

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation 3: The programme team to consider implementing a system of networking for mentors.

Reason: The documentation did not articulate how mentors across placements shared good practice or comment about the programme and a networking scheme was raised by mentors during the meeting with placement providers and mentors as a means of achieving this.

Commendations

We would like to thank the Faculty and programme team for their helpful responses and for providing additional information and the Visitors wish to make the following commendations;

1. There is an impressive practice placement approval and monitoring process in operation,
2. The implementation of a research project to investigate inter-rater reliability in practice.
3. The implementation of web-CT and use of a DVD package produced in conjunction with HEI's across the North West of England and the SHA.

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | University of Essex |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professional |
| Date of event | 07.10.05 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | February 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Bob Fellows (Registered Paramedic) Dr. Jean Mooney (Registered Podiatrist) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Edward Crowe |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | |

Scope of visit (*please tick*)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part 1.

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

| | yes | no | n/a |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme planning team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | yes | no |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

This is a new programme that has not been previously approved by HPC

| Requirement (please insert detail) | yes | no | n/a |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|----|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 12 |
|--|----|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition One

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

Condition:

The education provider must include details of the delivery of the proposed Supplementary Prescribing programme for Allied Health Professionals, to provide prospective students, employers, placement providers and medical supervisors with the information they require so that they are able to make an informed choice in their decision to link into the proposed programme.

This information must include a timetable of the proposed course to indicate the schedule of how the curriculum is taught, and how the learning objectives are achieved.

Reason:

It was not clear to the HPC visitors that the prospective students had sufficient pre-course information to allow them to make an informed choice prior to applying for a place upon the programme.

Condition Two

SET 2.2.2 Criminal convictions checks;

Condition:

The Education Provider must undertake a CRB check for each student enrolling on the course.

Reason:

Some entrants to the Supplementary Prescribing programme may work entirely within the private sector and therefore may not have had a current CRB check. HPC Registration requires the AHP to give a written undertaking that the AHP Registrant does not have any criminal conviction that prevents HPC-Registration. The terms of HPC-SET 2.2.2 requires that the course entrant demonstrates to the HEI that they do not have any criminal conviction that infringes their current HPC-Registration, in the same way that a new entrant to an AHP-related undergraduate programme would have to demonstrate to the HEI that they do not have any criminal conviction that would prevent future HPC-Registration

Condition Three**SET 2.2.3 Compliance with any health requirements;****Condition:**

The Education Provider must undertake a health status check for each student enrolling on the course.

Reason:

Some entrants to the Supplementary Prescribing programme may work entirely within the private sector and therefore may not have had a recent positive health status check. HPC Registration requires the AHP to give a written undertaking that the AHP Registrant does not have any health related issues conviction that prevents HPC-Registration. The terms of HPC-SET 2.2.3 requires that the course entrant demonstrates to the HEI that they do not have any health-related issue that infringes their current HPC-Registration, in the same way that a new entrant to an AHP-related undergraduate programme would have to demonstrate to the HEI that they do not suffer from any health-related issues that would prevent future HPC Registration

Condition Four

SET 2.3 Ensure that the education provider has an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition:

The education provider should include reference to the existing Trust and WDC policies within the course documentation This should include information on how these policies are implemented and monitored to ensure that all placement-based teaching can be delivered in a non-discriminatory manner

Reason:

The HPC visitors accepted that whilst robust policies were in position for the education provider, this principle must also be current in the practice arena. Thus the HEI must ensure that policies are in place that demonstrate that equal opportunities and anti-discrimination policies are extant within all clinical placements venues.

Condition Five

SET 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 University must include a copy of the pro-forma consent form they intend to use for all AHP students enrolling to the Supplementary Prescribing Programme.

Reason:

The University must ensure that informed consent is gained from all students enrolled on the programme to allow them to act as 'patients' and 'clients' in clinical role play settings. In doing this the HPC would be assured that all students enrolled to the programme accept the nature of the role play in advance, and thus are able to give informed consent to participate in role play exercises inherent within the programme delivery

Condition Six

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

Condition:

The Education Provider must introduce a scheme whereby all mentored placements are visited and approved prior to the student commencing the period of placement with the mentor (See also Condition 5.13: the University could be assured of the current Equal Opportunities Policy at the placement at the same visit)

Reason:

The HPC visitors expect the education provider to visit all placements to ensure that they are fit for purpose. The HEI should not rely upon either previous good experiences in relation to other education programmes, nor rely on the efforts of the student in determining that the placement is 'Fit for purpose'

Condition Seven

SET 5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition:

The Education Provider must introduce a scheme whereby all mentored placements are visited and approved prior to the student commencing the period of placement with the mentor (See also Condition 5.6: the University could be assured of the appropriateness of the current status of the placement venue at the same visit)

Reason:

The HPC visitors accepted that whilst robust policies were in position for the education provider, they must ensure that this is also reciprocated in the practice arena, by demonstrating that the placement provider has equally robust equal opportunities and anti-discrimination policies towards students attending those placement venues.

Condition Eight

SET 6.3 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external reference frameworks can be measured.

and

SET 6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition:

The marking grid / assessment sheet used in the OSCE examination should be presented to the HPC visitors, to assure them that it

- complies with an external reference framework
- allows intra- and inter-cohort consistency of assessment
- allows confidence in this element of the assessment process

Reason:

The assessment of OSCEs has the potential to allow marking to be subjective and / or open to the interpretation of the observers who score individual OSCE stations on the examination day. The use of robust and validated marking criteria will assure the HPC visitors that consistency and equity of assessment can and will be achieved for all students and across all cohorts.

Condition Nine

SET 6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition:

At least one of the External Examiners to the programme should be an Allied Health Professional whose name has prior inclusion within the relevant area of the Health Professions Council Register

Reason:

It was not made clear within the presented documentation who that person is or what the discipline of that person would be. The HPC visitors would ask that this is clarified and a copy of the signed agreement is made available for their inspection.

Deadline for the Conditions to be met: 12/01/06

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation One

SET 2.2.4 Apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation:

The University should demonstrate that it has a support / access / key skills programme in place to support those students who have not have studied to diploma / degree level prior to their joining the Supplementary Prescribing (SP) programme.

Reason:

Some entrants to the SP programme, who undertook original AHP-training programmes several years ago may not have studied to diploma / degree level prior to their joining the SP programme and thus may not be aware of the demands that study at Level 3 will require them to demonstrate. The provision of support / access / key skills programme for these students prior to their entry to the Supplementary Prescribing programme will ensure that all students are given equal opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and learning throughout the Supplementary Prescribing programme.

Recommendation Two

SET 3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation:

The University should demonstrate that there is a programme in place to allow staff development for non-salaried staff that input to the taught areas of the programme

Reason:

This will ensure parity of personal professional development within the programme teaching staff

Recommendation Three

SET 4.2 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

Recommendation:

As the programme is a new teaching programme for Allied Health Professions (AHPs), we recommend that the University should ensure via its monitoring and evaluation procedures that the appropriate balance is achieved to maintain and support the specific needs of individual AHPs

Reason:

This would ensure that the programme is constantly reviewed and adjusted to reflect the experience of previous cohorts, and thus potentially improve both the delivery of the programme and the learning experience of the students.

Recommendation Four

SET 5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the University ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified placement teaching staff by encouraging mentors to undertake formal training in mentorship

Reason:

The students learning and experience will be enhanced by appropriately prepared and knowledgeable mentors

Recommendation Five

SET 5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation:

We recommend that students, whose normal work practice is within specific fields, are allowed access to a wider range of clinical prescribing experiences through the mentored clinical placement programme. We recommend that 25% of the clinical placement programme for all course participants should take place within clinical situations that are different to the main discipline of their normal work programme.

Reason:

We anticipate that such a system to ensure a breadth of mentored clinical prescribing experience would benefit all students, and thus support the breadth of the theoretical component of the programme. The 'exchange programme' could be introduced within each cohort through a scheme of 'mentor exchange' between students.

Recommendation Six

SET 5.8.3 Undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation:

The University is advised to ensure that all new mentors to the clinical placement programme are encouraged to attend formal mentor training. 'Formal mentor training' implies that the mentor will have attended formal clinical placement training programmes offered by the University, or through their attendance at other programmes of mentor training, *such as the GP Vocational training Scheme.*

Reason:

Students will have enhanced placement experience if they are supported by well prepared mentors.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The Visitors thanked the Course Team for the clear documentation they provided to support their request for HPC approval of their proposed programme in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs.
2. The Visitors commended and thanked the Course Team for ensuring that former students of the Nurse / Pharmacists Supplementary Prescribing programme, and existing Practice placement mentors / Designated Medical Practitioners were invited to input to the Approvals Event.
3. The Visitors commended the inclusion of Appendix VII within the Course Documentation: the inclusion of a clear statement of the rationale, requirement and importance of Confidentiality within the Workplace was most useful.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to the nine conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Bob Fellows

Dr Jean Mooney

Date: October 2005

Health Professions Council

Visitors report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | University of Lincoln |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science |
| Date of event | 25-26 April 2006 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Martin Nicholson, Biomedical Scientist Mary MacDonald, Biomedical Scientist HPC Partners |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Jo Kemp |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Don Blackburn – Chair Martin Pinnick – Quality Phillipa Dyson – University Library Dave Kenyon – Faculty of Media and Humanities Alan Wainwright – IBMS Jim Blackstock- IBMS |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | n/a |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme planning team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | n/a |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | Intakes for 8 |
|---|------------------|

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

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 University must have evidence that where student participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Reason: This was not cited by the Visitors in the documentary evidence.

Condition 2

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills are required to practice safely and effectively.

Condition: The University ensures that the pass mark for all assessments ensures that students meet all Standards of Proficiency.

Reason: The current University regulations allow students to be Condoned in a module which does not guarantee that all the Standards of Proficiency are being met.

Condition 3:

6.7.2 for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title.

Condition: The University must ensure that the documentation regarding the award of a BSc without the Applied Honours, clearly states that this award does not lead to direct registration with the HPC.

Reason: From the Visitors reading of the documentation, this was not clearly cited in the documents.

Condition 4:

6.7.5 the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The University must appoint an external examiner who is HPC registered.

Reason: The External Examiners currently being used are not on the HPC register.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 15 June 2006

To be submitted to Approvals Committee on: 4 July 2006

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available.

Recommendation: The University should ensure consistent availability of books and journals.

Reason: The availability of books and journals on occasions was inadequate as indicated by the students.

Recommendation 2

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

Recommendation: The University should ensure that documentation clearly states the process for monitoring placements.

Reason: From the Visitors reading of the documentation, this was not clear.

Recommendation 3

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure.

Recommendation: The University should ensure that documentation clearly states the process in the event of a placement failure.

Reason: From the Visitors reading of the documentation, this was not clear.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The documentation has been well prepared in detail with excellent cross referencing to SETs and SOPs.
 2. Cooperation between Education Providers, Commissioners and employers is an exemplar.
- The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Martin Nicholson

Mary MacDonald

Date: 09/05/06

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Queen Margaret University College, Edinburgh |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Post Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy & Oncology MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | Full Time |
| Date of Visit | 12 th and 13 th April 2006 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Russell Hart Martin Benwell |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Nicole Borg |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part 1.

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

| | yes | no | n/a |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of 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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | yes | no | n/a |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | yes | no | n/a |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 12 every second year |
|--|----------------------|

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.2 for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title;

Condition: Clearly state in the programme documentation the degree awarded to students who achieve 120 credit points at SCQF level 11 but failing clinical modules.

Reason: Students with 120 points would be eligible for the award of a Postgraduate Diploma. If a student failed a clinical module they could still accrue over 120 points to be awarded the PG Dip, however they would not be eligible for HPC registration.- therefore a separate named award must be included in the programme documentation for those students who can be awarded a PG Dip that does not entitle them to HPC registration

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 30 June 2006

To be submitted to Approvals Panel/Committee on: TBC

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: HPC supports and encourages the development of IPE in the programme.

Reason: IPE is being included in the undergraduate pre registration radiotherapy programme and the HPC would encourage the development of IPE in the postgraduate pre-registration programme to promote an equity of experience.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Russell Hart

Martin Benwell

ALL CONDITIONS MET

**Health Professions Council
Department of Education**

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Education provider | Sheffield Hallam University |
| Name and titles of programme | Non Medical Prescribing Programme |
| Date of event | Thursday 6 th April 2006 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Vince Clarke – Paramedic Bob Fellows - Paramedic |
| HPC Executive officer | Jo Kemp – Education Officer |
| Joint panel members in attendance | Roger New - Chair Jenny Shelton (am) - Head of Quality & Enhancement Val Keating (pm) – Quality & Enhancement Eleanor Willcocks - Secretary |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| This is a major change to an existing Supplementary prescribing course run for Nursing, Midwifery and health Visitors and Pharmacists, however this is a new programme for the HPC to include AHPs (Physiotherapists, Radiographers, Chiropodists and Podiatrists) | |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | yes | no | n/a |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme planning team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | yes | no |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities, more specifically we had a demonstration of the Blackboard | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Clinical Practice areas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | yes | no | n/a |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| <p>Proposed student cohort intake number please state</p> <p>Non – Medical Supplementary Prescribing (2 cohorts per Year)</p> | <p>40 per intake</p> |
|---|----------------------|

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1:

SET 2.2.2 and 2.2.3. Apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks and compliance with health requirements.

Condition: Within the documentation, Sheffield Hallam University must ensure that all AHP students have a current Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) conviction checks and comply with the health check requirements.

Reason: It was stated by the University programme team that selection and entry requirements as listed in approval/validation documentation would be rigorously applied. However it was also recognised by the admissions team that students although predominately drawn from the NHS, due to SHA funding, are not exclusively so and that students could be self funded and potentially come from AHPs in private practice. Therefore the criminal conviction checks and health checks cannot remain solely the responsibility of an employer.

Condition 2:

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

Condition: Sheffield Hallam University must articulate within the documentation how consent is obtained by students participating as patients or clients in practical or clinical teaching.

Reason: From the reading of the documentation and discussion with the past students and programme development team that consent was not sufficiently clear. It is essential that students fully understand that they have the choice to act as a client / patient in role play, practical and clinical environments. That consent is required by the University in advance of the role play and can be withdrawn by the student at a later date, should they change their mind.

Condition 3:

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

Condition: Sheffield Hallam University must document how they will maintain thorough and effective systems for approving and monitoring all clinical practice placements.

Reason: From the reading of the documentation and discussion with the past students and the programme development team it was not sufficiently clear to the visitors that this occurred.

Condition 4:

SET 5.7 (5.7.2 and 5.7.5) Students and practice educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

- **5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained.**
- **5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The HPC visitors require a hard copy of the student handbook that satisfactorily addresses the two SET elements under 5.7 (i.e. 5.7.2 and 5.7.5).

Reason: From the reading of the documentation and discussion with the past students and program development team, these elements were not sufficiently clear.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 30 May 2006

To be submitted to Approvals Committee on: 13 June 2006

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The HPC visitors recommend that Sheffield Hallam University articulate more clearly in the documentation how the CPD, research and staff development is managed.

Reason: From the reading of the documentation and discussion with the practice development team this was not sufficiently clear.

Recommendation 2:

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

Recommendation: Sheffield Hallam University should make it clear within the documentation the minimum hours that are required in clinical practice.

Reason: It was not clear to the HPC visitors in reading the documentation. There were inconsistencies in the paperwork ascertaining to the duration of clinical practice.

Decision of the HPC Visitors

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve these programmes (subject to the 4 conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Vince Clarke:

Bob Fellows:

Date: April 2006

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Southampton University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy P/T |
| Date of event | 3/4 May 2006 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapy) Judith Martin (Occupational Therapy) Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapy) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Karen Scott |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | <p><u>Southampton University</u> Ian Giles (Chair) Bill Brooks Rosalynd Jowett George Lueddeke</p> <p><u>College of Occupational Therapists</u> Remy Reyes (Education Officer) Karen Holmes (Observer) Jo-Anne Supyk Jennifer Caldwell</p> <p><u>Chartered Society of Physiotherapists</u> Jenny Carey (Education Officer) Mairead O'Siochru</p> |

Scope of visit (*please tick*)

| | |
|--|----------|
| New programmes | X |
| Major change to existing programme | X |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | X |

Part 1.

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

| | yes | no | n/a |
|--|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme planning team | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | yes | no |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | X Previously seen |

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | yes | no | n/a |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

| | |
|--|---|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | Total 45 Physiotherapy 20 Occupational Therapy 25 |
|--|---|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

Condition 1:

The documentation must clarify the policy and procedures that would be followed in the event of the disclosure of a criminal conviction.

Reason:

The information concerning the procedures that are to be put in place was not clear in the documentation.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition 2:

The documentation must clearly state the minimum number of students that would ensure a viable cohort, below which the programme will not run.

Reason:

It is important that cohort numbers provide peer support and financial viability. While maximum numbers are identified in the documentation, the programme will start with smaller numbers, and thus minimum numbers must be identified in the section on proposed intakes.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Condition 3 (this condition is repeated at 5.1 below):

Clearly outline the conclusion to the programme, including timing, content and integration of practice with theory.

Reason:

The programme concludes with placement education that would be completed by students over different time scales. There was no indication as to how this placement would be integrated within the programme, or how students will conclude their studies. While this was clearly articulated by the programme team, it was not included in the documentation.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition 3 (repeated):

Clearly outline the conclusion to the programme, including timing, content and integration of practice with theory.

Reason:

The programme concludes with placement education that would be completed by students over different time scales. There was no indication as to how this placement would be integrated within the programme, or how students will conclude their studies. While this was clearly articulated by the programme team, it was not included in the documentation.

5.5. The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition 4:

The programme team must provide information about the current placement practice provision including geographical locations, staff skills, and professional work areas.

Reason:

There was no information about the present placement position upon which new provision will need to be built, to ensure range and numbers are appropriate.

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure;

Condition 5:

Develop and document a clear procedure for retrieval when there is failure in practice placement.

Reason:

There is no clear policy or format in place, particularly with regard to part time placements.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition 6:

Develop and document a clear procedure for retrieval when there is failure in practice placement.

Reason:

There is no clear policy and format in place, particularly with regard to part time placements.

Deadline for *Conditions* to be met: 15 June 2006

To be submitted to Approvals Committee on: 4 July 2006

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Carol Lloyd
Kathryn Heathcote
Judith Martin**

Date: 17 May 2006

Recommendations

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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.

Recommendation 1:

Review and revise attendance policy in relation to the new learning and teaching strategies being put in place.

Reason:

The present policy relates to physical attendance at sessions, but an increasing amount of the curriculum will be delivered through e learning.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation 2:

The programme team should consider mapping the programme against the KSF and ensure that students are aware of the role of regulatory and professional bodies.

Reason:

Students need to be fully prepared for employment, and KSF is an increasingly important aspect within the NHS. For safe practice students must be fully aware of all guidance and standards that pertain to their profession.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Recommendation 3:

Further develop and document the procedures for the initial approval of all elements of a new practice placement.

Reason:

The monitoring system is well developed, but the initial approval system has a limited system in place with few details.

Recommendation 4:

Monitor and review the effectiveness of part time placements from the perspective of students, academic staff and practice placement educators.

Reason:

The impact on students and programme provision of part time placements is unknown. To ensure that the all learning outcomes are achieved, an effective monitoring system should be in place to review the process.

Commendations

The Visitors would like to comment the programme team on the following:

The team has developed excellent collaboration with practitioners who have been pivotal to the programme development. Placement educators and colleagues actively support the development and are fully aware of the requirements of this particular programme.

The validation documentation and mapping exercise were clear and effective in providing necessary information for the Visitors. The mapping is detailed and provides an excellent format for following up information.

The library and information technology support provided, both on and off site, is excellent, with library staff having detailed knowledge of the particular needs of health programme students.

The e-learning strategy is clearly articulated with planned progression, including the need for both technical development and staff commitment.

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Southampton University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy P/T |
| Date of event | 3/4 May 2006 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2006 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapy) Judith Martin (Occupational Therapy) Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapy) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Karen Scott |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | <p><u>Southampton University</u> Ian Giles (Chair) Bill Brooks Rosalynd Jowett George Lueddeke</p> <p><u>College of Occupational Therapists</u> Remy Reyes (Education Officer) Karen Holmes (Observer) Jo-Anne Supyk Jennifer Caldwell</p> <p><u>Chartered Society of Physiotherapists</u> Jenny Carey (Education Officer) Mairead O'Siochru</p> |

| | |
|--|----------|
| New programmes | X |
| Major change to existing programme | X |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | X |

Part 1.

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

| | yes | no | n/a |
|--|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme planning team | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | yes | no |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | X Already seen |

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | yes | no | n/a |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

| | |
|--|---|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | Total 45 Physiotherapy 20 Occupational Therapy 25 |
|--|---|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

Condition 1:

The documentation must clarify the policy and procedures that would be followed in the event of the disclosure of a criminal conviction.

Reason:

The information concerning the procedures that are to be put in place was not clear in the documentation.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition 2:

The documentation must clearly state the minimum numbers of students that would ensure a viable cohort, below which the programme will not run.

Reason:

It is important that cohort numbers provide peer support and financial viability. While maximum numbers are identified in the documentation, the programme will start with smaller numbers, and thus minimum numbers must be identified in the section on proposed intakes.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Condition 3 (this condition is repeated at 5.1 below):

Clearly outline the conclusion to the programme, including timing, content and integration of practice with theory.

Reason:

The programme concludes with placement education that would be completed by students over different time scales. There was no indication as to how this placement would be integrated within the programme, or how students will conclude their studies. While this was clearly articulated by the programme team, it was not included in the documentation.

4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Condition 4:

The inclusion and progression of critical reflection and clinical reasoning must be clearly articulated within the documentation.

Reason

Although critical reflection and clinical reasoning are mentioned in the document, they are understated, and do not match present expectations.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition 3 (repeated):

Clearly outline the conclusion to the programme, including timing, content and integration of practice with theory.

Reason:

The programme concludes with placement education that would be completed by students over different time scales. There was no indication as to how this placement would be integrated within the programme, or how students will conclude their studies. While this was clearly articulated by the programme team, it was not included in the documentation.

5.5. The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition 5:

The programme team must provide information about the current placement practice provision including geographical locations, staff skills, and professional work areas.

Reason:

There was no information about the present placement position upon which new provision will need to be built, to ensure range and numbers are appropriate.

5.7.4 The assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure;

Condition 6:

Develop and document a clear procedure for retrieval when there is failure in practice placement.

Reason:

There is no clear policy or format in place, particularly with regard to part time placements.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition 7:

Develop and document a clear procedure for retrieval when there is failure in practice placement.

Reason:

There is no clear policy and format in place, particularly with regard to part time placements.

Deadline for *Conditions* to be met: 15 June 2006

To be submitted to Approvals Committee on: 4 July 2006

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Carol Lloyd
Kathryn Heathcote
Judith Martin**

Date: 17 May 2006

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Recommendations

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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.

Recommendation 1:

Review and revise attendance policy in relation to the new learning and teaching strategies being put in place.

Reason:

The present policy relates to physical attendance at sessions, but an increasing amount of the curriculum will be delivered through e learning.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation 2:

The programme team should consider mapping the programme against the KSF and ensure that students are aware of the role of regulatory and professional bodies.

Reason:

Students need to be fully prepared for employment, and KSF is an increasingly important aspect within the NHS. For safe practice students must be fully aware of all guidance and standards that pertain to their profession.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Recommendation 3:

Further develop and document the procedures for the initial approval of all elements of a new practice placement.

Reason:

The monitoring system is well developed, but the initial approval system has a limited system in place with few details.

Recommendation 4:

Monitor and review the effectiveness of part time placements from the perspective of students, academic staff and practice placement educators.

Reason:

The impact on students and programme provision of part time placements is unknown. To ensure that all learning outcomes are achieved, an effective monitoring system should be in place to review the process.

Commendations

The Visitors would like to commend the programme team on the following:

The team has developed excellent collaboration with practitioners who have been pivotal to the programme development. Placement educators and colleagues actively support the development and are fully aware of the requirements of this particular programme.

The validation documentation and mapping exercise were clear and effective in providing necessary information for the Visitors. The mapping is detailed and provides an excellent format for following up information.

The library and information technology support provided, both on and off site, is excellent, with library staff having detailed knowledge of the particular needs of health programme students.

The e-learning strategy is clearly articulated with planned progression, including the need for both technical development and staff commitment.