VISITORS' REPORTS

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction
The attached visitors' reports for the following programmes have been sent to the education providers and following a 28 day period no representations have been received. The education providers are in the process of meeting the conditions recommended by the HPC visitors.

Education provider	Programme name	Delivery mode
Anglia Ruskin University	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	Part-time
Anglia Ruskin University	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)	Full-time
	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic)	Full-time
Canterbury Christ Church University	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	Part-time
Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Full-time/ Part-time
	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy	Full-time
Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Full-time
Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy & Oncology	Full-time
	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography & Imaging	Full-time
University of Central England in Birmingham	Fd Sc Health and Social Care (Paramedic Science)	Full-time
University of Central England in Birmingham	Non-medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	Part-time
University of Derby	MA Art Therapy	Full-time
	MA Dramatherapy	Full-time
Glasgow Caledonian University	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9, 10 and 11)	Part-time
University of Hertfordshire	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science	Full-time
	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	Full-time
University of Hertfordshire	BSc (Hons) Radiography & Oncology	Full-time
University of Hull	Dip HE Operating Department	Full-time

	Practice	
London South Bank University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography	Part-time Full-time
London South Bank University	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography	Full-time Full-time
Nordoff-Robbins Music Therapy Centre	MA Music Therapy	Full-time
Oxford Brookes University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time Part-time
University of Paisley	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences	Full-time
University of Plymouth	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of Stirling	Non-Medical Prescribing	Part-time
University of Teesside	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of Ulster	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) BSc (Hons) Speech & Language Therapy	Full-time Full-time Full-time Full-time Full-time

Decision
The Panel is asked to –

accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, including the
conditions recommended by the visitors
or
accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, and vary the
conditions recommended by the visitors

Background information
None

Resource implications
None

Financial implications
None

Appendices
Visitors' reports (24)

Date of paper
21 May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Part-time
Date of Visit	12 April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood Tracey Samuel-Smith (Observing)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Jenny Gilbert (Chair) Sara Elliott (Secretary) David Bird (NMC) Jonathan Knowles (ARU) Dennis Wheeler (ARU) Sandra Burley (University of Hull)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	X	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐
IT facilities	X	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**40 x 2 Cohorts approx**

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:

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Condition: The admissions procedure must include a clear criteria for students in regard to the health requirements needed for admission to the programme.

Reason: Currently the criteria is not clear for health checks prior to admission to the programme. It should be redrafted to reflect the need for students to declare a clear health record.

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.

Condition: There must evidence of Allied Health Professional (AHP) staff involvement in the management committee for the module.

Reason: Currently the documentation provided to the visitors does not indicate that there is any AHP involvement with the programme, however during the discussions it became apparent that there was AHP input to the programme and this must therefore be clearly indicated in the Programme documentation.

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: The HPC must receive clear student cohort numbers for the programme.

Reason: It was noted during the discussions at the visit that the numbers for each student cohort taking the programme was not clear. HPC requires a clear student cohort number to ensure that there are sufficient resources in place to support the students whilst on the programme.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31 May 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31 May 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATION

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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 to students and staff.

Recommendation: The WEBCt and the Library resources should be inclusive for AHPs and of contemporary currency.

Reason: During the resources tour and IT presentation it became apparent that the WEBCt and the books and periodicals had limited relevance for AHPs. If student AHP numbers are to increase there should be adequate resources to support this increase.

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:

Mark Woolcock

Gordon Pollard

Date: 16 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc(Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) incorporating FdSc Radiotherapy and Oncology Practice BSc(Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) incorporating DipHE Medical Imaging Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	20th -21st February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Miss Linda Mutema Mrs Julie O'Boyle
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Trevor Bolton – Associate Dean – Ashcroft Business School Caroline Currer – Institute of Health & Social Care Susan Hughes – Principle Lecturer, Ashcroft International Business School David Flinton – Senior Lecturer – City University Martin West – Deputy Director – Department of Radiography –Cardiff University Professor Angela Duxbury – Discipline Lead – Sheffield Hallam University Bev Snaith – Consultant Radiographer – Emergency, Pinderfields General Hospital Libby Martin – Faculty Quality Assurance Officer Sharon Croxon – Academic regulations Officer

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒

Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	17

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme Admissions
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.
SET 5 Practice Placement Standards
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 equal opportunity and anti-discriminatory policy of the university and the individual practice placement needs to be clearly articulated within the student handbook.

Reason:
The documentation did not clearly articulate the equal opportunity and anti-discriminatory policy for both the university and practice placements. This needs to be included within the documentation to ensure that students and practice placement providers are informed.

Condition 2

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.

Condition:
The course team are advised to ensure that all of the HPC Standards of Proficiency are included within the mapping document. The module descriptors and all learning outcomes for the programme should clearly demonstrate how all of the Standards of Proficiency are addressed.

Reason:
The documentation lacked evidence which ensured that this standard is met. It was unclear on how students after completing the programme can meet all the Standard of Proficiency.

Condition 3

SET 6. Assessment standards
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:
The documentation should clearly articulate the requirements regarding student progression from one stage to the next.

Reason:
Students need to be provided with a clearer indication of their progression through the programme. The documentation did not clearly articulate when and how (including any conditions which must be met prior to progression) students progress through each stage of the programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation
To continue to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in relation to the student intake

Reason:
There should be an assurance that there is enough staff to deliver the programme effectively, without compromising HPC standards of proficiency, and that there is an adequate balance between staff and students.

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

Recommendation
The programme team to adopt the protocol to obtain consent form students participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason:
At present consent is being given by students; however it would be beneficial for the programme team to adopt a more structured protocol when obtaining consent.

SET 4 Curriculum Standards
4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

Recommendation
The course team to consider how they support those students whose practical experience is in advance of their academic underpinning knowledge.

Reason:
After meeting the students it became apparent that many have already gained experience of carrying out specific tasks within the trusts where they are employed, prior to gaining academic underpinning knowledge.

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

Recommendation
To explore provision of opportunity for inter-professional learning which could be incorporated within the programme

Reason
For the benefit of the programme and students it is encouraged for more thought to be given on incorporating more opportunities for inter -professional learning within the programme.

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation
To revise the audit documentation for placements to reflect modern radiographic practice.

Reason
Evidence of audit documentation for placements was provided. It is advised that the programme team should continue their audits and for the benefit of the programme, should ensure that the natures of the audits are up to date with modern radiographic practice

Commendations

1) **It was apparent that the programme team are experienced in delivering distance learning programmes.**

2) **The demonstration of the e-learning environment was impressive and supports our observations of the team.**

3) **We received positive feedback from the students regarding the level of support they received from the university.**

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 16th April 2007

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:

Julie O'Boyle

Linda Mutema

Date: 19/3/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	4th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Miss Pamela Sabine – Head of Podiatry and Podiatric Surgery – South East Essex PCT Mrs Kathryn Burgess – Head of Division of Medical Imaging & Radiography – University of Liverpool.
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mrs Jenny Hawkins (Chair) – Canterbury Christ Church University Mrs Shelagh Titchener – Director of Academic Planning and Quality. Dr Peter Merchant – Principle Lecturer, English Ms Judith Durrant – Programme Director, Professional Development Ms Karen Stansfield – NMC Representative Ms Carole Bennett-Rose – Visiting Lecturer, University of Central England Mrs Geraldine Francis – Principle Lecturer, Kingston University.

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☐	☐	☒

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**Max 25**

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 6. Assessment standards
6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition:
The assessment structure for the course needs to be clarified so that it is explicit to students as to what is required to pass each module.

Reason:
The assessment structure was not clearly articulated within the documentation which lead to confusion on what was required for students to pass each module. This needs to be more clearly outlined.

Deadline to meet condition: 14th May 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Recommendation:
The programme team should consider the development of a more formalised method of obtaining student consent.

Reason:
Through discussions with the programme team it was made apparent that consent from students was obtained, however the team agreed to consider devising a more formal way of obtaining consent which the visitors encourage.

Recommendation 2

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:
That the programme team re-visit the wording of the module descriptors to better reflect the necessary learning outcomes.

Reason:
The visitors felt that some of the wording used within the module descriptors could be improved to enable students to have a clearer understanding of how the module descriptors reflect the learning outcomes.

COMMENDATIONS

1) The programme team have engaged in a very positive way with the students and have acted on feedback from them.

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:

Miss Pamela Sabine
Mrs Kathryn Burgess

Date: 11/04/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Fulltime
Date of Visit	20-22 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Stephen Oates, Clinical Educator, Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust (Operating Department Practice) Susan Thompson, Lecturer, St John University (Occupational Therapy)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Penny Joyce, Principal Lecturer, University of Portsmouth (College of ODP) Nick Clark, Lecturer, Anglia Ruskin University (College of ODP)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	50

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

CONDITIONS

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including criminal conviction checks

Condition: The University needs to make the self-declaration process for keeping CRB checks up to date more transparent.

Reason: The documentation does not currently make it clear that students are required to complete annual declarations to keep their CRB check up to date.

Deadline for Conditions to be met:	21 May 2007
Suggested dates for submission to ETP:	5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.12 The Resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.
3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, IT facilities (including internet access), must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The University should take steps to ensure that all students have easy access to the Blackboard virtual learning environment.

Reason: Many learning resources are made available to students via Blackboard, however not all students have easy access to Blackboard at their practice placements.

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: The University should build upon its unique portfolio of programmes and setting by developing with some urgency an inter-professional learning programme for all four disciplines under review and within the University as a whole.

Reason: There is currently little evidence that inter-professional learning takes place, however the wide range of programmes offered and the unique physical location of all the programmes in the same building provide very good opportunities for this situation to change.

SET 5. *Practice Placements*

5.7.4 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure.

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make it clear who is responsible for which elements of the clinical assessment.

Reason: The documentation does not currently make this clear. The students and the practice placement providers would benefit from this being made more transparent.

Condition: The role of the logbook as a means of monitoring student progress on the practice placements could be made more explicit in the documentation.

Reason: The documentation does not currently make this clear. The students and the practice placement providers would benefit from this being made more transparent.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The audit system for practice placements is a good example of best practice.**
- **The placements allow movement to maximise the learning experience for the student.**
- **The enthusiasm for the programme expressed by the students is a positive reflection on the commitment of the course team and placement providers.**

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:

Stephen Oates

Susan Thompson

Date: 26 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff University
Name and titles of programme(s)	PG Dip Occupational Therapy BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (F/T) BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (P/T)
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Fulltime (except for OT P/T route)
Date of Visit	20-22 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Carol Walker, Retired Head of Occupational Therapy, York St John University Bernadette Waters, Director of Education and Head of Occupational Therapy, University of Southampton Susan Thompson, Lecturer, St John University (Occupational Therapy)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Tony Cryer, Cardiff University, Chair Remy Reyes, Professional Officer, College of Occupational Therapists (C)(COT) Helen Stoneley, Programme Leader, Occupational Therapy, University of Derby (COT) Jo-Anne Supyk, Senior Lecturer in Occupational Therapy, University of Salford (COT)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**PGDip 25** **BSc FT 64** **BSc PT 30**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 6. *Assessment Standards*

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

Condition: The regulations regarding professional suitability must be made more explicit in the programme documentation for the PG Dip and brought into line with the other OT programmes.

Reason: Professional suitability is currently covered adequately in the other OT programmes but not in the PG Dip.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 21 May 2007

Suggested dates for submission to ETP: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2. *Programme admissions*

2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including Accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Recommendation: The documentation should be revised to ensure that the procedures for Accreditation of Prior Learning are clearly articulated and transparent to prospective students.

Reason: The documentation does not currently include procedures for Accreditation of Prior Learning.

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.

Recommendation: The policy for staff development, both within the school and the wider university, should be more clearly demonstrated.

Reason: The current staff development opportunities available for staff, and the support that they received to take them up, was not clearly articulated in any of the documentation.

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: The policy for attendance monitoring should be clearly articulated in the documentation.

Reason: The procedure for monitoring attendance is currently unclear.

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: The University should build upon its unique portfolio of programmes and setting by developing with some urgency an inter-professional learning programme for all four disciplines under review and within the University as a whole.

Reason: There is currently little evidence that inter-professional learning takes place. The wide range of programmes offered and the unique physical location of all the programmes in the same building provide very good opportunities for this situation to change.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The development of the practice placements database for Wales is an example of best practice.**
- **The development of non traditional practice placements in occupational therapy to support professional innovation and the issues around placement capacity is excellent.**
- **The integrated model of curriculum delivery, which underpins the holistic occupational basis for professional practice, is commended.**
- **The collaborative nature of the teams across the three institutions is commended.**
- **The quality of the documentation was greatly appreciated by the 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:

```
Carol Walker
Bernadette Waters
Susan Thompson
```

Date: 26 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	20-22 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Professor Norma Brook Mrs Kathleen Bosworth
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Nina Thompson – QA Officer, the Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Marilyn Andres – Head of School of Health and Rehabilitation, Keele University (The Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
First visit since publication of QAA benchmarks	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☐	☐	☒
Programme team	☐	☐	☒
Placements providers and educators	☐	☐	☒
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☐	☐	☒

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☐	☐	☒
IT facilities	☐	☐	☒
Specialist teaching accommodation	☐	☐	☒

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**Max 90**

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

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.

Condition:
The programme team need to ensure that the implementation of the attendance regulation is clearly and firmly articulated within the course document and student handbook. Also statements referring to the regulations for both the regulatory body and professional body need to be rectified, so that it does not imply that HPC stipulates the number of clinical hours, for e.g. course document p63, paragraph 5.2.2 and within the student handbook, appendix 11.
The programme team must redraft and submit evidence to ensure this condition has been met

Reason:
The visitors felt that the information provided within the documentation relating to the attendance regulation was not clearly articulated. Students need to be clearly informed of the attendance regulations.
Also, statements within the documentation referring to HPC number of clinical hours are misleading for HPC does not stipulate number of hours. This needs to be rectified.

Condition 2

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.

Condition:
Reference of HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics need to be included within the PPD Module. Also in the course document, p63 paragraph 5.2, there needs to be clarification that the learner is governed by both the rules for the professional conducts for Chartered Physiotherapists and the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.
The programme team must redraft and submit evidence to ensure this condition has been met

Reason:
All students need to be fully aware that they are required to meet the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics prior to registration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 21 May 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

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

Recommendation:
The University should build upon its unique portfolio of programmes and setting by developing with some urgency an inter-professional learning programme for all four disciplines under review and within the University as a whole.

Reason:
There is currently little evidence that inter-professional learning takes place, however the wide range of programmes offered and the unique physical location of all the programmes in the same building provide very good opportunities for this situation to change.

Commendations

1) The visitors commend the research facilities and evidence based teaching and learning.

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:

Professor Norma Brook
Mrs Kathleen Bosworth

Date: 12/04/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography & Imaging BSc(Hons) Radiotherapy & Oncology
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Fulltime
Date of Visit	20-22 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Derek Adrian-Harris, Director of Radiography, University of Portsmouth Russell Hart, Radiotherapy Services Manager, Nottingham University Hospital
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Tony Cryer, Cardiff University (Chair) Julie O'Boyle, The College of Radiographers Graham Morgan, The College of Radiographers

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**Diagnostic Radiography = 60 Radiotherapy and Oncology = 22**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 5. *Practice placements*

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

Condition: The University must put in place a more formal mechanism for both approving and monitoring practice placements.

Reason: The current process is informal and inconsistently applied. There is insufficient emphasis on regular, structured monitoring.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 21 May 2007

Suggested dates for submission to ETP: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

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.

Recommendation: Professional development opportunities to ensure that staff maintain clinical currency should be extended to all staff and greater support for staff undertaking this professional development should be put in place.

Reason: Currently some staff are engaged in developing and maintaining the currency of their clinical skills however this is by no means the case for all staff. The programme would benefit from increased emphasis on this area.

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: The University should build upon its unique portfolio of programmes and setting by developing with some urgency an inter-professional learning programme for all four disciplines under review and within the University as a whole.

Reason: There is currently little evidence that inter-professional learning takes place, however the wide range of programmes offered and the unique physical location of all the programmes in the same building provide very good opportunities for this situation to change.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The in-practice IT system for student and placement provider feedback and interaction during practice placements is excellent.**

- **The image library for diagnostics is excellent.**

- **The enthusiastic support for students offered by the programme team is commended.**

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:

Derek Adrian-Harris
Russell Hart

Date: 26 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central England in Partnership with West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Name and titles of programme(s)	Foundation Degree in Health and Social Care (Paramedic Science) (for qualified IHCD ambulance technicians)
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of Visit	19th and 20th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	October 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Prof. Graham Rogers (chair) Ian Teague (external – paramedic) Jan Harris (external – academic) Fred Lawrence (external – academic) Timothy James (University representative) Sue Lillyman (University representative)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	2 x 12 P/A

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

CONDITIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Condition: The HEI must ensure students are aware of the consequences for non-attendance in both theory and practice by amending the student handbook accordingly.

Reason: There is a policy in place for theory and practice but it does not detail the consequences for non-attendance for the student. It should also specify the roles and responsibility of the HEI and partner Trust.

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.

Condition: The HEI must provide a written policy for the assessment and moderation of the work books.

Reason: The course programme utilises work books for student learning and covering key material. In order to ensure students are developing and demonstrating standards of proficiency. The process for assessment of the workbook, moderation and action planning should be detailed.

SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition: The HEI must produce a plan for recruitment of an external examiner for this programme.

Reason: Currently the course team are awaiting university approval of this pathway. The HPC team require evidence of active recruitment.

Deadline for conditions to be met:	**21 May 2007**
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:	**31 May 2007**
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:	**12 June 2007**

COMMENDATIONS

1. <u>**Partnership working**</u> **– there clear evidence of cohesive thinking and work related to the needs of the organisations and more importantly the students. The thought process for the programme has been given clear thought.**

2. <u>**Documentation and preparation**</u> **– the work of the visiting team has been made extremely easy in relation to the standard of documentation. The detail and depth of the information provides reassurance in relation to achieving the HPC SOP's for paramedic.**

3. <u>**Innovation**</u> **– the programme provides many avenues of clear thought and challenging of traditional approaches. The course work-books provide a new way of balancing operational, student and educational needs.**

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:

Marcus Bailey
Paul Bates

Date: 20 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central England, Birmingham
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non –Medial Prescribing Course for Health Professions
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT & PT
Date of Visit	03 April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jane Topham – Staff Development Officer – Yorkshire Ambulance Service (Educationalist) Mark Woolcock – South Western Ambulance Service (Clinician/Educationalist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar Katherine Lock (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Neil Staunton, Undergraduate Programme manager, Faculty of Law, Humanities, Development and Society (Chair) Marion Thompson, Director of Academic Quality, Faculty of Health (Secretary) Kuldip Bharj, NMC Reviewer, Head of midwifery and womens health, University of Leeds Margaret Abbott, External Adviser (Academic), Senior Lecturer, St Martins College/University of Cumbria Barbara Novak, External Adviser (Academic), Lecturer in applied biological sciences/Lead for nurse prescribing, Institute of Health Sciences/City University, London Lisa Hill, External Adviser (Practitioner), Kingswinford Fiona Copland, University Representative, Course Director, Cert HE:FE, Faculty of Education Lucy Land, Faculty Representative, Research Teaching Facilitator,/Field Co-ordinator, Faculty Centre

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New profession to the HPC	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	15

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.2.5 The Admission Procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the APEL process in the programme documents.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it became clear that particular details relating to the types of experience and qualification that would normally be permitted for use for exemption from teaching session were not outlined in the documentation.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must be appropriately registered with the HPC unless otherwise arranged.

Reason: A suitable external examiner who is in compliance with this standard must be appointed to this programme. In order to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard, the definitive documentation will need to be amended to include the stipulation on the appointment of a suitable external examiner.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **Monday 7 May 2007**

Expected dates for submission to ETP: **Tuesday 31st May 2007 (Report)**
                                           Tuesday 31st May 2007 (Approval)

Commendations

The visitors commend the Physiology component of the programme. Positive comments were received from colleagues and students and the Visitors were impressed by the supporting document and the comprehensive web resources.

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:

> **Jane Topham**
> **Mark Woolcock**

Date: 13 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Name and titles of programme(s)	MA Art Therapy MA Dramatherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	6-7 February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**MA Art Therapy** Philippa Brown (Art Therapist, Educationalist) Barry Falk (Art Therapist, Clinician) **MA Dramatherapy** Bruce Bayley (Dramatherapy, Clinician) Donald Wetherick (Music Therapist, Educationalist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dominique Davidson, Faculty Quality Manager (Chair) Hazel Punnett, Administrative Officer (Secretary)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
Programme not visited since publication date of QAA benchmark statement	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐

Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	MA Art Therapy - 16
	MA Dramatherapy - 12

Date
2007-02-20

Ver.
a

Dept/Cmte
APV

Doc Type
APV

Title
Visitors' Report - University of
Derby MA Art Therapy-MA
Dramatherapy

Status
Final
DD: None

Int. Aud.
Public
RD: None

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

GENERIC CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme teams must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials for both the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy to clearly articulate that the University no longer accepts criminal records checks completed by an applicant's previous employer and that a system of monitoring/declaration of criminal record status is in place.

Reason: The programme team indicated in discussion that the documentation has not been amended to reflect the intention that for the coming academic year neither programme would continue to accept criminal records checks from and applicant's previous employer. Further, though some placement providers required additional criminal records checks prior to placement, the Visitors felt that not all students may be provided with the opportunity to either be checked or declare a change in status of a criminal record unless the University of Derby implemented some form of monitoring process.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The programme teams must submit documentation to evidence the physical facilities in place a Britannia Mill for the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy programmes. The documentary evidence to show the progress of the refurbishment project should contain photographs and a statement of progress relating to relevant art therapy and dramatherapy specific facilities. In particular, for the MA Dramatherapy programme, the programme team must evidence how the historical problem of noise from dramatherapy groups has been overcome.

Reason: At the visit, the panel was shown the new facilities at the Markeaton campus, which can be utilised for both programmes through the University of Derby central timetable. However, the proposed facilities at Britannia Mill campus were not in place as the refurbishment project had not yet commenced. Given the Britannia Mill campus will be the site of profession specific teaching facilities, the Visitors felt that some evidence of completion of this refurbishment process is required.

From the documentation and through discussion, the Visitors also became aware that there were historic problems arising from noise from dramatherapy groups. The Visitors felt that this issue could be tackled in the new facilities and felt the programme team needed to evidence how this was one of considerations made in the refurbishment project.

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 programme teams must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation for the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy to clearly articulate in the protocol for obtaining student consent that students may be participating as patients, clients or colleagues.

Reason: In the student learning contract, there was not a reference to consent for participation as patient, client or colleague. The Visitors felt within the programme there would be many occasions, such as role-play or reflective group discussions where this consent would need to be obtained.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

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

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.

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

Condition: The programme teams must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation for the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy to include an objective marking scheme that articulates the attainment of the standards of proficiency for arts therapists within pass criteria.

Reason: In discussion, it became clear the University of Derby were in the process of adding detail to marking schemes throughout the institution as the previous university-wide standard was felt to require more information. The Visitors also felt the programmes required more developed marking schemes in order to ensure students obtained the threshold attainment levels for meeting the standards of proficiency within the boundaries of a pass mark.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programmes teams redraft and resubmit the programme documentation for the MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must come from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The programme documentation indicated the current external examiners for both programmes are appropriately registered, however, to ensure that future appointees are correctly registered, the Visitors felt the definitive programme documentation should make clear this stipulation.

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

MA Dramatherapy

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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 to students and staff.

Condition: The dramatherapy programme team must redraft and resubmit the recommended reading lists fro the module descriptors to evidence an update of the library stock to include a wider range of contemporary psycho-analytic and psycho-therapeutic literature.

Reason: The Visitors felt the recommended reading list did not recommend a sufficient range of psycho-analytic and psycho-therapeutic texts to direct students towards the theoretical basis of, and the range of approaches to, assessment and intervention (SoP 3a.1)

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 profession.

Condition: The dramatherapy programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that students may approach individuals registered with the British Association of Dramatherapists for personal therapy.

Reason: The programme documentation indicated a disparity between the requirements for personal therapy for both programmes. The Visitors felt that dramatherapy students should have the option to seek personal therapy with individuals registered from the relevant professional body in the guidance issued by both programmes.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 24th May/21st June
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

For approval of report: 31st May 2007
For approval of programme: 5th July / 2nd August 2007

GENERIC RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Recommendation: The MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy programme teams should consider devolving the personal tutor allocations away from the programme leader and to other members of academic staff.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent that the programme leaders for MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy were both personal tutors to all students registered on the respective programmes. Also through discussion, it was clear that students utilised all staff associated with the programmes fro academic and pastoral support. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the workload could be appropriately spread amongst the academic staff.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.7.2 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Recommendation: The MA Art Therapy and MA Dramatherapy should consider relocating the workload for clinical placement co-ordination away from the programme leader.

Reason: Through discussion, it became clear there were historic problems with placement co-ordination. Although much work had been done to ensure placement allocation occurred on time, the Visitors felt that by devolving the responsibility for placement co-ordination to another member of staff, improvements would be accelerated as more time could be dedicated to placement co-ordination.

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

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

Recommendation: The MA Art therapy and MA Dramatherapy programme teams should consider developing a more comprehensive agenda for training opportunities for placement providers.

Reason: Through discussion with the placement providers, it became clear, although attendance at training days is difficult to achieve owing to work commitments, placement providers would value the opportunity to attend the University for a full day of training. It was also suggested that the placement providers would appreciate the academic discussion of current practice at these events to add value.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider other forms of assessment across a range of assessment types throughout the whole programme.

Reason: The Visitors felt the programme exhibited an over-dependency on written essays as a method of assessment when other assessment methods might be utilised. In particular, through discussion the students suggested they would be very much in favour of differing assessment methods, such as tutor assessment within supervision groups or assessment of a solo autobiographical performance.

PROGRAMME SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

MA Dramatherapy

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: The dramatherapy programme team should accelerate the development in the programme of wider theoretical perspectives from a variety of psycho-analytic and psycho-therapeutic theories.

Reason: The Visitors noted the achievements of developing an integrated approach in the dramatherapy programme. However, it was felt that this should be accelerated to give students greater access to a wider range of theories.

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

Recommendation: The dramatherapy programme team should review the group size for year 1 supervision groups and tutorials.

Reason: The Visitors felt the current number of students in supervision groups for dramatherapy was significantly higher that they would normally expect. The Visitors

considered that smaller groups would aid the reflective process by ensuring individuals all had greater opportunity to contribute to discussion.

COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- the enormous volume of work channelled into ensuring consistency in placement co-ordination over the last two years and the hard work of the wider programme teams.
- the lively, enthusiastic and honest student group whom were met in the meeting with students.
- the placement providers for their high level of awareness of their responsibilities for teaching and learning and their evident satisfaction with and commitment to the working relationship with University of Derby

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:

MA Art Therapy
Philippa Brown
Barry Falk

MA Dramatherapy
Bruce Bayely
Donald Wetherick

Date: 19/02/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non-medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9) Non-medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 10) Non-medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11)
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	11th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Robert Fellows (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) David Whitmore (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) – *unable to attend Visit owing to work unforeseen work commitments.*
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Irene Bonnar (Chair), Associate Dean of Quality, School of the Built and Natural Environment, GCU Elaine Skea (Secretary), Assistant School Manager – Programme Support, School of Nursing, Midwifery & Community Health, GCU Susan Winterburn (HLSP/NMC), Senior Nursing Lecturer, School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Sheffield Carroll Siu (External Panel Member), Senior Lecturer, Institute of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Brighton Carole Doyle (Internal Panel Member), Senior Lecturer/Teaching Fellow, Caledonian Business School, GCU

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☐	☐	☒

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**60 per intake, 10% of which will be AHPs**

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

CONDITIONS

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 profession.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to correct the reference to the Department of Health document, *Outline curriculum for training programmes to prepare Allied Health Professionals as Supplementary Prescribers*.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted attributed the above document to the HPC. As the HPC does not issue curriculum guidance for programmes of study, this reference will be need to corrected throughout the programme documentation.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:

   5.3.1 a safe environment; and

   5.3.2 safe and effective practice.

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

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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for approving and monitoring placements. The placement approval and monitoring mechanisms must ensure the practice environments are safe, provide safe and effective practice and are compliant with suitable anti-discriminatory and equal opportunities policies.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that in the previous version of the programme there was no process to approve and monitor placement environments. In order to meet the standards of education and training, the programme team must devise a process to ensure appropriate practice placement standards are being met.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31st May 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007

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: The programme team should consider the addition of suggested pre-reading in the area of pharmacology to applicants to the programme.

Reason: In discussion with students, it was commented that they felt they would have benefited from a suggested list of reading on pharmacology before the commencement of the programme as the subject area was considered new and therefore challenging at the outset by the majority of the students.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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 to students and staff.

Recommendation: Glasgow Caledonian University should consider reviewing the opening hours of the learning resource centre to increase the hours available to students to access facilities and resources.

Reason: In the tour of facilities it was noted that the library opening hours were suitable for access to the resources. However, the Visitor felt that certain student groups, such as those working on shift patterns, may benefit from increased flexibility in the opening hours of the learning resource centre.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing the development of the training made available to Designated Medical Supervisors to continue to include the opportunity for DMPs to attend the University, but also pursue, as planned, other methods of disseminating information.

Reason: In discussion the programme team displayed the commitment to the training of the Designated Medical Supervisors. It was stated that uptake on University based training was low and accordingly other methods of training DMPs were being explored. In the meeting with a DMP, indications were made that University based training would be highly valued and felt the programme team should be made aware of this demand and should consider continuing attempts to train at the University.

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:

       Bob Fellows

Date: 17th April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name and titles of programme(s)	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT FT
Date of Visit	7th – 8th March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr R. J Cartwright - Divisional Manager - West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust Ms Sue Boardman - Paramedic Course Leader - Sheffield Hallam University
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Ms Catherine Rendell - Chair**, Associate Dean (Academic Quality), Faculty of Humanities, Law and Education, University of Hertfordshire **Mrs Clare Serafinowicz** - Clerk, Academic Quality Officer, University of Hertfordshire **Mr Peter Stanbury** - Faculty Member - School of Life Sciences - Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire. **Mrs Jan Turner -** Associate Dean (Academic Quality), Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire **Mr Paul Nicholas Brown -** Representative from Health Profession Council, Visitor, Assistant Director, Cardiff University **Ms Jo Cahill -** Deputy Associate Dean, Quality Assurance & Enhancement, Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire. **Ms Lesley Forsyth -** External Specialist - Approval and Accreditation assessor/advisor for the College of Radiographers. Department of Radiography, The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen **Ms Madge Heath -** Representative from Health Profession Council, Visitor, Principle Lecturer, University of Portsmouth **Miss Gemma Howell -** Clerk, Academic Quality Officer, University of Hertfordshire

	Mr Stuart Mackay - External Specialist - External Specialist - Approval and Accreditation assessor/advisor for the College of Radiographers, Department of Radiography, University of Salford **Ms Nicole Smith -** Representative from Health Profession Council, Visitor, Private Practitioner Physiotherapists **Ms Nina Thomson -** External Specialist - Representative from The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, Quality Assurance Officer

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 35 |

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 3 Programme Management and Resource Standards
3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent

Condition:
Appropriate documentation is required for all areas within practical and clinical teaching in relation to consent and Health & Safety Issues.

Reason:
The university needs to provide evidence that it has the necessary policies and forms to document student consent to participate as simulated patients. It also needs to provide evidence that students are provided with policies/procedures that document their understanding of Health & Safety requirements within the course e.g. manual handling, defibrillation and cannulation such as a sharps policy.

Condition 2

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:
Evidence needs to be provided to ensure a more robust attendance and monitoring mechanism is in place within the University.

Reason:
In discussion with current students it became obvious that there was not a workable and auditable system to ensure students attended for the requisite time.

Condition 3

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition:
From Student feedback it would appear that there are not enough Paramedic specific journals and textbooks available for students. This needs to be addressed to bring it in line with similar levels provided for other profession. Evidence needs to be submitted to ensure that this condition has been met.

Reason:
It would appear from student feedback that although the course committee has made a request for more profession specific journals and books no action has been taken to alleviate this issue.

Condition 4:

SET 6. Assessment standards
6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition:
Evidence needs to be provided prior to the start of the new programme, of the appointment of an external examiner from the relevant part of the register.

Reason:
The Health Professions Council requires the External Examiner to be from the relevant part of the register i.e. a paramedic.

Condition 5

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition:
Evidence needs to be provided to ensure that a system is put in place within the new programme that the education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements.

Reason:
From student feedback it would appear that some students are not receiving appropriate placement supervision and that no workable scheme is in place to monitor this. It is also a requirement that they is a system in place for auditing the placements and this was currently in a draft document, which was a questionnaire for the students, this needs to be a more robust method for monitoring of the placements.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 30 April 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31 May 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 12 June 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2.5 Accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Recommendation:
We would encourage the university to plan for the potential Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) of students on to the new programmes pending the demise of the IHCD technician and Paramedic Award scheduled for March 2008.
We also encourage the university to clarify within the documentation the APL for candidates wishing to apply to the course from other allied health professions.

Reason:
There seems to be some confusion around what will be the position of current first year students who would take their IHCD course after March 2008 when the course is planned lose its accreditation.

Recommendation 2:

SET 6. Assessment standards
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.

Recommendation:
To the review the assessment strategies for the new programme using student and staff evaluation, in relation to the inconsistencies between credit rating and assessment.

Reason:
The credit rating for some modules does not seem to reflect the amount of work required by the student. Some modules require the same level of student effort although the credits achieved are less.

Recommendation 3:

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation:
To encourage the continual development of a combined university and Ambulance Trust, Practice Placement Educator course and qualification.

Reason:
The University needs to develop in conjunction with the placement providers an accredited course for Practice Placement Educators.

COMMENDATIONS

1) The visitors commend the excellent working relationship between the University and Ambulance Trusts

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:

      Mrs Susan Boardman

      Mr R. J Cartwright

Date: 27/3/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full-time
Date of Visit	7/8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Paul Brown (Radiographer) Madge Heath (Radiographer) Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Ms Catherine Rendell - Chair**, Associate Dean (Academic Quality), Faculty of Humanities, Law and Education, University of Hertfordshire **Mrs Clare Serafinowicz** - Clerk, Academic Quality Officer, University of Hertfordshire **Mr Peter Stanbury** - Faculty Member - School of Life Sciences - Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire. **Mrs Jan Turner -** Associate Dean (Academic Quality), Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire **Ms Jo Cahill -** Deputy Associate Dean, Quality Assurance & Enhancement, Faculty of Health and Human Sciences, University of Hertfordshire. **Ms Lesley Forsyth -** External Specialist - Approval and Accreditation assessor/advisor for the College of Radiographers. Department of Radiography, The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen **Miss Gemma Howell -** Clerk, Academic Quality Officer, University of Hertfordshire **Mr Stuart Mackay -** External Specialist - External Specialist - Approval and Accreditation assessor/advisor for the College of Radiographers, Department of Radiography, University of Salford **Ms Nina Thomson -** External Specialist - Representative from The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, Quality Assurance Officer **Mr R. J Cartwright** - Representative from

	Health Profession Council, Visitor, Paramedic, Divisional Manager - West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust **Ms Sue Boardman** - Representative from Health Profession Council, Visitor, Paramedic, Course Leader - Sheffield Hallam University

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**Min. 12** **Max. 40**

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

CONDITIONS
SET 6. Assessment standards

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

Condition: The programme team must review the wording used in the level descriptors in assessment for the placement components.

Reason: Currently the pass mark criterion in the placement components allows a student to pass but require support. This means that they would not meet the standards of proficiency and be able to apply to enter the professional register. The wording in the level descriptors must be reviewed to ensure that all students who pass the placement modules meet the standards of proficiency and can begin to practise without supervision.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 30 April 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31 May 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 12 June 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The programme team should review the module documentation to make clearer where complementary and alternative medicine is included in the curriculum.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the Visitors learnt of examples where students were exposed to complementary and alternative medicines. The Visitors felt that the programme team should make it more explicit in the documentation where students can expect to be introduced to these approaches and their relevance to radiography.

COMMENDATIONS

- Well prepared and transparent review of the programme, which was engaging with a wide range of stakeholders.
- Good interprofessional learning ideas
- Good level of interprofessional working across the School, which was evidence in the individual programmes

- Excellent personal interaction with the students

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:

Paul Brown
Madge Heath
Nicola Smith

Date: 27/3/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	14/15 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Colin Keiley, Anaesthetic and Recovery Team Manager, Stepping Hill Hospital Foundation Trust, Stockport Nick Clark, Senior Lecturer, Operating Department Practice, HSHS
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Katherine Cockin, Reader, Faculty of Arts and Social Science (Chair) Sue Murphy, Faculty of Health and Social Care (Secretary) Tim Burton, Senior Quality Officer Jayne Lowton, Chair of Curriculum Review and Approval Group Helen Booth, College of Operating Department Practitioners

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New profession to the HPC	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	30- TBC

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: Further information must be provided to demonstrate that health checks can and will be carried out before the programme commences during the new cohort intake date of September.

Reason: The admission criteria requires health checks to be completed before a student can commence the programme, however concern was raised during the visit that sufficient health checking services may not be available due to the earlier cohort intake date of September (currently intake is in January).

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.

Condition: A breakdown of staffing hours allocated to the programme must be provided to demonstrate that sufficient staffing resources have been allocated.

Reason: Information provided during the visit suggests that the staff teaching the programme are appropriately qualified and experienced, however there was concern that other commitments within the university may result in them having insufficient time to allocate to the ODP programme.

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

Condition: A more formal consent process must be put in place that ensures that student consent is obtained before practical exercises and any potential implications of non-participation are explained to the student.

Reason: There is no consent process presently in place. The consent is 'implied' by enrolment in the programme, however this is insufficient.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Condition: Evidence must be provided to demonstrate that sufficient practice placement spaces will be available given the increase in cohort size.

Reason: The placement providers spoken to during the visit indicated that they did not feel they would be able to offer additional placements to meet the needs of the increased cohort size.

5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must have relevant qualification and experience:

Condition: A breakdown must be provided to demonstrate that there are sufficient mentors in the three disciplinary areas (anaesthetics, surgery and post-anaesthetics) to meet the course requirements.

Reason: The University's database for approving and monitoring placements and keeping track of mentors is excellent; however it does not currently record the disciplinary areas of the mentors. With the provision of this additional information, the database will be best practice.

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: Copies of the anti-discriminatory and equal opportunities policies of the private hospitals involved in practice placements must be provided, along with brief explanation of how these are monitored by the University.

Reason: No information was provide on how the university ensures that students who undertake placements in private hospitals are afforded equal opportunities and are not the subject of discrimination.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: Written confirmation that an external examiner will be appointed needs to be added to the programme documentation.

Reason: The programme team reassured the panel that an external examiner will be appointed, however this is not clear in the documentation.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **17 May 2007**

Expected dates for submission to ETP: **Thursday 31 May 2007 (Report)**
                                            Tuesday 12 June 2007 (Approval)

Commendations

The University's database and processes for monitoring student attendance are excellent and provide a good example of best practice. The database for managing practice placements is also excellent, and with the modifications agreed during the visit will provide a good example of best practice.

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:

Colin Keiley
Nick Clark

Date: 16 March 2007

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma in Higher Education in Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full Time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	David Bevan (ODP) Angela Duxbury (Radiography acting as the education specialist.)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair) Catherine Moss (Secretary) Helen Booth CODP, day three only Professor Mike Molan LSBU Professor Geoffrey Elliott LSBU Lisa Greatrex LSBU

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	X
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	X	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐
IT facilities	X	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	20

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:

Condition:

2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Condition: The education provider must reword and resubmit the selection and entry requirements in the programme documentation.

Reason: This would ensure that the appropriate and or professional entry standards are adhered to.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

Condition

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a CV for Jacqueline Kent

Reason: This CV was missing from the documentation provided prior to the visit.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

 Condition

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

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The education provider must resubmit the mentor database.

Reason: The database in its current form lacks information regarding evidence of appropriate registration, relevant qualifications and the appropriate practice placement educator training. In order for the SETS to be met this database should be updated and adhered to by the education provider.

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

Condition

Condition: The education provider must submit a sample of minutes for the collaborative meetings between the education provider and the practice placement educators.

Reason: There was strong evidence that these meetings take place but no minutes were provided to support this position.

Deadline for Conditions to be met:
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Recommendation: The Programme Teams consider student declaration for criminal convictions and health requirements on an annual basis.

Reason: Currently there is no formal policy to monitor criminal conviction checks and health requirements after entry to the programmes.

Commendations

The good support from the senior team to the Programme team is evident.

The collaborative nature between the programme team and the practice placement providers is a good example of best practice.

The buddy system for newly appointed staff is to be commended.

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 Bevan

Angela Duxbury

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Southbank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography PG Dip Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time/Part time
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	BSc = September 2007 PG Dip Diagnostic Radiography
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer) Linda Mutema (Radiographer0
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair) Catherine Moss (Secretary) Mr John Newton Society and College of Radiographers Professor Mike Molan LSBU Professor Geoffrey Elliott LSBU Lisa Greatrex LSBU

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	X
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	BSc 67

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

CONDITIONS

SET 1. *Level of qualification for entry to the Register*

The Council normally expects that the **threshold** entry routes to the Register will be the following:

1.1.1   PG Dip/MSc degree with honours for the following professions:
  ▪ Diagnostic radiography

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that the PGDip is the HPC approved qualification for entry onto the register, not the MSc.

Reason: Currently the PGDip is an exit award for those who do not complete the entire MSc, however the University only seeks HPC approval for the PGDip, not the entire MSc. The documentation for the PGDip therefore needs to be separated from the documentation for the MSc.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: Three months before the programme commences a written statement explaining what student numbers, timing and resource allocation will be required, together with an explanation of any impact this will have on other existing programmes.

Reason: The University have indicated that the programme is not likely to start until September 2008 and could not provide firm information on the impact the programme is likely to have on the commissioning numbers for other programmes or on the resources available to other programmes.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The learning outcomes of the PGDip modules should be revised to ensure that they are consistent with the level expected of an M level programme.

Reason: The current learning outcomes are insufficiently different from the BSc to justify its higher level status.

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

Condition: The assessment requirements for each module should be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with the revised learning outcomes.

Reason: The current assessment is inconsistent with the requirements of an M level programme.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: <mark>insert date</mark>
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: <mark>insert date</mark>

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Recommendation: Criminal conviction and health checks could be updated on an annual basis, or students could be asked to complete an annual self declaration.

Reason: Currently CRB checks and health checks are required before the programme commences, however there does not appear to be any mechanism to ensure these are kept up to date.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: Access to IT facilities and internet access should be equally available to all students on practice placement.

Reason: After discussion with the students it became evident that the internet access was variable in the hospital setting due to the various restrictions imposed by the trusts on access. This means that some students were unable to access the internet and specifically Blackboard as often as they wished.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.

Recommendation: Where the BSc (Hons) and the PG Dip are delivered jointly, the programme team should consider the learning and teaching approach is appropriate for the academic level.

Reason: The visitors noted that there could be an issue of an inappropriate academic level being taught when the two groups have shared learning.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation: There should be equity of experience across all placements.

Reason: Currently students are not necessarily having the same placement experience and this could result in inadequate learning outcomes for the students on placements.

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

Recommendation; There should be closer monitoring of student clinical progress.

Reason: This should ensure that all the learning outcomes for the placements are achieved at the appropriate stages.

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

5.7.1 the learning outcomes to be achieved;

Recommendation: Students need to be better informed of their responsibilities on placements.

Reason: Discussions with students and representatives from clinical placements indicated on occasion students and clinical staff were unaware of the learning outcomes of specific placements. The students by knowing their responsibilities on placement will know what their own learning outcomes are.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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.

Recommendation: Feedback on student assessments should be more explicit.

Reason: **To facilitate the student learning experience. Students felt that, used on their own, generic marking schemes were not very helpful as a form of assignment feedback. They found additional comments by lecturers more useful.**

COMMENDATIONS
1.   **The module guidelines and clinical portfolios are excellent.**

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:

Linda Mutema
Shaaron Pratt

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography PG Dip Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Part-time (BSc (Hons)) Full-time (PG Dip)
Date of Visit	6-8 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Angela Duxbury
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Phil Cardew (Pro VC and Chair) Catherine Moss (Secretary) Gaile Biggart Society and College of Radiographers Professor Mike Molan LSBU Professor Geoffrey Elliott LSBU Lisa Greatrex LSBU

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	X	☐	☐
Programme team	X	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	X	☐	☐

Students (current or past as appropriate)	X	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	X	☐	☐
IT facilities	X	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	X	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**BSc = 12** **PG Dip = 17**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 1. *Level of qualification for entry to the Register*

The Council normally expects that the **threshold** entry routes to the Register will be the following:

1.1.1   Bachelor degree with honours for the following professions:
  - chiropody or podiatry;
  - dietetics;
  - occupational therapy;
  - orthoptics;
  - physiotherapy;
  - prosthetics and orthotics;
  - radiography;
  - speech and language therapy;
  - biomedical science (with the Certificate of Competence awarded by the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS), or equivalent if appropriate); and

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that the PGDip is the HPC approved qualification for entry onto the register, not the MSc.

Reason: Currently the PGDip is an exit award for those who do not complete the entire MSc, however the University only seeks HPC approval for the PGDip, not the entire MSc. The documentation for the PGDip therefore needs to be separated from the documentation for the MSc.

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: The admissions procedures must clearly articulate the fact that students on successful graduation must apply for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Currently the documentation does not explain this and therefore the students are not aware that this process is <u>not</u> automatic.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The education provider must provider confirmation and review of the resources for the new programmes.

Reason: Before the new programmes commence there must be evidence produced that will show that the commissioned numbers have been given support by NHS London and that the numbers and resources have not been moved to the detriment of the other established programmes.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:
    5.3.1 a safe environment; and for
    5.3.2 safe and effective practice.

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

Condition: The documentation must include clinical placement resources for 2 of the cancer centres involved in student placements.

Reason: In the current documentation the practice placement educator information for the 2 cancer placements is missing. There is no named placement educator or mentor listed.

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including student self declaration on an annual basis.

Reason: Currently there is no formal policy to monitor criminal conviction checks and health requirements after entry to the programmes.

Commendations

The partnership with the Trusts is excellent.

The quality of the subject specific documentation was excellent.

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:

Angela Duxbury

Date: 9 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Nordoff Robbins Music therapy Centre – City University London
Name and titles of programme(s)	MA Music Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	13th – 14th February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr John Strange – Head Music Therapist – Newham Music Trust Mr John Fulton – Art Psychotherapist – NHS Ayrshire & Arran Mr Barry Falk – Art Psychotherapist – Childrens Catholic Society
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ms Helen Patey – Head of Clinical Services Ms Sophie Hampton – Centre Administrator

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New Programme	☐
Not been visited since publication of QAA Benchmarks	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	10

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

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.
4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.
SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place.

Condition:

The provider must make every effort to ensure that each student's first period of Personal Music Therapy does not overlap with the start of her/his external Personal Psychotherapy, nor the second period of Personal Music Therapy with the last sessions of Personal Psychotherapy. In the event that an overlap appears likely to be unavoidable, the student concerned must be advised to discuss the matter with both of her/his therapists and ensure that any appropriate communication that may be required is undertaken in order to ensure protection of all parties in advance of the said overlap. The programme team must re submit documentation to ensure that this condition has been met.

Reason:

The Visitors appreciate the value, as elements of the professional training, of Personal Music Therapy within the course and of Personal Psychotherapy external to the course (a requirement under HPC), of whatever kind, subject to approval/recommendation by the awarding Institution as indicated in the document relating to Personal Therapy (including the option of further music therapy) and the Visitors would wish to see both these elements of the training preserved in their present form. The Visitors were however unanimous that if the two forms of therapy, with different practitioners, were to overlap and thus run concurrently, this could pose a potential risk to students' psychological wellbeing. The Visitors recognise that overlaps may have occurred for only a small proportion of students, and are aware that with careful planning and timetabling it should be possible to avoid any future overlaps. Furthermore they understand that in some clinical circumstances, where communication between therapists is well managed, work on two or more domains may be indicated and this form of treatment may be effective. However, in the context of training and meeting the requirements of the SETs and SOPs, (in particular SOP 1a.6: - understanding the value of therapy in developing insight and self-awareness through their own personal experience) the Visitors felt that the mechanisms as to how this degree of communication might be implemented were not outlined in the documentation.

In order to minimise the risk, the Visitors recommend that the above condition should be set:

Condition 2:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition:
All course documentation should be checked, amended and re-submitted as necessary to conform with the information in the Validation Document, and where possible with its presentation therein, in order to create parity across the documentation.

Reason:
The Visitors found inconsistencies in recording course modules in the Validation Document and the Student Handbooks. They considered that the documentation led to difficulties in ensuring the SETs were met and expressed concern that it might lead to confusion for students interpreting the requirements of the modules.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 6. Assessment standards
6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation:
The form on which the student's personal psychotherapist confirms attendance be amended to specify 30 sessions as the norm

Reason:

As regards the number of sessions of personal psychotherapy students should receive, the Visitors noted with satisfaction that although the HPC does not currently specify a number, the figure of 30 specified in the course documents accords with the curriculum guidance for the profession. However, the Visitors considered that a mechanism to assure compliance with the Personal Therapy component through training should be adequately recorded.

Recommendation 2

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
SET 3.12. The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme
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 to students and staff.
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 profession

Recommendation:
The indicative reading lists should be reviewed and amended so as to reflect more adequately the range of reading, particularly in the area of psychodynamic theory since students are expected to undertake to apply principles of Psychodynamic theory in practice.

Reason:
The Visitors noted with great satisfaction the scope and range of the library stock, but considered the indicative reading lists gave insufficient emphasis to the range of psychodynamic theory that informs practice in the Arts Therapies and Psychotherapy. They understood that students are actually encouraged to read beyond these lists. However the visitors considered that there would be merit in presenting reading lists that directly included such bibliographic references, hence the recommendation.

COMMENDATIONS

1) **The visitors were impressed with the accommodation and the range of study facilities, in particular with the technology and I.T., books and journals, the music and instruments, the high staff student ratio and the large body of qualified staff.**

2) **Organisation, communication and support for students is very good**

3) **All aspect of the programme are under regular review**

4) **Consistent commitment and involvement of the validating body to the development of the programme.**

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:

Mr Barry Falk
Mr John Strange
Mr John Fulton

Date: 13/3/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education in Operating Department Practice Programme delivered at Swindon Campus
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT
Date of Visit	6-7 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount (Educationalist) Stephen Oates (Clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Peter Bradley (Chair), Director of Academic Development and Quality Ailsa Clarke, Quality Assurance Officer

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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 Owing to the introduction of the new programme at a new Swindon campus, this visit was utilised to monitor the programme delivery at the Brunel ODP Centre and Marston Road campus which will be closing in 2008 when the existing students graduate. The HPC panel received the standard annual monitoring submission to assess and discuss at the visit. Oxford Brookes University were made aware that if required, the HPC Panel may set conditions and recommendations against the programmes delivered at Marston Road and Brunel ODP Centre.	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	41

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:

2.1 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: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation and advertising materials, including an addendum to the prospectus, to clearly articulate successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to register rather than right to register. Further, the location of the programme's delivery must be updated throughout the documentation.

Reason: The documentation and website information for the programme could be considered to mislead an applicant into believing completion of the programme would entitle registration rather than lead to eligibility. The Visitors also noted in some places the information for applicants had not yet been updated to reflect delivery at the new site in Swindon.

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that criminal records and occupational health checks are part of the admissions criteria and are undertaken prior to the commencement of the programme and are satisfactorily completed before a student attends placement education. Furthermore, it should be clearly stated in the documentation that the criminal records checks are enhanced.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that that criminal records and occupational health checks were being performed in such a way to meet this standard, however, the documentation did not reflect this process as it indicated occupational health and criminal records bureau checks were performed not at the admissions stage but before each and every placement. The Visitors felt the programme documentation must be updated reflect the actual process undertaken and that the criminal records check performed are enhanced.

2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation removing any reference to ENB awards

Reason: In discussion, it became apparent that the ENB award route through the programme would no longer be offered. Accordingly, the Visitors felt the documentation for the programme must be updated to remove this route.

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.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the breakdown of staff full time equivalents and provide CVs of appointed staff.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that the documentation submitted did not accurately reflect the intended staff compliment and division of staff hours between individuals. The Visitors felt the correct breakdown of staff full time equivalents must be included in the definitive documentation along with CVs of any staff appointed in order to consider this standard being met.

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

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must submit documentation to clearly articulate the project plan to transfer equipment and resources from the Marston Road campus to the Swindon campus. This evidence should include a statement of progress in the project plan, photographs of any completed facilities and an indication of further steps to consolidate clinical facilities at the Swindon campus that may take place upon the completion of delivery at Brunel ODP Centre and the Marston Road campus.

Reason: In discussion and through documentation submitted on the visit date it was clear that the programme team and the senior management team had in place a project plan to manage the transfer of physical resources to the Swindon campus. The Visitors felt that to ensure facilities were in place for the commencement of the programme further evidence of implementation and completion of the project plan would be required. It was also noted that there may be a transition period in which students would access facilities at other sites whilst the programme was being delivered in three separate locations and the Visitors felt that plans for consolidation of these additional resources upon completion of the delivery at the Marston Road campus and Brunel ODP Centre would ensure adequacy of resources at the Swindon site.

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 to students and staff.

Condition: The programme team must submit documentation to clearly articulate the transfer process of subject books to the Swindon campus. This documentation should also take into account the increased demand on the stock arising from cross-usage of texts between nursing and ODP students.

Reason: In the tour of facilities, the Visitors were shown the intended space to be used to house the library stock. Though this space was felt to be adequate to service the requirements of the students, the Visitors felt that confirmation of the transfer process of texts was required to ensure they were accessible to students on the commencement date of the programme. Further, the Visitors noted that the library space was already in use for nursing students and that some consideration would need to be made in any additional purchasing to ensure adequate numbers of texts were available for both student groups.

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 profession.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the role of the regulator and professional body and use appropriate terminology in terms of HPC approval and professional body accreditation of programmes of study.

Reason: Throughout the documentation there were misappropriations of terminology and documentation attributed to the HPC, such as "HPC Benchmarks", requirements for hours of practice placement experience and completion times for the award.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

> 5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

> 5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

> 5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must submit the documentation from the new practice mentor database to clearly articulate, for the existing programme delivered at Marston Road campus and the new programme to be delivered at the Swindon Campus, that practice mentors are appropriately qualified, experienced, registered and have been trained and attended updating sessions.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that the database that has been used to hold information on the practice mentors is to be upgraded. The Visitors felt it was necessary to ensure that this new system of recording information on the practice placement mentors was in place in time for the start of the programme and contained relevant information to be used in the decision making process regarding the allocation of a student to a practice location.

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

Recommendation: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the considerations made to the integration of placement environments previously managed by Brunel ODP Centre staff. In particular, this information will need to take into account the differing lead-in times in providing details of placements to placement providers and students.

Reason: In discussion it became apparent that placement co-ordination between Oxford Brookes University and Brunel ODP Centre was to an extent managed in different ways. The Visitors felt that confirmation of the arrangements for Oxford Brookes University to take over placement co-ordination from the Brunel ODP Centre and the considerations in adapting to potentially different methods of co-ordination would need to be clearly agreed and documented.

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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory polices are assessed in the approval process of placement environments.

Reason: Currently all placements are held in NHS trusts and are covered by robust equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory polices. However, in discussion it was acknowledged that there may be moves to place students within private hospitals and the Visitors felt that the programme documentation should reflect a rigorous process of ensuring all placement environments were able to provide suitable policies to protect students, staff and patients.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the stipulation that at least one external examiner must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register.

Reason: In discussion it was made clear that the current external examiner was appropriately registered. However, the Visitors felt that in order to ensure that this standard continued to be met in future the programme documentation must include the stipulation for registration.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 21st June 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 2nd August 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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 to students and staff.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing the IT facilities available at the Swindon campus to ensure adequate provision to the number of students requiring access. The Visitors also recommend that the programme team consider implementing a cross-campus loan system that regularly delivers to the Swindon Campus.

Reason: The campus at Swindon has sufficient IT facilities to support the programme and the library facilities provide an adequate range of texts. The Visitors felt that a review of the IT facilities and consideration of providing easy access to texts at the other University libraries would be beneficial to students on the programme.

Commendations

The Visitors commend:

- The use of WebCT, which in its application to providing information to practice educators was well developed and implemented.

- The programme teams at both of the delivery sites, particularly the Brunel ODP Centre team who are leading the programme through its final year of a successful provision which has produced many graduates clearly exhibiting fitness to practice.

- The strong student group showing enthusiasm and determination at our meeting.

- The enthusiasm and hard work of the placement providers, particularly in the transition period affecting the programmes.

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:

Stephen Oates

Alan Mount

Date: 28/03/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Paisley
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc(Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	14/15 Feb 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr Thomas Cavanagh, Biomedical Scientist Prof William Gilmore, Biomedical Scientist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mr Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Mr Ian Smith, Dean, School of Education, University of Paisley (Chair) Mr D Bishop, Pathology Department, Ninewells Hospital and Medical School NHS (representing IBMS) Mrs Liz Kennedy, Director, University Campus, Ayr, University of Paisley Professor Paul Whiting, Faculty of Health & Life Sciences, De Montford University (representing IBMS) Mr Alan Wainwright, Institute of Biomedical Science Ms Nina Anderson, Quality Enhancement Unit, University of Paisley Mr Kim Macintyre, Quality Enhancement Unit, University of Paisley

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**15-20**

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:

2.1 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: The documentation must be revised to make professional body and regulatory requirements clear to students before they take up the programme.

Reason: Currently students do not receive this information until towards the end of the programme, by which time they will have already invested considerable time and resources.

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that CRB checks should be completed before a student commences the programme.

Reason: CRB checks are not currently required until students begin practice placement. By this time they will have invested considerable time and resources into a programme they may be prevented from completing.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The programme team needs to be revised to ensure that there are sufficient teaching staff with recent clinical experience.

Reason: CVs provided for the current fulltime staff do not provide sufficient evidence that there are sufficient staff with recent clinical experience teaching on the 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.

Condition: The module descriptors must be re-written to ensure that professional ethics and responsibility are integral to the programme, including a basic overview towards the beginning of the programme.

Reason: Professional ethics and responsibility are not currently taught until towards the end of the university-based part of the programme.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.
5.8.2 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must be appropriately registered.

Condition: The University must provide a list of all staff involved in supervising practice placements and their CVs, along with an explanation of how they will ensure that those staff are appropriately registered.

Reason: The University did not provide reassurance that there were adequate mechanisms in place to ensure that placements were supervised by appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure that sufficient time is allocated to ensure that the learning outcomes identified for practice placement can be met.

Reason: It is not currently clear that sufficient time is allocated to ensure placement learning outcomes can be met on placement or where the learning outcomes are unable to be met on placement, alternative arrangements are made to ensure these learning outcomes are covered within the University-based components of the programme.

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

Condition: Further evidence must be provided as to how the University's existing policies and processes for work-based/placement learning will be implemented for this programme.

Reason: It is currently unclear how the programme team will coordinate practice placement components of the programme.

5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Condition: The programme team must ensure that all practice placement educators are provided with information on the learning outcomes to be achieved at the practice placement.

Reason: Some practice placement providers spoken to during the visit had not been provided with detailed information on the learning outcomes to be achieved (for example, they had not seen the module descriptors).

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.
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: The programme team must implement a system of regular, minuted meetings with placement providers to monitor how placements are progressing and identify any issues that need to be resolved.

Reason: Discussion with placement providers identified a differing degree of knowledge about the programme and the learning outcomes sought from the placements. There was also a wide variation in the quality of the communication between the programme team and the placement educators.

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training;

Condition: The University must provide a written description of how they will ensure those involved in supervising placements have undertaken appropriate educator training programmes.

Reason: The current system is inadequately defined and does not provide assurance that placement supervisors will be adequately skilled in training and assessment techniques.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The University should give consideration to refurbishment of the present laboratory teaching areas.

Reason: While current facilities are adequate, there are some concerns that if overcrowded, the existing laboratories may not provide an optimal and safe learning environment. The height of the benches, provision of wash basins, and the control of environmental temperatures are particular areas worthy of attention.

COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors were impressed by the quality of the library and IT facilities, and the quality of the support available from the librarians and IT support staff.

Students spoke highly of their experience on the existing non co-terminus programme and indicated they would like to continue their involvement with the University should postgraduate opportunities arise in the future.

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: **Mr Thomas Cavanagh**

                            Prof William Gilmore

Date: **16 February 2007**

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma in Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of Visit	18th and 19th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Julie Weir (RODP) Alan Mount
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith Osama Ammar (Observing)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Nick Clark (CODP) Stephen Arkle (Chair) Isobel Ryder (QA) Liz Parton (QA) Avril Kudzi (Secretary)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐
New Profession	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**30**

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:

2.1 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

and

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:
2.2.5 accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit advertising materials for the programme to ensure the entry criteria on the website provides clear information for students wishing to apply for the programme.

Reason: Currently the website indicates that there are additional entry criteria for mature students. The programme documentation submitted for approval does not include the additional entry requirement for mature students. Accordingly the website requires updating to ensure this information should is removed.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the unit descriptors for Developing Professional Practice and Professional Practice to include references to HPC's Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Reason: Currently the unit descriptors refer students to the Code of Conduct, Performance and Ethics. To ensure students are able to locate the correct documentation on HPC's website, the unit descriptors must be updated.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31st May 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing the Student Handbook – Course Supplement to provide students with information on the academic and pastoral support they can expect to receive during the course of the programme.

Reason: Information about academic and student support is currently provided in the unit descriptors. It is recommended that this information is replicated in the Student Handbook – Course Supplement to provide students with another source of information.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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.

and

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:
6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing the definition of student misconduct, which is contained in the Student Handbook – Course Supplement, to take account of students whose entry to a professional register is not automatic upon graduation.

Reason: In practice the misconduct policy applies adequately to students on the ODP programme. However the Visitors felt that currently a student studying to become an Operating Department Practitioner could argue that the definition of misconduct does not apply to them. This is because the definition, by explicitly and exclusively referencing students on programmes that lead automatically to registration, may not cover students on the ODP programme who must apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme.

Commendations

The visitors would like to commend the programme team for their innovative use of technology to support student learning, particularly the voting facility.

The visitors would like to commend the programme team for the standard of information provided to students regarding the placement providers.

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:

Alan Mount

Julie Weir

Date: 26th April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	28 February – 1st March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Norma Brook (Educationalist) Julie Weir (Clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar, Education Officer Sam Mars, Policy Officer (Observing)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ruth Clemow, Acting Associate Dean of Faculty of Health and Social Work (Chair) Lisa Williams, Senior Administrator, Quality (Secretary) Claire Knapman, Administrative Assistant, Quality Paul Wicker, Edgehill University (External Assessor) John Tarrant, Bournemouth University (External Assessor) Penny Joyce, University of Portsmouth (CODP representative)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☒
New profession to the HPC	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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 Annual Monitoring Visitors' Report for academic year 2005-2006 raised concern over standards of education and training 2, 5 and 6.	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	30

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the requirement for an Enhanced Criminal Records Bureau check to be completed as a component of the entry requirements for the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation referred to the criminal records check and it was clearly part of the entry criteria for the programme. However, the documentation did not indicate the criminal records check would be "enhanced" and the Visitors felt that the requirement would be clearer in the documentation if it was separated under a different heading from occupational health checks.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the regional nature of the delivery of the programme. In particular an explanation and a rationale must be provided for the concurrent delivery of three modules from the first year of the programme at the centre at Truro.

Reason: In discussion with students and the programme team it became clear that eight students per cohort received lectures for three first year modules from staff at the centre in Truro. This arrangement was not made clear in the programme documentation. The Visitors felt that, in order to make a determination of how effectively the programme is managed, further information regarding the regional nature of delivery would be required. An overview of the teaching of academic content, staff involvement and learning and teaching resources would assist the Visitors in making their determination.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include the placement audit pro-forma and a description of the process of approving and monitoring placement provision.

Reason: Through discussion, it was clear that the programme team and the practice quality development department were working to ensure practice placement standards and were developing the quality mechanisms to improve the process in future. However, in the documentation it was not made clear how the process currently operated and the Visitors felt the programme documentation must clearly explain how practice placement standards are maintained.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate and illustrate the relationship and the process of collaboration between the programme team and practice placement educators. In particular, this redraft will require the updating of the flowchart featured on page 13 of the reference document A15.

Reason: Through discussion with the practice placement educators and the associate dean for practice quality development, it was clear that there would be imminent changes to the relationship between the practice educators and the programme team owing to changes at national and contractual level the roles of the existing practice clinical educators and the link tutor. In order to ensure the arrangements for collaboration for the September 2007 cohort continued to the meet this standard of education and training, the Visitors felt the new arrangement, once agreed, must be submitted to the HPC.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include the marking scheme/criteria for the formative and summative assessment elements of the practice portfolio.

Reason: The Visitors felt that the assessment of practice competencies which formed a component of the portfolio was clear in the submitted documentation. However, it was felt by the Visitors that the evaluation process of additional components of the portfolio, such as reflective evidence, was not sufficient. The Visitors felt that the programme team should clearly identify the purpose of the portfolio as a programme component and which elements are formatively and summatively assessed.

6.7.3 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register; and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the title of the aegrotat award that will not lead to eligibility for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Through discussion it became clear the title for an aegrotat award would be Diploma of Higher Education in Health Studies, however this was not made clear in the documentation. There is reference to the Certificate of Higher Education if students had not achieved sufficient credit for the diploma award. However, the HEI's academic regulations relating to the aegrotat award should be made clear in the documentation.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the stipulation that at least one external examiner must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register.

Reason: The documentation made it clear that the current external examiner was appropriate registered. However, the Visitors felt that in order to ensure that this standard continued to be met in future the programme documentation must include the stipulation for registration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 14th May 2007
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

For approval of the report: 31st May 2007
For approval of the programme: 5th July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

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.

Recommendation: The University of Plymouth should consider accelerating the appointment of a lecturer/practitioner who is a registered operating department practitioner.

Reason: The Visitors felt the programme was adequately resourced and had sufficient profession specific input. However, the Visitors felt that the programme team would be better able to support ODP students with the inclusion of more operating department practitioners on the academic staff delivering the programme and offering personal tutor support.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider separating personal development profile elements of the portfolio from the practice assessment documents.

Reason: In discussion with the students, it became apparent that the volume of information in the portfolio was at time considered cumbersome and over-complicated to complete. The Visitors suggest that by dividing the two elements of personal development profile and practice assessment documents, these feelings towards the portfolio might be adequately addressed.

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

Recommendation: The programme should report any future changes to the interprofessional learning strategy to the HPC through the appropriate monitoring process.

Reason: In light of the changes occurring throughout the faculty with regard to interprofessional learning, the Visitors felt the programme team should ensure that HPC is kept up to date with the changes in the strategy and the impact upon this programme.

Commendations

The Visitors commend the strong relationship between the practice placement educators and the programme team. This relationship was strongly evidenced in discussion and by the innovation by the programme team and support provided by the placement providers in the production and dissemination of a DVD-ROM to help address the issue of placement educators not being able to find the time to attend regular updates at the university, which is common to placement-driven programmes.

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:

      Norma Brook

      Julie Weir

Date: **2nd March 2007**

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Stirling
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non-medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	12th April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Robert Fellows (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) David Whitmore (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) – *unable to attend Visit owing to work unforeseen work commitments.*
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Andrew McAuley (Chair), Head of Department of Marketing Mrs Edna Docherty (Secretary), Academic Registrar's Office Ms Karen Stansfield (HLSP/NMC), Senior Lecturer, Sheffield Hallam University Dr Iain Ferguson (Internal Panel Member), Senior Lecturer, Department of Applied Social Science

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☐	☐	☒

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**82 per intake, 10% of which will be AHPs**

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:

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate a process for ensuring applicants to the programme will be able to meet occupational health requirements.

Reason: The programme documentation provided detailed information on entry requirements apart from occupational health testing. The Visitor felt the programme team would need to ensure that an applicant was made aware of any occupational health requirements or tests prior to commencing the programme.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

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 programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the information provided on page 25 that indicates audits of placement environments performed by other education providers would be accepted. Further the programme team must submit additional information regarding the approval and monitoring processes for placement environments to indicate how they have been adapted to ensure HPC standards for placements are being met, such as ensuring compliance with equal-opportunities and anti-discriminatory polices.

Reason: In discussion it became clear the programme team would not accept audits of placement environments performed by other education providers. Accordingly, the Visitor felt this would need to be reflected in the documentation. Additionally, a system of approval and monitoring of placement environments is in place, but in discussion it was recognised that this would need to be augmented to ensure all HPC standards for placements were being fully met. Therefore, the Visitor feels information regarding these changes to the approval and monitoring processes are required to be submitted for scrutiny.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31st May 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

Commendations

The Visitor commends:

- the innovation and quality of the virtual learning environment. A strong commitment has been made to e-learning and the members of staff supporting the VLE received very positive comments from the various groups that the HPC panel met at the Visit. Further evidence of the high quality of the learning package produced by this programme team can be found in the fact that it has been franchised to many other education providers across the UK.

- the quality and clarity of the submitted documentation. The HPC panel were impressed by the organisation and detail of the documentation in evidencing how the standards of education and training were met. Obvious care had been taken to cater to the needs of the HPC panel.

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:

Bob Fellows

Date: 17th April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Teeside
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practitioner
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	28th – 28th March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr Alan Mount Mrs Julie Weir
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Derek Simpson – (Chair) Dean, School of Computing Ms Fiona Terry – (Secretary) Centre for learning & Quality Enhancement

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
New Profession	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	Max 30

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition:
There needs to be consistency within the documentation that prospective students will be required to complete an 'enhanced' CRB clearance check. The programme team must redraft and submit documentation to ensure this condition is met.

Reason:
References made within the documentation referring to CRB checks were inconsistent in stating the students will be required to complete an 'enhanced' CRB clearance check. This needs to be clearly stipulated and consistent within the documentation.

Condition 2

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.

Condition:
References to the HPC Standards of Proficiency need to be included and more explicit within the student documents i.e; module outlines, student handbook and student practice portfolio.

Reason:
It was not clearly stipulated within the documentation the relevance of HPC Standards of Proficiency. This needs to be more explicit.

Condition 3

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.
5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;
5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition:
The programme team need to produce an electronically based mentor update grid which shows the grade of staff qualifications, teaching qualifications and when they were last updated.

Reason:
It was difficult to see within the documentation, clear up to date information regarding placement mentor staff, such as who they are and what qualifications they hold. Through producing an electronically based update grid, this will help ensure this information is kept up to date and can also act as a monitoring aid.

Condition 4

5.7.3 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct.
6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.

Condition:
More detailed references need to be included within the documentation given to students, of the HPC Standards of Proficiency and HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Reason:
It was not clearly stipulated within the documentation the relevance of HPC Standards of Proficiency and HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics. This needs to be more explicit.

Condition 5

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:
6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Condition:
The programme team must review and resubmit documentation, wherever it states eligibility to register, it should state 'eligibility to apply for registration with HPC'. There also needs to be consistency in the definitions of the HPC

Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics and the AODP student code of conduct.

Reason:
References made within the documentation stating 'eligibility to register' are misleading for it should state 'eligibility to apply for registration with HPC'. This needs to be changed.

Many references to AODP were clearly presented within the documentation however references to the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics were not clearly defined. This needs to be included and clearly articulated within the documentation.

Condition 6:

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:
6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition:
In line with Set 6.7.5, evidence must be provided that demonstrates compliance with the standard governing the appointment of an external examiner.

Reason;
The visitors appreciate the skills and expertise of the current external examiner. However, it is a requirement that evidence needs to be provided demonstrating the appointment of an external examiner which meets this set.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31st May 2007

RECCOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.7 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be used effectively.

Recommendation:
Encourage the development of a simulated operating theatre to enhance student experience.

Reason:
Through student feedback it was apparent that they would truly benefit from having an opportunity at the university to experience a simulated operating theatre prior to placement.

Recommendation 2

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

Recommendation:
To review the Inter-professional / shared learning component of the programme, in light of student feedback.

Reason:
Through student feedback it was felt that the inter-professional learning component could be improved. The visitors encourage the programme team to continue to develop this component through student feedback.

Recommendation 3

5.3.2 The practice placement settings must provide safe and effective practice

Recommendation:
Allow the discretion of the CCOs to permit students to work more flexible shift patterns to mirror that of their mentors in order to enhance the student experience, e.g. nights, weekends.

Reason:
It was highlighted during the placement mentors meeting that opportunities within placement can arise where students could work with their mentors outside normal working hours, which would aid in enhancing student experience.

The visitors commend the partnership between the CCOs, the University and their initiative in using honorary contracts.
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:**

Mr Alan Mount

Mrs Julie Weir

Date: 11/04/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	13-15 March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Radiography** Linda Mutema (Radiographer - Diagnostic, Educationalist) Anne-Marie Conway (Radiographer - Therapeutic, Educationalist) **Speech and Language Therapy** Gillian Stevenson (Speech and Language Therapist, Clinician) Lorna Povey (Speech and Language Therapist, Clinician) Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapist, Educationalist) **Physiotherapy** Katie Bosworth (Clinician, Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Educationalist/Clinician, Physiotherapist) **Occupational Therapy** Margaret Shanahan (Educationalist, Occupational Therapist) Carol Lloyd (Educationalist, Occupational Therapist) Katie Bosworth (Clinician, Physiotherapist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor D McAlister (Chair) Pro-Vice Chancellor, Teaching and Learning, University of Ulster Professor B Hannigan, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Research and Innovation, University of Ulster Ms C Roulston, Head of School of Economics and Politics, University of Ulster Mrs C Avery, Academic Office, University of Ulster

	Mrs R McCluskey, Academic Office
	Ms G Dooher, Quality Management and Audit Unit
	Mrs J Davison, Programme Leader for Occupational Therapy, University of Teesside
	Mrs J Hussey, Head of Department for Physiotherapy, The University of Dublin
	Mr M West, Senior Lecturer in Radiography, Cardiff University
	Ms R Williams, Senior Lecturer in Speech and Language Therapy, City University
	Mrs R Heames, College of Occupational Therapy, Head of Occupational Therapy, Coventry University
	Ms J Jepson, College of Occupational Therapy, Senior Lecturer Occupational Therapy, University of East Anglia
	Ms K Holmes, Education Officer (Accreditation), College of Occupational Therapy
	Ms S Eastburn, Chartered Society of Physiotherapists, Head of Division of Rehabilitation, University of Huddersfield
	Ms J Carey, Education Officer, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
	Mr R Price, College of Radiography, Head of School Health and Emergency Professions, University of Hertfordshire
	Ms P Pimm, College of Radiography Radiotherapy Services Manager, Velindre Hospital, Cardiff
	Professor J Stansfield, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy, Professor of Speech Pathology, Manchester Metropolitan University
	Ms R Hussain, Professional Development Standards Manager, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapy

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☒
Programme not visited since publication date of QAA subject benchmark statements	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the	☒	☐	☐

	Yes	No	N/A
programme			
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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 **For BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, the annual monitoring submission raised issues for investigation under SET 3, specifically around staff number adequacy.**	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**RAD (D) – 50** **RAD (T) - 12** **SLT - 30** **PH - 70** **OT - 60**

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

GENERIC CONDITIONS

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.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include increased referencing in required reading lists of the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Reason: Across all the programmes, the Visitors felt that reference was made to professional body standards for conduct, performance and ethics, but that more direction to the HPC standards is required to ensure students are aware of thresholds they are expected to meet whilst in education and when registered.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include greater detail in the information provided on assessment methods in the module descriptors.

Reason: Across all the programmes, the Visitors noted details regarding particular assessments, such as word limits and durations of examinations, were absent from some module descriptors, but in particular in modules shared across all the programmes. In order to be able to determine the effectiveness of the assessment methods in measuring attainment of learning outcomes, the Visitors felt this information is required.

RADIOGRAPHY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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 to students and staff.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to review all module descriptors in the therapeutic and diagnostic disciplines to ensure the inclusion of the most relevant and current texts. In this review, the programme team should ensure that there is consistency in selection of texts across modules.

Reason: The Visitors commented that the reading lists issued in the module descriptors contained texts that were not the most recent editions. Further, the Visitors felt there was a range of texts being recommended and required across modules and that that it would be more appropriate to the curriculum to have consistency in texts required and recommended.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

> 5.7.1 the learning outcomes to be achieved;

> 5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

> 5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

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

> 5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit the placement handbook issued to placement educators in the therapeutic discipline and re-draft and resubmit the student handbook for both therapeutic and diagnostic disciplines. These documents must be submitted electronically.

Reason: The placement handbook issued to radiotherapy placement educators was not received until the day of the event and as is the case with the student handbook contained outdated information and terminology regarding regulatory status. The Visitors felt the documentation must be resubmitted in order to ensure that placement educators and students received up to date and correct information regarding placements.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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: The programme team must submit evidence of a consistent formal documentary process for providing feedback on coursework assessment.

Reason: In discussion with the students, the Visitors noted that the process of providing feedback on coursework assessments was not consistently applied across all modules. In order to evidence students will receive similar levels of feedback to be able to adequately measure their own performance and progression against objective criteria the Visitors felt it was necessary to put in place a consistent process of feedback.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

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: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the information which details the relationship between the programme and the Health Professions Council. The redrafted information should clarify the relationship between holding the qualification and access to the HPC Register.

Reason: The current handbook, in places, does not make clear to applicants that completion of the BSc (Hons) programme leads to eligibility to apply for, rather than automatic entitlement for registration with the Health Professions Council.

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.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the overall aims of the programme to ensure that the programme produces graduates who are safe practitioners.

Reason: The current overall aims for the programme seek to produce students who are competent and effective practitioners; there is no reference to producing students who are safe practitioners. Through the learning outcomes at the module level, it is clear that the programme will produce practitioners who are safe and in discussion with the programme team, it was clear that the word was omitted from the documentation in error. The visitors agreed that the programme aims should be revisited to provide clarity.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must review the documentation relating to the placement components of the programme so that it is explicit how students progress through the placements modules at the different levels. This revised information should make clear the number of re-sit opportunities (at each level and overall) as well as the implications of failure and the procedure for re-attempting each placement module.

Reason: Currently it is not clear from the documentation how students progress through each of the placement modules and in particular what the implications are for failing one of the year two placements. The visitors need to be clear of the arrangements and the implications of failure, so they can ensure themselves that there is a balance between supporting students and making sure that those who complete the programme are fit to practise.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 24th May 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 12th June 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

RADIOGRAPHY SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

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.

Recommendation: The University of Ulster should review the staffing level on both the diagnostic and therapeutic programme teams to bring it in line with other healthcare disciplines and to ensure there is adequate support to both disciplines.

Reason: The visitors noted the staff-student ratio on the radiography programme was higher than in than in other programmes of study. However, the Visitors felt from discussions with students and staff that there was adequate support to deliver an effective programme. In discussion it was clear that consideration was being made to transfer a member of staff from one discipline to another and the Visitors wanted to ensure that this would not cause an imbalance in the adequacy of staff numbers between disciplines.

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 profession.

Recommendation: The programme team should map the programme to the College of Radiography curriculum framework.

Reason: In discussion, it was clear that the professional body representatives and the Visitors felt the programme did meet the curriculum guidance issued for the profession, however, the Visitors noted that through a comprehensive mapping of the programme to the College of Radiography curriculum framework it would be clearer how the programme relates to the guidance and therefore how the programme meets this standard of education and training.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

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 profession.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revising the learning outcomes in the module 'Psychosociocultural Influences on Occupation and Health' (OTH311J1) which relate specifically to counselling skills and techniques.

Reason: The Visitors were concerned that the current wording in the learning outcomes was misleading to students as it suggested that those who successfully completed the module could be competent in selecting and applying counselling skills and techniques. These are the specific skills and techniques of the counselling profession and not achievable by students on an occupational therapy programme.

GENERIC COMMENDATIONS

The Visitors commend:

- The Learning Resource Centre viewed in the tour of facilities. The Visitors were impressed by the facilities available for IT, and study spaces as well as the high standard of the accommodation.

- The transition from four-year programmes to three-year programmes which the Visitors viewed as being well managed, particularly in reference to stakeholder involvement.

PHYSIOTHERAPY SPECIFIC COMMENDATIONS

- The strong link exhibited between research informing teaching and practice.

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY SPECIFIC COMMENDATIONS

- The excellent collaboration between the University speech and language therapy team and the practice placement providers.

- The pastoral, clinical and academic support for students on the programme from the University speech and language therapy team.

- The speech and language therapy programme team's use of research to inform clinical teaching.

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:

Radiography
Linda Mutema
Anne-Marie Conway

Speech and Language Therapy
Gillian Stevenson
Lorna Povey
Carol Lloyd

Physiotherapy
Katie Bosworth
Anthony Power

Occupational Therapy
Margaret Shanahan
Carol Lloyd
Katie Bosworth

Date: 30/03/07