

## Visitors' report

|                                      |                                       |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | Aston University                      |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Full time                             |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Biomedical scientist                  |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 23 – 24 March 2010                    |

## Contents

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents .....            | 1  |
| Executive summary .....   | 2  |
| Introduction.....         | 3  |
| Visit details .....       | 3  |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4  |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5  |
| Conditions.....           | 6  |
| Recommendations.....      | 15 |

## 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 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 17 May 2010 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 8 June 2010. 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 30 July 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 16 September 2010.

## Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body 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 programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme 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 professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession       | Christine Murphy (Biomedical Scientist)<br>Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist)   |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)  | Lewis Roberts   |
| HPC observer                              | Paula Lescott   |
| Proposed student numbers                  | 25  |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | 01 October 2010   |
| Chair                                     | Roy Smith (Aston University)  |
| Secretary                                 | Gillian Cook (Aston University)   |
| Members of the joint panel                | Andrew Usher (Institute of Biomedical Science)<br>Jim Cunningham (Institute of Biomedical Science)<br>Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) |

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Minutes of meetings  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Supplementary documents  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 35 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 21 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that it addresses the exact nature of the applied route, provides details about the funding arrangements available for students undertaking the applied route and details on the likelihood of students receiving financial assistance during the placement year, as well as clearly outlining the funding arrangements for Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and immunisation checks.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the documentation submitted showed inconsistencies and did not give students a coherent explanation of the nature of the programme and the funding options available to them. The visitors also noted that students were not given any information about competition for places on the Applied route. From a review of the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine how the students were able to financially plan for the placement year. Both the programme team and students expressed concerns about the funding arrangements for the placement year with some students noting that they did not receive any funding until 7 months into the placement. One student also stated that they were doing a 4 day week on placement to allow them to take on part time work. The education provider should clarify the funding arrangements for placements and formalise details around any flexibility that is given to students to allow them to take up part time work.

The visitors also expressed concerns that the funding arrangements for CRB and immunisation checks were not clear. The visitors noted contradictory accounts from students about whose responsibility it was to pay for these checks. This information should be clearly stated within the programme documentation, including advertising material so that applicants have all the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that all placements in the programme are initially approved by the education provider and then regularly monitored.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors noted that there was not enough evidence that the placements are approved and monitored by the education provider. The education provider must clearly outline the specific roles and responsibilities in the management of placements at both the education provider and at placement sites. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme team apply clear procedures when dealing with problems on placement and that clear lines of responsibility are drawn between the placement providers and the education provider.

The visitors were provided with an example Memorandum of Understanding between the education provider and a placement provider. The visitors require further evidence that the Memorandums of Understanding or placement agreements clearly articulate the requirements of all parties involved in placements.

As the education provider must take responsibility for placement management for the programme the visitors felt further evidence is required to ensure that this standard is being met.

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify the process that is in place to audit and monitor resource provision in all placement environments for students on placement.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not clarify how the education provider audits and monitors the provision of resources in all placement settings. The visitors require further evidence to show how placements are audited, and the minimum resource requirements expected of a placement, to ensure that adequate resources are in place to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme and that student learning is supported.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not find evidence of a consent procedure in place to mitigate any risk involved in students participating as service users in practical teaching. The visitors were shown the policy utilised for gaining consent for research projects but this did not demonstrate how consent is obtained for practical elements in the programme. The visitors require further evidence to show the consent policy in place, how the education provider will collect consent and also how they will inform students about this policy and their right to confidentiality.

### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that there is a process in place for dealing with concerns about profession-related conduct in the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine the exact intended use for the draft Fitness to practice document provided. The visitors require clarification of the finalised process that is place for dealing with student conduct and guidance outlining this process. The visitors also require further evidence that outlines the ways in which this information will be communicated to students and placement providers.

#### **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 revisit the learning outcomes and module descriptors to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that the standards of proficiency are addressed within all aspects of the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to see where the standards of proficiency were being met within the programme from the module descriptors and learning outcomes. The visitors also noted that the standards of proficiency had been mapped mostly against the placement element of the programme and appeared dependent on the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) portfolio. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the standards of proficiency are linked to all aspects of the curriculum, not just the placement element, and are clearly communicated to all parties involved in the programme.

In addition, as the documentation provided indicated that learning outcomes and assessment in the programme appeared dependent on the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) portfolio the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the learning outcomes are linked to the standards of proficiency in the assessment portfolio This should include clear guidelines regarding the completion of the portfolio (including when the portfolio is started) and clear demonstration of the progression of skills required throughout the programme.

#### **4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly outline how theory and practice are integrated in both the theoretical and practical parts of the programme.

**Reason:** From the learning outcomes, module descriptors and mapping of the standards of proficiency and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how theory and practice were integrated in the programme and how this was informed through the design of the programme. The visitors noted that the standards of proficiency had been mapped mostly against the placement element of the programme therefore it appeared that there is a separation of theory and practice in the programme. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the standards of proficiency are linked to all aspects of the curriculum, not just the placement element.



### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and clearly outline how practice placements are integral to the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors noted that there was not enough evidence that the education provider was responsible for managing the placements in the programme. The visitors require further evidence to show the ongoing partnership arrangements with practice placements, how the education provider supports and encourages practice placement staff to take part in developing the programme and how the learning outcomes for the practice placement are in line with the rest of the programme.

### **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate that the range of placements is appropriate to ensure the achievement of the programmes learning outcomes and the methods utilised to ensure that there is parity regarding the placement experience on the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team, placement providers and students it was not clear that the education provider has mechanisms in place to ensure that all students on placements get comparable experiences. From the information provided at the visit it was apparent that some of the placements utilised are multi-disciplinary and some are single discipline. The visitors were therefore concerned that some placement providers could offer students a wide range of clinical experiences and others would only be able to offer students a limited range.

The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider ensures comparable experience across students on the programme despite different placement environments. This evidence should detail the elements that are required of each placement environment and the core outcomes required to ensure that all students are fit to practice on completion of the programme. The visitors also require information that demonstrates that these requirements are clearly articulated to all parties involved in placements.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for checking the quality of placements. The education provider must also produce guidelines on their placement requirements,

articulating what they constitute as a safe and supportive placement environment.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to check and monitor the quality of a practice placement and therefore demonstrate that the education provider was responsible for and managing the placements in the programme. The visitors require further evidence of the auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether placements are of good quality and provide safe and supportive environments.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all programme documentation and produce clear policies and procedures to support the approval and monitoring of placements.

**Reason:** From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors did not have enough evidence that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the approval and monitoring of placements and therefore that the education provider was responsible for the placements in the programme. The visitors require the education provider to produce clear policies and procedures around placements in the programme to ensure that this standard is met.

In addition, the visitors noted references in the documentation to students being removed from placements due to unsatisfactory performance. The visitors require clarification of what constitutes unsatisfactory performance and how this policy is communicated to all parties involved in placements.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information about the way in which they check the quality of placements and monitor the equality and diversity policies of practice placements. The education provider must also clarify the mechanisms that they use to inform students about access to these policies.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to check and monitor the quality of a practice placement and therefore demonstrate that the education provider was responsible for managing the placements in the programme. The visitors require further information to clarify the mechanisms that the education provider uses to monitor the equality and diversity policies of its practice placements. The visitors also require evidence that demonstrates how students are informed about accessing

the equality and diversity policies on placements and what to do if they feel they have been discriminated against whilst on placement.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify the placement audit and document a clear process for monitoring staff numbers and experience within the placements utilised on the programme. The education provider must also document the criteria by which they judge staff to be appropriately qualified and experienced.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit and speaking to the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to check and monitor the quality of practice placements and therefore demonstrate that the education provider was responsible for managing the placements in the programme. The visitors require further information to clarify the mechanisms that the education provider uses to monitor the staff numbers and experience of its practice placements and the staff numbers and experience requirements that the education provider sets to ensure that staff support student learning in a safe environment.

#### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team and placement providers it was not made clear that sufficient arrangements are in place to prepare practice placement educators to supervise students on the programme. The visitors noted that the education provider could utilise practice placement educators who had received external training for supervising students. The visitors require clarification of how the education provider ensures the suitability of this training in preparing educators to take students from this programme.

From the information provided the visitors could not determine how practice placement educators were informed of the programme specific requirements including the learning outcomes. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the plans for delivering programme specific training to practice placement educators, the details of the commencement dates of this training and the content of the planned training. The visitors also require evidence to show how they will provide ongoing refresher training.

#### **5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure that there is regular communication between the education provider and practice placements to ensure that key information is exchanged between the two parties.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement educators it was clear that collaboration was in place. The visitors were concerned however that information regarding CRB checks was not being communicated between the two as it was mentioned that this information was kept solely with the practice placements. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider effectively collaborates with the practice placement providers regarding key information in relation to student CRB checks.

#### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements in the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided the visitors noted that the placement handbook was in a draft format. The visitors noted that the information provided in this document did not fully prepare students, practice placement providers and educators with the information required to prepare all parties for the placement experience. The visitors noted that the learning outcomes were not clearly communicated within this document and therefore it was not clear how the learning outcomes were linked to the requirement that the standards of proficiency are met. The document provided also did not clearly communicate the timings and durations of placements and the associated records to be maintained on placements, the assessment procedures and the lines of communication and responsibility between the education provider, the students and the practice placement.

The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met; this could be in the form of a finalised placement handbook.

#### **6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the learning outcomes and module descriptors to clearly demonstrate how they ensure that the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to see where the standards of proficiency were being met within the programme from the module descriptors and learning outcomes. The visitors also noted that the standards of proficiency had been mapped mostly against the placement element of the programme and appeared dependent on the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) portfolio. The visitors require clarification of whether the IBMS portfolio would be utilised in the programme as it stands or if it would be adapted by the education provider to the programme. In the case of the portfolio being adapted the visitors would require the finalised version of this assessment tool.

From the documentation submitted it was not clear who would be assessing the practice placement elements and the IBMS portfolio. The visitors require further evidence regarding the assessment of the placement module in the programme including details of the methods of assessments, what is required as part of the placement assessments, the timescales involved and clarification of the actions taken if the timescales or assessment requirements are not met. The visitors noted that if the education provider were to use IBMS verifiers to assess students on placements, as was indicated at the visit, they would not be assessing the specific learning outcomes for the placement module. The visitors require evidence of the training that will be provided to verifiers for the requirements of the programme.

The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment methods used ensure that the students are meeting the standards of proficiency and are clearly communicated to all parties involved in the programme to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

#### **6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the assessment methods ensure that the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes. The visitors require further evidence to clarify the assessment methods used during the practice placements that demonstrates the link to the module learning outcomes.

#### **6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the measurement of student performance is objective within the programme and ensures fitness to practice.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes. The visitors could not fully determine the details around the education provider placement visits, the criteria of the visits and details outlining the expectations of placement tutors and the work that students are required to complete at which stages of the placement experience.

The visitors also expressed concern by the potential lack of parity in the assessment of students because practice placement educators did not appear to have received programme specific training from the education provider. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met, this should include clarification of the mechanisms in place to ensure that the education provider maintains overall responsibility for placements.

### **6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the placement module of the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted it was not clear what arrangements were in place for students who did not progress from the placement year into the final year of the programme. The assessment regulations for the programme did not provide the required information on this matter. The visitors require the documentation to clearly outline the options that are available for a failing student on this programme. From discussions at the visit it was apparent that the assessment regulations for the programme were due to be finalised at an internal verification event in April. The visitors need to receive the finalised assessment regulations from this event. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme 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 were happy with the planned external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

## Recommendations

### **5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The visitors wish to strongly recommend that the education provider checks that all practice placement educators are HPC registered.

**Reason:** The visitors recommend that the education provider checks the registration status of all placement educators if they are on the HPC register as an additional level of security for the education provider placement management.

Pradeep Agrawal  
Christine Murphy

Visitors' report

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Name of education provider</b> | University of Cumbria                   |
| <b>Programme name</b>             | Non-Medical Prescribing (Masters Level) |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>           | Part time                               |
| <b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>    | Supplementary prescribing               |
| <b>Date of visit</b>              | 16 March 2010                           |

Contents

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents .....            | 1  |
| Executive summary .....   | 2  |
| Introduction.....         | 3  |
| Visit details .....       | 3  |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4  |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5  |
| Conditions.....           | 6  |
| Recommendations.....      | 15 |



## 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Chiropodist' or 'Podiatrist' must be registered with us. 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/ongoing approval (delete as appropriate) of the programme. The education provider has until 26 April 2010 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 20 May 2010. 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 May 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2010.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - the level of qualification for entry to the Register, programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment (delete as appropriate). The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional bodies 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 programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme 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 and the professional bodies, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Jim Pickard (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)<br>David Whitmore (Paramedic)  |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Brendon Edmonds   |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 100 (2 intakes/year)  |
| Initial approval  | 2007  |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2010  |
| Chair   | Heather Prince (University of Cumbria)  |
| Secretary   | Caron Jackson (University of Cumbria)   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Helen Kerry (University of Cumbria)<br>Maureen McDonald (University of Cumbria)<br>Eleri Mills (External)<br>Sam Sherrington (External)<br>Dianne Bowskill (Nursing and Midwifery Council)<br>Andrew Husband (Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain)<br>David Gerrett (Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain)<br>Damian Day (Royal Pharmaceutical |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | Society of Great Britain)<br>Phillipa Strevens (Royal<br>Pharmaceutical Society of Great<br>Britain) |
|--|--|

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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"/> |

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 41 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 16 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made 2 recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, we do not 'record' but rather 'annotate' the registration of an individual who successfully completes the qualification. Furthermore, we do not 'accredit' programmes. In the submitted documentation, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to the HPC as a 'professional body', rather than a 'regulatory body'. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to amend the reasons for requiring applicants to provide a medical certificate as part of admissions procedures.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation, applicants to programme were required to provide a medical certificate to confirm they were in good health. The visitors also noted the documentation referred to the provision of a medical certificate as a requirement of the HPC. The HPC does not require the provision of a medical certificate as part of admissions procedures, but rather requires evidence that appropriate health procedures are conducted at admission to the programme.

The visitors were satisfied the admissions procedures in place to address health requirements were appropriate. The visitors considered the reasons for these health requirements could be misleading to applicants. Therefore they require the programme documentation be amended to remove any reference to the provision of a medical certificate as a HPC requirement.

#### **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 masters level learning outcomes in the programme handbook to reflect those articulated in the module descriptor.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation the learning outcomes listed for masters level studies differed between the module descriptor and the programme handbook. The programme team indicated there was indeed an increased expectation on students studying at a masters level and the learning outcomes in the module descriptor and programme handbook should be consistent.

The visitors considered the differences between the learning outcomes in these two documents could be misleading to students. Therefore they require the programme team revise the programme handbook at masters level to ensure the learning outcomes are consistent with those listed in the module descriptor.

#### **4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme specification to amend reference to the HPC publishing the 'Outline Curriculum for Training Programmes to prepare Allied health professions as Supplementary Prescribers'.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the programme specification listed key sources of information that assisted the development of the programme. In particular the '(2004 ) Outline Curriculum for Training Programmes to prepare Allied health professions as Supplementary Prescribers' was attributed as a HPC document.

The visitors' consider this could be potentially misleading to students. The visitors' therefore require this reference be amended to attribute this document to its' correct source.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures the provision of a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the Designated Medical Practitioner in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site provide a safe and supportive environment. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to conduct a risk assessment of each placement site, a placement induction and how candidates are made aware about risks and safety issues. An audit tool should also address how a record of these activities is maintained and sent back to the education provider.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the Designated Medical Supervisor in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them. However, the visitors were advised the programme team relies on existing audit information used on pre-registration programmes.

In light of the above information, the visitors require further evidence of the system used to approve each placement site and how that system ensures ongoing monitoring is conducted. In particular any evidence should address how an audit tool is linked to any policies and processes for approving placements, how the audit tool is used to approved the placement site, how the audit tool is used to continually monitor the quality of the placement, how this information is recorded and how any issues arising are managed and inform the development of processes and the programme. An audit tool should also address how a record of these activities is maintained and sent back to the education provider.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement sites have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the Designated Medical Supervisor in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience and that appropriate equality and diversity policies are in place. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them. However, the visitors were advised the programme team relies on existing audit information used on pre-registration programmes.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site has an equality and diversity policy in place for candidates. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to evidence the presence of such policies together with an indication of how these policies are implemented and monitored at the placement site. The audit tool should also address how a record of these policies is provided to the education provider.

### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement sites have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the designated medical supervisor in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience and for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to assess the provision of staff in accordance with the learning needs of the student. The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.



## **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the designated medical supervisor in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience and for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. The agreement also outlines the qualifications and experience necessary to be appointed as a Designated Medical Practitioner. At the visit itself, the visitors were not clear as to how the programme team ensures the Designated Medical Practitioner and others involved in the placement experience have relevant knowledge, skills and experience beyond these initial measures at admission of a student.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to assess the whether placement educators are appropriate to meeting the learning needs of the student and that they provide a safe environment. The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

## **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must require Designated Medical Practitioners to undertake mandatory training and refresher training sessions.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through meetings at the visit the education provider conducted training and refresher training sessions for Designated Medical Practitioners. However these training sessions were not mandatory and therefore not all Designated Medical Practitioners undertook training and regular refresher training prior to supervising a student.

In order to be satisfied the SET is met, the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence articulating the requirement for Designated Medical Practitioners training to be mandatory. In particular, any evidence submitted should detail how this training is to be conducted, the frequency with which it will be conducted and also the implications for Designated Medical Practitioners who do not undergo training and refresher training.

### **5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the Designated Medical Practitioner in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience and for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. The agreement also outlines the qualifications and experience necessary to be appointed as a Designated Medical Practitioner. At the visit itself, the visitors were not clear as to how the programme team ensures the Designated Medical Practitioner and others involved in the placement experience are appropriately registered beyond these initial measures at admission of a student.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures all placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit tool is used to assess the whether placement educators are registered and if not, how they are deemed to be appropriate to provide placement education to the student. The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

### **5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the systems in place to ensure regular collaboration between the education provider and the placement provider.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation and at the visit the effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider was limited. In particular, the education provider sent the practice handbook to the Designated Medical Supervisor prior to a student starting placement and then also wrote to the supervisor at approximately half way through the placement. The visitors did not receive any documentation which evidenced these communications being carried out.

In light of this information, the visitors are not satisfied a system is in place to provide regular, effective collaboration between the education provider and practice placement environments. Any further evidence should detail how staff on the programme maintain regular contact with placement providers. In particular, the system should detail how contact provides a channel for regular communication directly between the placement site and the education provider to allow for feedback on the student's progression or on the programme planning

and design. The system should also address how a record of this communication is maintained by the education provider and how any issues highlighted from the system are actioned.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of Designated Medical Practitioner training and how these sessions fully prepare the practitioner for placement.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through meetings at the visit the education provider conducted training and refresher training sessions for Designated Medical Practitioners. However these training sessions were not mandatory and therefore not all Designated Medical Practitioners undertook training and regular refresher training prior to supervising a student. Furthermore the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the content of these sessions.

In light of the above information and to be satisfied the SET is met, the visitors require further documentation of the content of the training sessions delivered to Designated Medical Practitioners. In particular, any further evidence submitted should address how the training communicates key messages including: learning outcomes to be achieved; the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained; expectations of professional conduct; the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and communication and lines of responsibility.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must resubmit the programme documentation to further develop the assessment sheet used in relation to OSCE's.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation and at the visit itself the use of OSCE assessment. The visitors were also provided with the assessment sheet used to assess OSCE's.

The visitors were not satisfied the assessment sheet adequately articulated the areas to be covered during an OSCE assessment for supplementary prescribing. Furthermore, the visitors' were not satisfied the assessment sheet ensured a student must know and apply all the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber. Therefore the visitors require this OSCE assessment sheet be updated to clearly articulate all the areas to be covered during an OSCE assessment for supplementary prescribing.

**6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Condition:** The education provider must develop assessment criteria for assessment of competencies carried out by the Designated Medical Practitioner on placement.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation the competencies to be achieved by the student whilst on placement. Also the visitors noted the Designated Medical Practitioner assessed each competency and signed off each as it was achieved. . The visitors deemed the competencies alone did not sufficiently provide the opportunity for a Designated Medical Practitioner to make an objective assessment of the competencies. Furthermore, the visitors deemed the assessment criteria did not sufficiently assess whether a student was fit to practise. In discussions with the programme team, it was noted there was no assessment criteria which clearly articulated the level at which a students may pass or fail a competency.

The visitors consider the lack of clear, objective assessment criteria to be potentially confusing for Designated Medical Practitioners and students. The visitors require the programme team revisit the programme documentation to develop assessment criteria which clearly articulates an objective assessment of student performance for the achievement of competencies. The assessment criteria must be specific for the assessment of each competency.

## **6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards of assessment conducted by Designated Medical Practitioners.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation the competencies to be achieved whilst on placement. The visitors also noted the Designated Medical Practitioner assessed each competency and signed off each as it was achieved. Further the visitors also noted the absence of assessment criteria to assist Designated Medical Practitioners to make an objective assessment of the competencies.

The visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensured each Designated Medical Practitioner's assessment a student's competency was consistent. In particular, given the absence of objective assessment criteria, the visitors' were not satisfied there was an effective mechanism in place for the education provider to decide if there was parity and objectivity across all Designated Medical Practitioner assessments. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment. Any further evidence should address how objective criteria is applied within this mechanism to ensure the education provider of objectivity in assessment.

## Recommendations

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revising the current provisions for inducting students to the Blackboard learning environment.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit itself students were provided with training sessions to induct them to using the Blackboard learning environment. Whilst meeting with students, the visitors noted that in light of this induction, student's still required further support to assist them with interacting with this system.

Although the visitors were satisfied this SET is met, they recommend the education provider revisit the current provisions and support in place to induct students to Blackboard to further enhance this process.

### **5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider providing Designated Medical Practitioners with access to the Blackboard learning environment.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the students and programme team used the Blackboard environment as a tool to delivery the programme. The visitors noted the Designated Medical Practitioners did not currently have access to this environment.

To further enhance the education providers ability to meet this SET, the visitors recommend access should be granted to practitioners. In particular, this access could be used as another channel for direct communication between the education provider and the placement providers to deliver key messages throughout the duration of the programme. Furthermore, this environment could also be used as a forum for regular discussion between Designated Medical Practitioner's to further enhance and develop the programme.

Jim Pickard  
David Whitmore

## Visitors' report

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Name of education provider</b> | University of Cumbria                            |
| <b>Programme name</b>             | Non-Medical Prescribing<br>(Undergraduate Level) |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>           | Part time  |
| <b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>    | Supplementary prescribing                        |
| <b>Date of visit</b>              | 16 March 2010                                    |

## Contents

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents .....            | 1  |
| Executive summary .....   | 2  |
| Introduction.....         | 3  |
| Visit details .....       | 3  |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4  |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5  |
| Conditions.....           | 6  |
| Recommendations.....      | 14 |

## 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Chiropodist' or 'Podiatrist' must be registered with us. 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/ongoing approval (delete as appropriate) of the programme. The education provider has until 26 April 2010 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 20 May 2010. 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 May 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2010.



## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - the level of qualification for entry to the Register, programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment (delete as appropriate). The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional bodies 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 programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme 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 and the professional bodies, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Jim Pickard (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)<br>David Whitmore (Paramedic)  |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Brendon Edmonds   |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 100 (2 intakes/year)  |
| Initial approval  | 2007  |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2010  |
| Chair   | Heather Prince (University of Cumbria)  |
| Secretary   | Caron Jackson (University of Cumbria)   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Helen Kerry (University of Cumbria)<br>Maureen McDonald (University of Cumbria)<br>Eleri Mills (External)<br>Sam Sherrington (External)<br>Dianne Bowskill (Nursing and Midwifery Council)<br>Andrew Husband (Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain)<br>David Gerrett (Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain)<br>Damian Day (Royal Pharmaceutical |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | Society of Great Britain)<br>Phillipa Strevens (Royal<br>Pharmaceutical Society of Great<br>Britain) |
|--|--|

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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"/> |

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 42 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made 2 recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, we do not 'record' but rather 'annotate' the registration of an individual who successfully completes the qualification. Furthermore, we do not 'accredit' programmes. In the submitted documentation, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to the HPC as a 'professional body', rather than a 'regulatory body'. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to amend the reasons for requiring applicants to provide a medical certificate as part of admissions procedures.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation, applicants to programme were required to provide a medical certificate to confirm they were in good health. The visitors also noted the documentation referred to the provision of a medical certificate as a requirement of the HPC. The HPC does not require the provision of a medical certificate as part of admissions procedures, but rather requires evidence that appropriate health procedures are conducted at admission to the programme.

The visitors were satisfied the admissions procedures in place to address health requirements were appropriate. The visitors considered the reasons for these health requirements could be misleading to applicants. Therefore they require the programme documentation be amended to remove any reference to the provision of a medical certificate as a HPC requirement.

#### **4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme specification to amend reference to the HPC publishing the 'Outline Curriculum for Training Programmes to prepare Allied health professions as Supplementary Prescribers'.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the programme specification listed key sources of information that assisted the development of the programme. In particular the '(2004 ) Outline Curriculum for Training Programmes to prepare Allied health professions as Supplementary Prescribers' was attributed as a HPC document.

The visitors' consider this could be potentially misleading to students. The visitors' therefore require this reference be amended to attribute this document to its' correct source.

#### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures the provision of a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the Designated Medical Practitioner in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site provide a safe and supportive environment. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to conduct a risk assessment of each placement site, a placement induction and how candidates are made aware about risks and safety issues. An audit tool should also address how a record of these activities is maintained and sent back to the education provider.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the Designated Medical Supervisor in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them. However, the visitors were advised the programme team relies on existing audit information used on pre-registration programmes.

In light of the above information, the visitors require further evidence of the system used to approve each placement site and how that system ensures ongoing monitoring is conducted. In particular any evidence should address how an audit tool is linked to any policies and processes for approving placements, how the audit tool is used to approved the placement site, how the audit tool is used to continually monitor the quality of the placement, how this information is recorded and how any issues arising are managed and inform the development of processes and the programme. An audit tool should also address how a record of these activities is maintained and sent back to the education provider.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement sites have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the Designated Medical Supervisor in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience and that appropriate equality and diversity policies are in place. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them. However, the visitors were advised the programme team relies on existing audit information used on pre-registration programmes.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site has an equality and diversity policy in place for candidates. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to evidence the presence of such policies together with an indication of how these policies are

implemented and monitored at the placement site. The audit tool should also address how a record of these policies is provided to the education provider.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement sites have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the designated medical supervisor in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience and for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to assess the provision of staff in accordance with the learning needs of the student. The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

#### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the designated medical supervisor in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience and for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. The agreement also outlines the qualifications and experience necessary to be appointed as a Designated Medical Practitioner. At the visit itself, the visitors were not clear as to how the programme team ensures the Designated Medical Practitioner and others involved in the placement experience have relevant knowledge, skills and experience beyond these initial measures at admission of a student.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to assess the whether placement educators are appropriate to meeting the learning needs of the student and that they provide a safe environment. The audit tool should also

address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must require Designated Medical Practitioners to undertake mandatory training and refresher training sessions.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through meetings at the visit the education provider conducted training and refresher training sessions for Designated Medical Practitioners. However these training sessions were not mandatory and therefore not all Designated Medical Practitioners undertook training and regular refresher training prior to supervising a student.

In order to be satisfied the SET is met, the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence articulating the requirement for Designated Medical Practitioners training to be mandatory. In particular, any evidence submitted should detail how this training is to be conducted, the frequency with which it will be conducted and also the implications for Designated Medical Practitioners who do not undergo training and refresher training.

### **5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the admissions process to the programme. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the student and the Designated Medical Practitioner in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience and for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. The agreement also outlines the qualifications and experience necessary to be appointed as a Designated Medical Practitioner. At the visit itself, the visitors were not clear as to how the programme team ensures the Designated Medical Practitioner and others involved in the placement experience are appropriately registered beyond these initial measures at admission of a student.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures all placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit tool is used to assess the whether placement educators are registered and if not, how they are deemed to be appropriate to provide placement education to the student. The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.



### **5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the systems in place to ensure regular collaboration between the education provider and the placement provider.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation and at the visit the effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider was limited. In particular, the education provider sent the practice handbook to the Designated Medical Supervisor prior to a student starting placement and then also wrote to the supervisor at approximately half way through the placement. The visitors did not receive any documentation which evidenced these communications being carried out.

In light of this information, the visitors are not satisfied a system is in place to provide regular, effective collaboration between the education provider and practice placement environments. Any further evidence should detail how staff on the programme maintain regular contact with placement providers. In particular, the system should detail how contact provides a channel for regular communication directly between the placement site and the education provider to allow for feedback on the student's progression or on the programme planning and design. The system should also address how a record of this communication is maintained by the education provider and how any issues highlighted from the system are actioned.

### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of Designated Medical Practitioner training and how these sessions fully prepare the practitioner for placement.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through meetings at the visit the education provider conducted training and refresher training sessions for Designated Medical Practitioners. However these training sessions were not mandatory and therefore not all Designated Medical Practitioners undertook training and regular refresher training prior to supervising a student. Furthermore the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the content of these sessions.

In light of the above information and to be satisfied the SET is met, the visitors require further documentation of the content of the training sessions delivered to

Designated Medical Practitioners. In particular, any further evidence submitted should address how the training communicates key messages including: learning outcomes to be achieved; the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained; expectations of professional conduct; the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and communication and lines of responsibility.

### **6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must resubmit the programme documentation to further develop the assessment sheet used in relation to OSCE's.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation and at the visit itself the use of OSCE assessment. The visitors were also provided with the assessment sheet used to assess OSCE's.

The visitors were not satisfied the assessment sheet adequately articulated the areas to be covered during an OSCE assessment for supplementary prescribing. Furthermore, the visitors' were not satisfied the assessment sheet ensured a student must know and apply all the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber. Therefore the visitors require this OSCE assessment sheet be updated to clearly articulate all the areas to be covered during an OSCE assessment for supplementary prescribing.

### **6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Condition:** The education provider must develop assessment criteria for assessment of competencies carried out by the Designated Medical Practitioner on placement.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation the competencies to be achieved by the student whilst on placement. Also the visitors noted the Designated Medical Practitioner assessed each competency and signed off each as it was achieved. . The visitors deemed the competencies alone did not sufficiently provide the opportunity for a Designated Medical Practitioner to make an objective assessment of the competencies. Furthermore, the visitors deemed the assessment criteria did not sufficiently assess whether a student was fit to practise. In discussions with the programme team, it was noted there was no assessment criteria which clearly articulated the level at which a students may pass or fail a competency.

The visitors consider the lack of clear, objective assessment criteria to be potentially confusing for Designated Medical Practitioners and students. The visitors require the programme team revisit the programme documentation to develop assessment criteria which clearly articulates an objective assessment of

student performance for the achievement of competencies. The assessment criteria must be specific for the assessment of each competency.

#### **6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards of assessment conducted by Designated Medical Practitioners.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation the competencies to be achieved whilst on placement. The visitors also noted the Designated Medical Practitioner assessed each competency and signed off each as it was achieved. Further the visitors also noted the absence of assessment criteria to assist Designated Medical Practitioners to make an objective assessment of the competencies.

The visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensured each Designated Medical Practitioner's assessment a student's competency was consistent. In particular, given the absence of objective assessment criteria, the visitors' were not satisfied there was an effective mechanism in place for the education provider to decide if there was parity and objectivity across all Designated Medical Practitioner assessments. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment. Any further evidence should address how objective criteria is applied within this mechanism to ensure the education provider of objectivity in assessment.

## Recommendations

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revising the current provisions for inducting students to the Blackboard learning environment.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit itself students were provided with training sessions to induct them to using the Blackboard learning environment. Whilst meeting with students, the visitors noted that in light of this induction, student's still required further support to assist them with interacting with this system.

Although the visitors were satisfied this SET is met, they recommend the education provider revisit the current provisions and support in place to induct students to Blackboard to further enhance this process.

### **5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider providing Designated Medical Practitioners with access to the Blackboard learning environment.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the students and programme team used the Blackboard environment as a tool to delivery the programme. The visitors noted the Designated Medical Practitioners did not currently have access to this environment.

To further enhance the education providers ability to meet this SET, the visitors recommend access should be granted to practitioners. In particular, this access could be used as another channel for direct communication between the education provider and the placement providers to deliver key messages throughout the duration of the programme. Furthermore, this environment could also be used as a forum for regular discussion between Designated Medical Practitioner's to further enhance and develop the programme.

Jim Pickard  
David Whitmore

## Visitors' report

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>      | East of England Ambulance Service<br>NHS Trust  |
| <b>Validating body / Awarding body</b> | University of East Anglia   |
| <b>Programme name</b>                  | Certificate of Higher Education in<br>Emergency Medical Care<br>(incorporating the IHCD paramedic<br>award) |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>                | Part time   |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>   | Paramedic   |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                   | 11-12 March 2010  |

## Contents

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents .....            | 1  |
| Executive summary .....   | 2  |
| Introduction.....         | 3  |
| Visit details .....       | 3  |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4  |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5  |
| Conditions.....           | 6  |
| Recommendations.....      | 16 |

## 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 6 May 2010 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 20 May 2010. 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 1 July 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 16 September 2010.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Robert Fellows (Paramedic)<br>Gordon Pollard (Paramedic) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Ruth Wood  |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 140 per cohort, twice a year (280 total)                 |
| Initial approval  | November 2008  |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | 12 November 2010   |
| Chair   | Steven Russell (University of East Anglia)               |
| Secretary   | Timothy Southon (University of East Anglia)              |

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IHCD Information   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Module workbooks   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Additional education provider information  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The HPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it.

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"/> |



## Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 32 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 25 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit and resubmit all the submitted programme documentation and any other documents to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to individuals being “state registered”. The documentation was unclear when stating that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply to the register only. The terminology used when referring to the College of Paramedics was also out-of-date in that it referred to them as the British Paramedic Association. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove and correct any instance of incorrect or out of date terminology and to clearly articulate that successful completion of the programme provides eligibility for admission to the HPC register only.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate the systems that are in place to manage the programme effectively.

**Reason:** From the programme documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were not satisfied they had received enough evidence to show how the partnership between the two bodies running and delivering this programme worked together effectively. Discussions at the visit revealed some evidence of collaborations and reviews but there was no formal recognition of the arrangements in place or documentary evidence of past collaborative meetings. The visitors noted in particular the discussed and documented Paramedic Pathway Group, Regional Clinical Learning and Development Group, formal weekly reviews of student feedback, the external verification by the IHCD, external examiner reports and responses, audit processes for the programme (placements, hospitals, tutor evaluations, course evaluations) and service level agreements with placement providers. The visitors require greater clarity of evidence that illustrates the formal programme review processes are in place and copies of documents (such as agendas, minutes, reports, actions etc) relating to these processes in order to demonstrate the systems are in place and manage the programme effectively.

### **3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Reason:** From the programme documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were not satisfied they had received enough evidence to show the programme had regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Discussions at the visit revealed there were continuous evaluations and reviews but there was no formal recognition of the arrangements in place. The visitors noted in particular, the discussed Paramedic Pathway Group, Regional Clinical Learning and Development Group, formal weekly reviews of student feedback, the external verification by the IHCD, external examiner reports and responses, and audit processes for the programme (placements, hospitals, tutor evaluations, course evaluations). The visitors require evidence that illustrates the formal programme monitoring and review processes are in place and copies of documents (such as agendas, minutes, reports, action plans etc) relating to these processes in order to demonstrate the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place from November 2008 to date.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that the number of staff in place is adequate to deliver an effective programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation and through discussions at the visit there was only one Paramedic tutor on secondment to University of East Anglia and clear plans for a total of 840 students on the programme. Furthermore, there were two staff members primarily supporting the delivery of the programme (Senior Clinical Learning and Development Manager and Course Director). The visitors also noted there were no named module leaders, rather a 'module team' who developed each module with the Course Director leading all modules. Contingency plans were in place if the Course Director was absent for an extended period, namely the Director of School of Continuing Education would provide cover for this role.

In light of the above information the visitors were not satisfied there was an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme. In particular, the visitors were not satisfied the number of staff was adequate to manage the potential student numbers (in particular for study days and finding enough mentors for the three tiered system in place). Furthermore, the visitors were not satisfied the contingencies in place to manage any absence of staff from the programme were adequate to ensure its' effective delivery. In particular, the visitors highlighted the Course Director's responsibility to lead all modules was problematic. The visitors require further documentary evidence that there is an adequate number of staff in place for the 840 students, along with further evidence of the contingency plans in place, including named module leads for each module.

### **3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure the facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings is clearly communicated.

**Reason:** Discussions at the visit with students, the programme team and the placement providers stated there was no provision for travel expenses and flexible arrangements for study days in particular and a general uncertainty around annual leave information, access to books and other resources including IT resources whilst on placement. The discussion with the senior team however revealed all of these provisions were in place if requested. The lack of knowledge demonstrated by the students, the programme team and the placement providers would add additional pressures and difficulties for the student on top of the required learning. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised making the support provisions for the welfare and wellbeing of a large number of students more widely known and more clearly communicated to both to the visitors and the students.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the consent form and protocols used to obtain consent to ensure there are clearly articulated opt-out pathways.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided by the education provider during the visit it was clear that a policy for obtaining student consent was in place. The wording on the form did not make it clear that students could opt out of certain practical involvement if they so wished. In order to ensure this standard is being met the visitors need a revised form and guidelines to more clearly state that there are opt-out pathways and associated learning plans.

### **3.15 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 education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure the attendance policy for the programme is clearly communicated to the students.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided it was stated there was an expectation for the students to attend all onsite study days with a mandatory attendance of 100%. From discussions at the visit it became apparent that although there was the 100% mandatory requirement the study days were repeated and a support package would be put in place if the student could not attend the days, with options to put the module on hold or continue the module and attend the day the next time it was held. Because the students, programme team and practice placement educators were not aware of this information the visitors require it to be included within the programme documentation.

#### **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 revisit the learning outcomes for the programme to clearly reflect the following standard of proficiency and demonstrate how these learning outcomes for this standard of proficiency are addressed and assessed:

- **2a.2 be able to select and use appropriate assessment techniques.**

**Reason:** Although the visitors received all the modules for the programme and its constituent components prior to the visit, there was insufficient evidence provided for the visitors to judge if the above standard of proficiency had been met in its' entirety. The visitors particularly noted the section of the standard of proficiency that states registrant paramedics must "be able to conduct a thorough and detailed physical examination of the patient using observations, palpation, auscultation and other assessment skills to inform clinical reasoning and to guide the formulation of a diagnosis across all age ranges, including calling for specialist help where available". Therefore the visitors require revised documentation detailing how this standard of proficiency is taught and assessed.

#### **4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all programme documentation to clarify which curriculum guidance it is, that they use.

**Reason:** The documents received prior to the visit did not make it clear which version of the College of Paramedics Curriculum Guidance was being used. Discussions at the visit clarified it was the College of Paramedics Curriculum Guidance and Competence Framework (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Jan 2008). The documentation also repeatedly referred to the College of Paramedics by their previous designation – the British Paramedic Association. To clarify this information and prevent confusion for the students and the education provider, the visitors require the programme documentation to be revised with the additional information of which version is used and the new name for the British Paramedic Association.

#### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to highlight where students are taught about the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided there was no clear area where this particular topic is taught and these standards were not included in the reading lists. The visitors were satisfied the principles of conduct, performance and ethics

are taught within the programme but could not locate where information regarding these particular standards were. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to clearly make reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and include the standards and associated document - Guidance on conduct and ethics for students, in the modules and reading lists.

#### **4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of how the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider there was no clear research components of the programme taught beyond the first year. Discussions at the visit stated the basic level of research taught in the first year was enough to support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking. The visitors were not clear as to how the programme continued to support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking past this first year and so could not fully support and develop student progression from 'novice' to 'expert' through the theoretical and practical components of the programme. Graduates of the programme must be able to practice autonomously with reflective thinking and a knowledge of evidence based practice. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme supports and develops evidence based practice, autonomous and reflective thinking through the programme.

#### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clarify the mentorship model used.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions at the visit, how the three tiered mentorship model (senior mentor, associate mentor and mentor) worked proved to be very confusing. The placement providers and education provider had differing terminology which made it difficult to understand where the students interacted with the mentors and what each role was. The visitors require clarification that practice placements remain integral to the programme and also require the education provider to clarify the mentorship structure to ensure all parties involved understand the roles and contact points for the mentors and students.

#### **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide documentation that clarifies the number, duration and range of practice placements and clarifies the supernumerary role, identifying the number of hours undertaken by the students in this role.

**Reason:** The documentation received prior to the visit did not detail the number, duration and range of placements to be undertaken by students. In particular, the documentation was unclear as to what the supernumerary role involved for the student. Discussions revealed it was in essence to be a 'third person' in an observational capacity on an ambulance however; it was not clear how many hours this accounted for and where the hours were located within the programme. Additionally the documentation was unclear as to the duration of placements, and where the learning outcomes were assessed and where they were not assessed during placement. In addition, in discussion with programme team and students, they also could not identify who were the named mentors at all locations across the trust.

Therefore the visitors require further documentation which details all of the information regarding the placement experience to ensure that practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes, both geographically and numerically in support of 800 plus students, including information regarding the supernumerary role. Documentation should also address how this information is communicated to students and placement supervisors.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how they manage and develop mentoring on the programme.

**Reason:** The mentoring is an important aspect of the programme and the documentation provided prior to the visit did not have any information regarding how the mentoring was managed or developed across the practice area. Discussions at the visit revealed it very much relied on informal arrangements. The visitors realise there are confidentiality aspects to mentoring but need to ensure the placements are a safe and supportive environment for the students. The visitors therefore require evidence of how mentoring is managed and developed to reduce the risks in the practice environment.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of the audits that the clinical placements on the programme are subjected to. This should include details of the processes for initial approval and the systems for ongoing monitoring and assessment of placements at all locations across the practice placement arena.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit information about placement audits, and therefore how the programme team ensures that placement environments are suitable, was not provided. Discussions at the visit revealed it very much relied on informal arrangements. The visitors noted in

particular, the discussed Paramedic Pathway Group, Regional Clinical Learning and Development Group, formal weekly reviews of student feedback, the external verification by the IHCD, external examiner reports and responses, and audit processes for the placements and hospitals. The visitors require evidence that illustrates the formal placement monitoring and review processes are in place and copies of documents (such as agendas, minutes, reports, actions etc) relating to these processes in order to demonstrate the programme has effective approval and monitoring and systems for all of the placements in the practice arena.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the number of mentors involved with the programme.

**Reason:** In the discussions and documentation provided it was not clear how many mentors were involved with the programme over the ambulance trust service area. With the potential for 840 students and the three tiered mentorship model it was unclear whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and fully available staff at the practice placement setting or not. The visitors therefore require information regarding the associate mentors, mentors and lead mentors both numerically and geographically across the ambulance trust service arena to handle the increased student numbers.

#### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit evidence which identifies the clinical qualifications and relevant experience of practice placement mentors.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit does not identify the clinical qualifications and relevant experience which is required of the mentors in the three tiered mentorship model. The visitors need to ensure the qualifications and experience of the mentors is balanced geographically across the trust service area and within each clinical placement. The visitors, therefore, require the education provider to submit full evidence which identifies required clinical qualifications and experience and how they are mapped across the lead mentor, associate mentor and mentor.

#### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit the curriculum details of the K320 Mentorship and assessment in health and social care settings qualification they require from the mentors.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted did not provide information about this qualification. The education provider has stipulated they require mentors to



undertake this qualification and that it ensures practice placements are a safe and supportive environment. The visitors require evidence about the curriculum of this K320 to ensure this qualification is appropriate and suitable to provide an adequate level of practice placement educator training for the mentors. The visitors also require evidence to show how adequate numbers of staff will be developed through this programme to meet the needs of 800 plus students.

#### **5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of the collaboration in place between the education provider and the practice placement providers.

**Reason:** From the programme documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors felt that they had not received enough evidence to show how the partnership between the education provider and the practice placements worked together effectively and regularly. Discussions at the visit revealed there were collaborations and reviews but there was no formal recognition of the arrangements in place. This lack of formal communication could undermine the longevity of the partnership arrangements in place. The visitors therefore require evidence regarding the nature, frequency and actions resulting from collaborations since November 2008 to date.

#### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are informed about the timings and duration of placements, the communication and lines of responsibility and the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit did not make it clear how students and practice placement educators are informed about the timings and duration of placements, the communication and lines of responsibility and the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress. Discussions at the visit clarified the information and the visitors were satisfied that these were areas the education provider had considered. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence that these areas are communicated to students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators across all areas of the clinical arena so that students and mentors are fully prepared for placements.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the learning outcomes for the programme to clearly reflect the following standard of proficiency and demonstrate how these learning outcomes for this standard of proficiency are addressed and assessed:

- **2a.2 be able to select and use appropriate assessment techniques.**

**Reason:** Although the visitors received all the modules for the programme and its constituent components prior to the visit, there was insufficient evidence provided for the visitors to judge if the assessment of the learning outcomes meant the above standard of proficiency had been met in its' entirety. The visitors noted particularly the section of the standard of proficiency that states registrant paramedics must "be able to conduct a thorough and detailed physical examination of the patient using observations, palpation, auscultation and other assessment skills to inform clinical reasoning and to guide the formulation of a diagnosis across all age ranges, including calling for specialist help where available". The visitors require revised documentation detailing the assessment strategy and design for the learning outcome relating to this standard of proficiency.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit programme documentation to clarify the number of practice hours assessed for students.

**Reason:** The documentation provided was unclear as to the number of hours of practice students are assessed for and the number of hours of practice the student is not assessed for within the programme. In order for the visitors to judge how the professional aspects of practice are assessed in the practice placement setting, the visitors require clarification of the practice hours and assessments including details of the supportive preceptorship arrangements for students post qualification.

**6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of the external verifications from the IHCD of the practice placements.

**Reason:** The documentation provided stated the practice placements were externally verified by the IHCD but provided no evidence of this verification either for the theory elements or for any aspects of the practice arena. The visitors were

unclear as to how the education provider ensured assessment of students within each placement site was applied consistently across all divisions of the ambulance trust, as these appeared to have an inconsistent approach. The visitors therefore require this evidence to ensure there is a parity of assessment standards between the education provider and the practice placements in all clinical and non-clinical areas.

#### **6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation including admissions materials, to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit did not clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register. The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation to ensure this is clearly articulated throughout the programme documentation and admissions material.

#### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register or propose alternative arrangements with the HPC.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided there was insufficient detail regarding the appointment requirements for external examiners and details of the current external examiner on the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider wide assessment regulations however require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiners on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement. The visitors also require evidence regarding the appointed external examiner, including their Curriculum Vitae, the induction procedures the education provider took them through on appointment and the external examiners' reports for the programme.

## Recommendations

### **2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revising their criminal convictions check policy to introduce an additional criminal convictions check for non-EU applicants.

**Reason:** The documentation indicated that only one criminal conviction check was carried out on applicants when they first applied. The visitors felt this standard was met but recognised that a criminal conviction check on a non-EU citizen when they have only been in the country a short time would not disclose any pertinent information. The visitors were aware that a check, three months after admittance onto the programme, on non-EU citizens could disclose more relevant information and would suggest the education provider take this policy on board.

### **6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider could consider changing their assessment strategy methods in placements from the numerical audit of skills practice to a competency based assessment to meet learning outcomes.

**Reason:** Discussions at the visit indicated the education provider and placement partner were discussing the benefits of moving to a more competency based assessment rather than the number based approach currently used. The visitors agreed this standard was met but felt the programme would be further enhanced by moving to a competency based approach. The visitors noted that other similar programmes have already done so and so this may increase the appeal of the programme for applicants.

Robert Fellows  
Gordon Pollard

## Visitors' report

|                                   |                          |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Name of education provider</b> | Keele University         |
| <b>Programme name</b>             | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>           | Full time                |
| <b>Date of visit</b>              | 14-15 April 2010         |

## Contents

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents .....            | 1 |
| Executive summary .....   | 2 |
| Introduction.....         | 3 |
| Visit details .....       | 3 |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4 |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5 |
| 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 17 May 2010 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 8 June 2010. 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 17 May 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2010.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event where the professional body also considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body 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 programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme 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 professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)<br>Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)  |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Brendon Edmonds  |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 100  |
| Initial approval  | January 2002   |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2010   |
| Chair   | Bill Dixon (Keele University)  |
| Secretary   | Martine Iwaszko (Keele University)   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Peter Grannell (Keele University)<br>Nesta Hartley (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)<br>Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) |

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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"/> |



## Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing 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 programme.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, it should also be made clear throughout all documentation that HPC approval of a programme does not automatically lead to HPC registration for those who complete the programme but rather to 'eligibility to apply for HPC registration'. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate at least one external examiner appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation the appointment of an external examiner. The external examiner was a HPC registered physiotherapist and therefore appropriately appointed to the role of external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors found no reference within the documentation to the requirement for the external examiner to be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

In order to be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require the programme documentation be redrafted to include requirement for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Anthony Power  
Katie Bosworth

## Visitors' report

|                                   |                                    |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Name of education provider</b> | Manchester Metropolitan University |
| <b>Programme name</b>             | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy           |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>           | Full time                          |
| <b>Date of visit</b>              | 11-12 February 2010                |

## Contents

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents .....            | 1 |
| Executive summary .....   | 2 |
| Introduction.....         | 3 |
| Visit details .....       | 3 |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4 |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5 |
| Conditions.....           | 6 |
| Recommendations.....      | 8 |

## 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 March 2010 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 20 May 2010. 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 15 April 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 8 June 2010.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body 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 programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme 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 and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)<br>Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)   |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Brendon Edmonds   |
| HPC observer  | Benjamin Potter<br>Lewis Roberts  |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 134   |
| Proposed start date of programme approval               | September 2010  |
| Initial approval  | 24 June 2005  |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2010  |
| Chair   | Mr Michael Jeffrey  |
| Secretary   | Miss Emma Wingate   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Nigel Cox (Manchester Metropolitan University)<br>Judith Canham (Manchester Metropolitan University)<br>Rachel McAlpine (Manchester Metropolitan University)<br>Janet Edgar (Manchester Metropolitan University)<br>Katy-Jane Baines (External)<br>Helena Johnson (External)<br>Liz Hancock (Chartered Society of |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Physiotherapists)<br>Ms Nina Thomson (Chartered<br>Society of Physiotherapists) |
|--|---|

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Assessment Regulations   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to be registered with the HPC as having a “licence to practice”. The visitors also noted the documentation stipulated students must complete 1000 hours on practice placement in order to meet HPC requirements for registration. The HPC do not set a specified number of hours to be completed for placement.

The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

### **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:**

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider stipulated students must complete 1000 hours on practice placement in order to meet HPC requirements for registration. The visitors noted the HPC do not set a specified number of hours to be completed for placement.

The visitors consider the information provided could be misleading to students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any reference to the HPC setting a required amount of practice placement hours to be completed.



**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the assessment strategy in place for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the programme documentation did not contain specific reference to the assessment strategy governing the assessment for the programme. In particular, the visitors were unclear as to how students were made aware of the rationale underpinning assessment across the three years of the programme. The definitive document included the heading 'assessment strategies' beginning on page xiii. However this describes the assessment methods used, the marking and moderation procedures, and feedback processes. It does not articulate the underlying strategy or justification for use of the assessment tools, and why the chosen tools will allow students to evidence their achievement of the learning outcomes and how they will enable students to demonstrate their increasing capability as they progress through the programme.

The visitors concluded the programme documentation must clearly articulate the assessment strategy to students. Therefore the visitors require the programme documentation be reviewed accordingly to include the assessment strategy for the programme.

## Recommendations

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the access students have to library and IT facilities.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the provision of IT and library facilities available to students on the programme. The visitors also noted the library had reduced opening hours on the weekend. In the meeting with student representatives, the visitors noted some students accessed the alternative campus library at times as this was more accessible for library and IT resources.

The visitors are satisfied the SET is met however recommend the programme team review the current provision of library and IT services to ensure they continue to be readily available for students.

### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider including specific reference where appropriate to the HPC guidance on health and character and student conduct and ethics.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation and in meeting with programme team there was a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

The visitors are satisfied the SET is met however recommend the programme team include specific reference where appropriate in the programme documentation to the HPC guidance on health and character and student conduct and ethics to assist this process.

Valerie Maehle  
Fleur Kitsell

## Visitors' report

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | University of Plymouth                        |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Full time                                     |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Practitioner psychologist                     |
| <b>Relevant modality / domain</b>    | Clinical psychologist                         |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 2 – 3 March 2010                              |

## Contents

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents .....            | 1 |
| Executive summary .....   | 2 |
| Introduction.....         | 3 |
| Visit details .....       | 3 |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4 |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5 |
| Conditions.....           | 6 |
| Recommendations.....      | 7 |

## 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 April 2010 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 20 May 2010. 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 14 April 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 20 May 2010.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body 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 programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme 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 and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Robert Munro (Biomedical scientist)<br>Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist)   |
| HPC executive officer                                   | Ruth Wood  |
| HPC observer  | Ben Potter   |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 14   |
| Initial approval  | July 2009  |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2010   |
| Chair   | Mick Fuller (University of Plymouth)   |
| Secretary   | Lisa Lamb (University of Plymouth)   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Tim Auburn (University of Plymouth)<br>Mel Joyner (University of Plymouth)<br>Claire Knapman (University of Plymouth)<br>Stephen Melluish (University of Leicester)<br>Joe Miller (Devon Partnership)<br>Lyn Westcott (University of Plymouth)<br>Eve Knight (British Psychological Society)<br>Theresa Powell (British Psychological Society)<br>Carol Martin (British Psychological Society)<br>Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society)<br>Jo Daniels (British Psychological Society)<br>Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) |

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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.

A condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining SET.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and any advertising material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.



## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider including the student's eligibility to register with the HPC alongside the instances where the student's eligibility to apply for chartered status with the British Psychological Society (BPS), appears in the programme documentation.

**Reason:** Within the programme documentation the visitors noted that there are several instances when the eligibility of a student to apply for chartered status with the BPS is made clear. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team review the documentation to include the student's eligibility to register with the HPC alongside these. This would then help to ensure that the eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC and the differences between the regulatory body and the professional body are embedded within a student's learning.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to utilise the Service Receiver and Carer Consultative Group to build on the clear strengths gained from including them in the design and delivery of the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in discussion with the programme team, students and the service users, that the involvement of the Service Receiver and Carer Consultative Group was beneficial in developing areas of the programme such as admissions, inductions, research, teaching, problem based learning and assessment. The visitors wish to support the programme team in maintaining the involvement of the Service Receiver and Carer Consultative Group with this recommendation, to build on the impressive work they have done so far in enhancing the effective management of the programme.

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider the continued monitoring of IT provision for the students when they are on practice placements.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there were concerns raised about access to IT provision on practice placements within the annual programme monitoring documentation. The visitors also noted the provision of IT facilities available to the programme, both on site and at the university library. In the meeting with student representatives, concerns were raised about the some periodic lack of access to IT provision whilst on placement. The visitors were satisfied the standard was met however recommend the programme team continue to monitor

the current provision of IT services to ensure that students' learning continues to be fully supported while on practice placements.

**3.15 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 education provider should consider revising programme documentation to highlight the mandatory attendance requirement for students on the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that within the programme documentation there were some instances where the mandatory attendance requirement was set at 90% and other instances where it was set at 80%. In discussion with the programme team this was clarified as 80%. As such the visitors are satisfied the standard is met however recommend the programme team review the documentation to avoid any confusion for students and staff about the mandatory attendance requirements.

Robert Munro  
Laura Golding

## Visitors' report

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | The Open University                               |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | Diploma in Higher Education in Paramedic Sciences |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Part time   |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Paramedic   |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 28 January 2010                                   |

## Contents

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents .....            | 1 |
| Executive summary .....   | 2 |
| Introduction.....         | 3 |
| Visit details .....       | 3 |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4 |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5 |
| 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 March 2010 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 20 May 2010. 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 14 May 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2010.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum and practice placements. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating/awarding body did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Vince Clarke (Paramedic)<br>Jim Petter (Paramedic) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Rachel Greig                                       |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 100  |
| Initial approval  | 1 October 2008                                     |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | August 2010  |
| Chair   | Prof Trevor Herbert (The Open University)          |
| Secretary   | Alison Nash (The Open University)                  |

## 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The HPC did not review SETs mapping documents prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, these were reviewed at the visit itself.

The HPC did not review SOPs mapping, practice placement handbook, curriculum vitae for relevant staff or external examiners reports prior to the visit as these documents were not required by the visitors and not necessary to assess the change.

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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)             | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The HPC did not see the learning resources or specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the major change did not effect these areas.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing 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 programme.

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

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

## Conditions

### **2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit the final version of the APEL learning guide for review.

**Reason:** The document entitled 'SZL110 Demonstrating practice in health sciences. APEL Learning Guide' was review by the visitors prior and during the visit. This document outlines details relating to the proposed APEL module, SZL110, which formed part of the education providers major change submission. Upon review of this document and through discussions with the programme team the visitors were happy to approve the major change and accept the module as an avenue for students to access the programme via APEL. However, the visitors noted the document was still in draft form and identified some incorrect wording relating to who would be entitled to undertake the module. Therefore, in order for the visitors to be ensured the information in the APEL Learning Guide is accurate and correct they require this document to be finalised and resubmitted for review.

### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit documentation that demonstrates to sponsors that practice placements are integral to the programme.

**Reason:** Currently the education provider uses the Collaborative Agreement to delegate responsibility of arranging placements to a students' sponsor. In the programme documentation there is a list of placements that students are expected to complete in order to achieve the learning outcomes and thus the standards of proficiency. Currently it is stated that these placements are mandatory. As part of the major change submission the education provider wishes to change the wording around placements from 'required' to 'indicative'. However, the visitors were concerned that changes of this wording may result in some sponsors neglecting to arrange placements for their students. If this was the case the visitors felt the programme would no longer meet the SET as placements may not remain an integral part of the programme.

During discussions with the head of department the visitors learned that as a requirement for student progression and completion of the programme students had to submit a placement time log which was assessed along with their portfolio containing reflective accounts of each of their placements. If at the end of the programme a students time log was judged by the education provider to not be adequate eg the placements were not sufficiently varied or the student had not completed enough placement hours then that student would fail. Similarly, if after the first year of the programme the education provider had concerns over the students' attendance of placements this would be investigated further to ensure adequate progression.



The visitors were satisfied that the assessment of the time log was a suitable tool for the education provider to ensure placements remained an integral part of the programme however would like to see documentary evidence describing this system. Additionally, the visitors would like to see evidence of how this system is communicated to the signatories of the Collaborative Agreement. The visitors feel by communicating this to the sponsors it will be understood that placements must form an integral part of the programme and student progression and completion is dependent on their attendance of placements.

## **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit documentation that demonstrates to sponsors the importance of an appropriate number, range and duration of placements to support programme delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** Currently the education provider uses the Collaborative Agreement to delegate responsibility of arranging placements to a students' sponsor. In the programme documentation there is a list of placements that students are expected to complete in order to achieve the learning outcomes and thus the standards of proficiency. Currently it is stated that these placements are mandatory. As part of the major change submission the education provider wishes to change the wording around placements from 'required' to 'indicative'. However, the visitors were concerned that changes of this wording may result in some sponsors neglecting to arrange placements for their students and certain competencies may be signed off without appropriate placement experience. If this was the case the visitors felt the programme would no longer meet the SET as the number, duration and range of placements would not be sufficient to delivery the programme.

During discussions with the head of department the visitors learned that as a requirement for student progression and completion of the programme students had to submit a placement time log which was assessed along with their portfolio containing reflective accounts of each of their placements. If at the end of the programme a students time log was judged by the education provider to not be adequate eg the placements were not sufficiently varied or the student had not completed enough placement hours then that student would fail. Similarly, if after the first year of the programme the education provider had concerns over the students' attendance of placements this would be investigated further to ensure adequate progression.

The visitors were satisfied that the assessment of the time log was a suitable tool for the education provider to ensure students had access to the appropriate number, duration and range of placements however would like to see documentary evidence describing this system. Additionally, the visitors would like to see evidence of how this system is communicated to the signatories of the Collaborative Agreement. The visitors feel by communicating this to the sponsors it will be understood that student progression and completion of the programme is dependent on their attendance of a wide range and number of placements over an appropriate time scale.

Vince Clarke  
Jim Petter

## Visitors' report

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | The Open University                    |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Part time                              |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Paramedic                              |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 28 January 2010                        |

## Contents

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents .....            | 1 |
| Executive summary .....   | 2 |
| Introduction.....         | 3 |
| Visit details .....       | 3 |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4 |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5 |
| 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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 March 2010 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 20 May 2010. 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 14 May 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2010.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum and practice placements. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating/awarding body did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the Diploma in Higher Education in Paramedic Sciences. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Vince Clarke (Paramedic)<br>Jim Petter (Paramedic) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Rachel Greig                                       |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 100  |
| Initial approval  | 1 October 2008                                     |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | August 2010  |
| Chair   | Prof Trevor Herbert (The Open University)          |
| Secretary   | Alison Nash (The Open University)                  |

## 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The HPC did not review SETs mapping documents prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, these were reviewed at the visit itself.

The HPC did not review SOPs mapping, practice placement handbook, curriculum vitae for relevant staff or external examiners reports prior to the visit as these documents were not required by the visitors and not necessary to assess the change.

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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)             | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The HPC did not see the learning resources or specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the major change did not effect these areas.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing 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 programme.

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

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

## Conditions

### **2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit the final version of the APEL learning guide for review.

**Reason:** The document entitled 'SZL110 Demonstrating practice in health sciences. APEL Learning Guide' was review by the visitors prior and during the visit. This document outlines details relating to the proposed APEL module, SZL110, which formed part of the education providers major change submission. Upon review of this document and through discussions with the programme team the visitors were happy to approve the major change and accept the module as an avenue for students to access the programme via APEL. However, the visitors noted the document was still in draft form and identified some incorrect wording relating to who would be entitled to undertake the module. Therefore, in order for the visitors to be ensured the information in the APEL Learning Guide is accurate and correct they require this document to be finalised and resubmitted for review.

### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit documentation that demonstrates to sponsors that practice placements are integral to the programme.

**Reason:** Currently the education provider uses the Collaborative Agreement to delegate responsibility of arranging placements to a students' sponsor. In the programme documentation there is a list of placements that students are expected to complete in order to achieve the learning outcomes and thus the standards of proficiency. Currently it is stated that these placements are mandatory. As part of the major change submission the education provider wishes to change the wording around placements from 'required' to 'indicative'. However, the visitors were concerned that changes of this wording may result in some sponsors neglecting to arrange placements for their students. If this was the case the visitors felt the programme would no longer meet the SET as placements may not remain an integral part of the programme.

During discussions with the head of department the visitors learned that as a requirement for student progression and completion of the programme students had to submit a placement time log which was assessed along with their portfolio containing reflective accounts of each of their placements. If at the end of the programme a students time log was judged by the education provider to not be adequate eg the placements were not sufficiently varied or the student had not completed enough placement hours then that student would fail. Similarly, if after the first year of the programme the education provider had concerns over the students' attendance of placements this would be investigated further to ensure adequate progression.



The visitors were satisfied that the assessment of the time log was a suitable tool for the education provider to ensure placements remained an integral part of the programme however would like to see documentary evidence describing this system. Additionally, the visitors would like to see evidence of how this system is communicated to the signatories of the Collaborative Agreement. The visitors feel by communicating this to the sponsors it will be understood that placements must form an integral part of the programme and student progression and completion is dependent on their attendance of placements.

## **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit documentation that demonstrates to sponsors the importance of an appropriate number, range and duration of placements to support programme delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** Currently the education provider uses the Collaborative Agreement to delegate responsibility of arranging placements to a students' sponsor. In the programme documentation there is a list of placements that students are expected to complete in order to achieve the learning outcomes and thus the standards of proficiency. Currently it is stated that these placements are mandatory. As part of the major change submission the education provider wishes to change the wording around placements from 'required' to 'indicative'. However, the visitors were concerned that changes of this wording may result in some sponsors neglecting to arrange placements for their students and certain competencies may be signed off without appropriate placement experience. If this was the case the visitors felt the programme would no longer meet the SET as the number, duration and range of placements would not be sufficient to delivery the programme.

During discussions with the head of department the visitors learned that as a requirement for student progression and completion of the programme students had to submit a placement time log which was assessed along with their portfolio containing reflective accounts of each of their placements. If at the end of the programme a students time log was judged by the education provider to not be adequate eg the placements were not sufficiently varied or the student had not completed enough placement hours then that student would fail. Similarly, if after the first year of the programme the education provider had concerns over the students' attendance of placements this would be investigated further to ensure adequate progression.

The visitors were satisfied that the assessment of the time log was a suitable tool for the education provider to ensure students had access to the appropriate number, duration and range of placements however would like to see documentary evidence describing this system. Additionally, the visitors would like to see evidence of how this system is communicated to the signatories of the Collaborative Agreement. The visitors feel by communicating this to the sponsors it will be understood that student progression and completion of the programme is dependent on their attendance of a wide range and number of placements over an appropriate time scale.

Vince Clarke  
Jim Petter