

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Glyndŵr University
Validating body/Awarding body	Glyndŵr University
Programme names	Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals at level 6) Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals at level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapy Podiatry/Chiropody Radiography
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary Prescribing
Date of visit	22 January 2009

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programmes. The education provider has until 11 March 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 March 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 20 April 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programmes. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 11 June 2009.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programmes. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programmes only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Elisa Simeoni
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approvals	May 2009
Chair	John Poulton (Glyndŵr University)
Secretary	Anna Watts (Glyndŵr University)
Members of the joint panel	Kevin Gilliam (Internal Panel Member) Cerys Alonso (Internal Panel Member) Deborah Robertson (External Panel Member, University of Chester)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review the mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs prior to the visit as a mapping document was not required by the visitors as the programmes are post-registration qualifications.

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

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

The HPC met with previous and current students from the Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programmes for nurses and pharmacists as the programmes seeking approval currently do not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 12 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the programme documentation to clearly reflect that an HPC-registered Allied Health Professional (AHP) who successfully completes the programmes will have the HPC register annotated with the Supplementary Prescribing entitlement.

Reason: In the programme documentation submitted prior to the visit, there were inaccurate references made to the annotation on the HPC register following successful completion of the programmes. Therefore, in order to give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make or take up the offer of a place on one of the programmes, the visitors wish the education provider to amend the programme documentation to clearly state that HPC-registered AHPs who successfully complete one of the programmes will have the HPC Register annotated with the Supplementary Prescribing entitlement.

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

Condition: The education provider must produce advertising material for the programmes offered at both levels 6 and 7.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit, a course information flyer was provided for the programme offered at level 6. During the visit, the visitors were told that the flyer for the programme offered at level 7 was not produced yet. Therefore the visitors said that the education provider must produce flyers for both levels in order for applicants to have all the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make or take up the offer of a place on one of the programmes.

- 2.2.1 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English.**

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence that the programme documentation includes reference to the required English Level for registered AHPs.

Reason: The documentation that was submitted to the visitors prior to the visit did not include a statement on the level of English required for the programmes. Whilst the prospective students will be registered AHPs and the standard of

proficiency regarding the level of English will be met, there was no mention of this in the programme documentation including the student handbook. Students on this programmes need to be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 of the International English Language Testing System with no element below 6.5.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence that the programme documentation includes information that applicants will be required to show evidence that they have undertaken a recent Enhanced Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) check prior to enrolment on the programmes.

Reason: The documentation that was submitted to the visitors prior to the visit did not always clearly reflect that Enhanced CRB checks must be carried out prior to admission to the programmes. Therefore, the programme documentation, and in particular pre-programme information for students, must include detail on the need for an enhanced CRB check and the procedures in place should the applicant receive a positive identification.

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted to the visitors prior to the visit did not contain information about health requirements. In discussion with the programme team, it was clear that the education provider did not ask students to bring evidence of recent health checks prior to the start of the programmes. Therefore, an outline of pre-programme enrolment health requirements, in particular within the student handbook, needs to be produced to better inform students of any programme-related health requirements. In particular, the visitors wish to see evidence of systems that are in place in order for the education provider to obtain a self declaration of health from any prospective students confirming that there is nothing in their health that would prevent them from becoming an AHP supplementary prescriber. The students will need to be informed of this requirement prior to enrolling the course so the programme documentation needs to be updated accordingly, in particular the student handbook must include this requirement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide information about the protocols used to obtain consent where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, it was clear that there is no form used to obtain consent from students. Therefore, the education provider must produce evidence of appropriate protocols which will be used to obtain students consent.

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

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

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were told that attendance on the programmes is mandatory. However, the documentation submitted prior to the visit neither clearly specified that attendance on the programmes is mandatory nor what the minimum percentage attendance requirement is. Therefore in order for this standard to be met, the education provider must include this information in the programme documentation, including the student handbook.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the programme documentation to clearly indicate in the learning outcomes that the HPC standard of proficiency (SOP) for supplementary prescribing programmes is covered by successfully completing one of the programmes.

Reason: In the programme documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors could not find any reference to the standard of proficiency for supplementary prescribing programmes. Therefore, the visitors wish the learning outcomes to reflect that the SOP, which is as follows, will be covered by successful completion of one of the programmes: *Registrants must know and be able to apply the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber in order to have their name annotated on the Register.*

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process to maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements will be implemented.

Reason: At the visit, the education provider provided a copy of a sample intended audit tool for placements but did not provide evidence of how this system will be implemented. Therefore, as the education provider must take

responsibility for placement management, the visitors need to see evidence of how the system for approving and monitoring placements will be implemented to ensure that this standard is being met.

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 education provider must provide evidence of the information provided to students and to Designated Supervising Medical Practitioners (DSMPs) of the implementation of the assessment procedures undertaken in practice, and of any action which is to be taken in the case of failure, including student appeal.

Reason: In discussions with the students and the DSMPs, the implementation of the practice assessment process appears open to interpretation by individual DSMPs, and the action to be taken in the case of student failure, or disagreement between student and DSMP on placement, including appeal, is not clear. Therefore, in order to be assured that this standard is being met, the visitors need to see evidence of the information provided to students and DSMPs of the implementation of the assessment procedures undertaken in practice, and of any action which is to be taken in the case of failure, including student appeal.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a process in place for regular refresher training for Designated Supervising Medical Practitioner (DSMP).

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit and in discussion with the placement providers, it was clear that there is a formal process in place for DSMP training. However, the visitors were told that no refresher training is organised. Therefore, the visitors considered that evidence of a process ensuring regular refresher training for DSMPs must be provided in order to be assured that the education provider keep the DSMPs up-to-date and make sure that this group still has the appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to fulfil their role.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the systems which are in place to ensure standardisation of the assessment procedure operated by the Designated Supervising Medical Practitioner (DSMP) in the clinical practice environment, including monitoring and moderation of assessment tasks undertaken.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, it appears that clear processes are in place to standardise assessment within the University. However, in discussions at the visit with the programme team and the DSMPs, the systems of standardisation to be operated when DSMPs are assessing students in the clinical environment are not clear. Therefore, in order to be assured this standard is being met, the visitors need to see evidence of the systems which are in place to ensure standardisation of the assessment procedure operated by DSMPs in the clinical practice environment, including monitoring and moderation of assessment tasks undertaken.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programmes must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors are happy with the current external examiner arrangements for the programmes but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programmes have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Karen Harrison
Glyn Harding